

REVIEWS / COMPTES RENDUS

- Bryan D. Palmer, *Working-Class Experience: The Rise and Reconstitution of Canadian Labour, 1800-1980*
by Leo Panitch / 221
- Labour History* (Labour History Provincial Specialist Association of the British Columbia Teachers' Federation)
by Ellen Moffat / 225
- Judith Fingard, *Jack in Port: Sailortowns of Eastern Canada*
by Marcus Rediker / 230
- William Repka and Kathleen M. Repka, *Dangerous Patriots: Canada's Unknown Prisoners of War*
by Desmond Morton / 231
- Eileen Sufrin, *The Eaton Drive: The Campaign to Organize Canada's Largest Department Store, 1948 to 1952*
by Mercedes Steedman / 233
- Bill Freeman, *1005: Political Life in a Union Local*
by David Millar / 236
- Hayden Roberts, *Culture and Adult Education: A Study of Alberta and Quebec*
by John Bullen / 238
- Wallace Clement, *Class, Power and Property: Essays on Canadian Society*
by S.D. Clark / 240
- Donald J. Patton, *Industrial Development and the Atlantic Fishery: Opportunities for Manufacturing and Skilled Workers in the 1980s*
by R. James Sacouman / 242
- Maureen Fitzgerald, Connie Guberman, and Margie Wolfe, eds., *Still Ain't Satisfied: Canadian Feminism Today*
by Margaret Benston / 243
- Yvan Lamonde, Lucia Ferreti et Daniel Leblanc, *La culture ouvrière à Montréal (1880-1920): bilan historiographique*
par Jean-Guy Genest / 245
- Jean Gérin Lajoie, *Les Métallus 1936-1981*
par Georges Massé / 249
- David M. Gordon, Richard Edwards, and Michael Reich, *Segmented Work, Divided Workers: The Historical Transformation of Labor in the United States*
by Michael H. Frisch / 255
- Maurice Isserman, *Which Side Were You On?: The American Communist Party During the Second World War*
by John Saville / 258
- Joel Denker, *Unions and Universities: The Rise of the New Labor Leader*
by Paul Axelrod / 261
- Stephen A. Marini, *Radical Sects of Revolutionary New England*
by Bruce Tucker / 262
- James Oakes, *The Ruling Race: A History of American Slaveholders*
by Robert McCormack / 264
- Ronald L.F. Davis, *Good and Faithful Labor: From Slavery to Sharecropping in the Natchez District, 1860-1890*
by Herbert Aptheker / 266
- Bruce M. Stave, ed., *Modern Industrial Cities: History, Policy, and Survival*
by Gilbert A. Stelter / 267
- Gwendolyn Wright, *Building the Dream: A Social History of Housing in America*
by Peter G. Goheen / 268
- Alice Kessler-Harris, *Out to Work: A History of Wage-Earning Women in the United States*
by Linda Kealey / 270
- Daniel E. Sutherland, *Americans and Their Servants: Domestic Service in the United States from 1800-1920*
by Deborah Gorham / 272

- Barbara Melosh, *'The Physician's Hand': Work Culture and Conflict in American Nursing*
by Kathryn McPherson / 273
- Margery W. Davies, *Woman's Place Is at the Typewriter: Office Work and Office Workers
1870-1930*
by Nancy S. Jackson / 275
- Margaret W. Rossiter, *Women Scientists In America: Struggles and Strategies to 1940*
by Anita Clair Fellman / 277
- Rachel Kahn-Hut *et al.*, ed., *Women and Work*
by Arlene Tigar McLaren / 280
- Chris Aldred, *Women at Work*
by Patricia Lane / 281
- Kevin Harris, *Teachers and Classes: A Marxist Analysis*
by Jane Gaskell / 283
- Jean-Pierre Bardou, Jean-Jacques Chanaron, Patrick Friedenson, James M. Laux, *The
Automobile Revolution: The Impact of an Industry*
by Robert E. Ankli / 284
- Maria Hirszowicz, *Industrial Sociology: An Introduction*
by G.B. Rush / 285
- Charles F. Sabel, *Work and Politics. The Division of Labor in Industry*
by Carl J. Cuneo / 288
- J.M. Bumsted, *The People's Clearance, 1770-1815*, and Stephen P. Dunn, *The Fall & Rise of
the Asiatic Mode of Production*
by Rosemary E. Ommer / 291
- Willie Orr, *Deer Forests, Landlords, and Crofters: The Western Highlands in Victorian and
Edwardian Times*
by J.M. Bumsted / 296
- Raymond H. Dominick III, *Wilhelm Liebknecht and the Founding of the German Social
Democratic Party*
by Glen R. McDougall / 298
- Jean Lacouture, *Leon Blum*
by John Sherwood / 300
- Carmen Sirianni, *Workers Control and Socialist Democracy: The Soviet Experience*
by Larry Peterson / 303
- Richard Cornell, *Revolutionary Vanguard: The Early Years of the Communist Youth
International, 1914-1924*
by Ken Hansen / 306
- Victor Rothman, *Britain and the Cold War, 1941-1947*
by Donald Avery / 308
- Geoff Hodgson, *Labour at the Crossroads*
by Donald Swartz / 311
- Peter Richardson, *Chinese Mine Labour in the Transvaal*
by T. Jin Tan / 313
- Mikiso Hane, *Peasants, Rebels and Outcasts: The Underside of Japan*
by E. Patricia Tsurumi / 315
- Eric Fry, ed., *Rebels and Radicals*
by George Rudé / 317

REVIEWS / COMPTES RENDUS*

Bryan D. Palmer, *Working-Class Experience: The Rise and Reconstitution of Canadian Labour, 1800-1980* (Toronto: Butterworths 1983).

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THIS ambitious book need hardly be stressed: it is the first attempt by a labour historian of the new "Marxist/culturalist" school to survey the entire span of working-class history in Canada through the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. It is immediately apparent that this is a book which could not have been written ten years ago. Its ability to transcend the conventional surveys of labour organization and labour politics to present a broader and deeper cultural history of working-class life rests in good part on more particular recent studies in time and place by a new generation of social historians, especially those doing feminist as well as labour history. Indeed, in one sense Palmer's new book may be seen as a tribute to a decade of work by these historians, providing a rich showcase as well as a synthesis of their work.

Even with these resources to call on, it must be said that such an ambitious undertaking took courage; some will even say *chutzpah*. Yet the utility of the project and its issue cannot be denied. Students can now be introduced to a broad sweep of working-class history in Canada through a book which does not actually treat the

telos of this history as the legal institutionalization of the trade unions and the creation of the CLC and the NDP. They will find, moreover, that it is unnecessary to think about class in Canada as one of a series of "factors" (region, religion, ethnicity, gender . . . class) with the point being to pronounce one factor more important than another in Canadian history or in shaping workers' lives; and that it is possible instead to think about class holistically, to see how the particular "factors" simultaneously compose and fragment social life, and in doing so produce that distinctive collectivity — the *Canadian* working class. They will be brought to understand that a class analysis does not mean describing this or that class in isolation, but means examining the formative relations between classes as they develop through time. Students will be able to appreciate through reading this book that when it is said that a class is formed through conflict or struggle, this is *not* to be construed to mean that the history of the class is predominantly one of revolutionary consciousness and purpose. (D. Bercuson take note.) It means rather that it is through workers' attempts to establish their autonomy *vis-à-vis* capital and the state that the working class becomes more than a collective object (with workers having only a structurally given exploitation and domination in common) and becomes a collective subject, an active, living force in society and history. The struggles workers engage in may be about wages or dignity, organization or

* Table of Contents for reviews is on pp. 4 and 5.

control, elections or revolutions, but however mundane or lofty these struggles, they become the stuff of class formation as they yield collective experiences, ideas, and associations which are more or less autonomous and distinctive from those of other classes. In this respect, one of the most valuable aspects of the book is Palmer's repeated demonstration that working-class defeats no less than victories can contribute to the making of a class; it is in the process of coming together for the struggle that collective identities are formed. Those who would count in and counsel only the successful compromise, and count out the spectacular failure on the grounds that "it is better to bend than break," will understand little of the process of class formation.

In teaching lessons like these, Palmer's book constitutes an explicit critique of an earlier social democratic labour history. That it does so less through theoretical assertion than through empirico-historical example is one of the book's main strengths (although Palmer is not above taking a Morton or a Bercuson on in direct debate, and this indeed livens many a page). But this book can also be seen as a defence against the critics of the new labour historians, especially of Palmer's and Kealey's work on Ontario. To those who have alleged a centralist bias, it can be said that this book pays more attention to working-class life, organization, and struggle in the Maritimes and B.C. than any previous labour history survey of Canada. Those who have charged blindness to American domination and the national question may be surprised to find here a major emphasis on the role of American capital in transforming the *Canadian political economy from the turn of the century onwards*; and they will find as well a sympathetic treatment of the CCU and other nationalist forces in the modern labour movement. And against those who have complained of ideological passion scorching the "objective" historical record, it can be said in return that

Palmer's treatment here of the CCF-CP conflict through the 1930s and the 1940s constitutes one of the few truly non-sectarian discussions of this critical chapter in Canadian labour history (Palmer acknowledges that Abella is another).

Perhaps most important, those who think that the word "experience" in the title means that the book is about quaint but ephemeral cultural practices from the charivari to Joe Beef's tavern to Bob Dylan's music are in for a surprise. Palmer's concepts of culture and experience include unions and parties as well as "ritual and revelry;" indeed, for good or ill, the reader will actually find far more of the former than of the latter as she or he moves from the first chapter on 1800-1850 through the rest of the book. As for the "bloodless economic categories" of economic stage and structure, there is no dearth of this either, as is only to be expected from an author who makes it explicit at the outset that "it is class, as embedded in the structural, primarily economic context of specific social formations, that is at the conceptual root of this study." Again, it can confidently be said that there is more attention paid here to consideration of the changing structure of capital and to occupational and sectional shifts than in any other labour history survey.

Obviously I am a fan. Yet despite all of its undeniable positive qualities, I found reading this book a troubling and ultimately disappointing experience. *Accustomed to being taken by the hand* and given a slow walking tour of working-class life in late nineteenth-century Hamilton, it came as a shock to be put on a fast train, whereby we covered a lot of distance but at the expense of the blurring of the images. This book suffers, in other words, from the insurmountable defect of historical surveys. The excitement generated by the new history has very much derived from the opportunity it affords of savouring working-class life in rich detail. To be sure, the critics may

sneer at generalizations made from the study of this or that city or region, but someone who has lived the working-class experience can recognize, given sufficient detail, the genuinely common elements of exploitation, struggle, and community, and observe with fascination how they come to be expressed in different or like fashion in his or her own place and time and in another. With the survey, however, much of the richness of the detail is lost in favour of chronology and comprehensiveness. I was tantalized by being exposed to many things of which I had been ignorant, but I was frustrated by the inadequacy of only being able to examine them through a few lines of text.

The frustration, and ultimately the tedium, of the rush of incident and fact is tempered of course by the connection established between them by the author's interpretation and argument. The fast train of a survey is always taking you somewhere, usually to the point where the working class can be said to be "made" (or to have "made it"). For the social democratic historians that destination, as I have said, is the legal institutionalization of the trade unions and the creation of the CLC and NDP, in the post-World War II era. For Palmer that destination is reached much earlier, indeed before most other historians have even started their journey. Yet in this respect, too, the book is quite troubling.

Palmer's central theme is that the Canadian working class was "made" in the 1880s, a decade of "unprecedented working class militancy and cultural cohesion," when the class was first unified through the "movement culture" of the Knights of Labor which took an "unequivocal stand" against industrial capitalism. It is this decade which in fact provides the focal point for Palmer's entire survey. The three chapters on the nineteenth century are conceived in terms of their leading up to the "consolidation" in the 1880s of a distinctive, oppositional, unified, working-class culture out of the

breakdown of the fragmented local paternalisms of early nineteenth-century Canada. The three chapters on the twentieth century follow the theme of the working class being "unmade," as Palmer actually puts it. The struggles of the first two decades of the twentieth century, culminating in the famous conflict of 1919, are portrayed as an "Indian Summer," as the last battle cry of the Knights' "movement culture." The decade of the 1920s is seen in terms of the consolidation of monopoly capitalism and the onset of a culture of mass consumerism, both of which pulverize and atomize the working-class community. A "reconstitution" is begun again with the unemployed and CIO struggles of the 1930s and continues right through to the white-collar unionization and wage militancy of the 1960s and 1970s. But the benchmark always remains the 1880s, whose unity of political and workplace struggles with "a culture of resistance and alternative" has never been reestablished.

It is perhaps not surprising that Palmer should place the period he knows best at the centre of his survey, and it is certainly not invalid for him to attempt to reestablish a collective memory for the Canadian working class that antedates the CIO or 1919. But he actually does both the 1880s and the study of the Canadian working class a disservice by trying to make that decade bear a weight that it simply cannot sustain. Indeed, astonishing as it may seem, Palmer's chapter on the 1880s and the Knights of Labor is in some ways the least satisfying chapter in the book, precisely because so much is made to ride on it. We are given but the merest glance into the Knights' ideology, programme, and strategy, so that the treatment of the Knights as the central unifying force of the class simply lacks substance. And one has the uncomfortable feeling throughout the chapter that despite Palmer's repeated claims about unprecedented and unsurpassed working-class *cohesion*, there is in fact little effective unity for the class

transcending the level of region. It is therefore with some chagrin that we find *only at the end of the chapter* that the riddle that has been plaguing us is finally answered in a way that denies what Palmer seemed to be arguing or at least lends only a very particular meaning to terms like consolidation and fragmentation. It turns out that the "movement culture" overcame paternalism but not localism, that the horizons of this "unified culture" were effectively bounded by particular constituencies, communities, and neighbourhoods, and that not even the leadership of this movement culture had an orientation towards developing an economic or political strategy which would turn the working class into a *cohesive national force*.

Once seen in this light, Palmer's whole project of trying to demonstrate the making and unmaking of the Canadian working class at a point around 1886 becomes, if not wrong, then at least strained and precious. For as much as the Knights accomplished in the 1880s, the rapid demise of the "movement culture" together with its *inherent localism*, leaves us contemplating what was not even begun to be accomplished in terms of "consolidation." Palmer is of course uncomfortably aware of this and tries to account for the Knights' failures in terms of their being trapped by the "limits of their experience" in "small scale production and community" so that they could not recognize the significance of national politics or economic strategy. But will this really do in the context of a domestic conjuncture where the bourgeoisie was ambitiously developing and realizing a grandiose "national policy" on a continental plane? And will it do in the context of an international conjuncture where the working class in this very decade was developing in Germany and elsewhere the great mass social democratic parties?

The point, however, is not to give what Palmer calls the Knights' "eclectic radicalism" a worse mark than the Second

International's Marxism. It is rather to insist that any analysis of the development of the Canadian working class must dwell on what remained to be done, far more than what was "undone" as the working class turned to the twentieth century. For what is put on the agenda by the struggles of *this century* is precisely the attempt to forge a unity for the working class beyond workplace and locale, to allow the working class to play a role as a distinctive national economic and political force. In this sense, it is entirely more appropriate to see 1919, for instance, in terms of its links to the struggles of the 1930s and 1940s than in terms of its links to the 1880s.

But even if one wants to say that the Canadian working class came closer to "consolidation" in the 1930s and 1940s than in the 1880s, this still hides the main point, which is that in comparative terms the Canadian working class has always been and remains one of the less successful of the western working classes in forging political, economic, or cultural unity. This is not a matter of saying that region or ethnicity is "more important" than class but rather that the expression of class in Canada has been characterized by greater pluralism and fragmentation and less cohesion and unity than in many other societies, and that this has made the working class weaker as a political and cultural force than in those other countries. Palmer describes this condition well enough and from time to time he raises particular factors that contribute to it (not least, in his view, twentieth-century immigration). But he refuses to try his hand at a general explanation in comparative terms, so that we might weigh the specificity of immigration in the Canadian case or compare the timing and impact of mass consumerism or monopoly capitalism here and elsewhere. In the end, with a "message" in a two-page conclusion to a 300-page book that we draw inspiration from the example of the 1880s, we feel cheated. The author has simply not lived up suffi-

ciently to the promise of the quotation on the frontispiece of the book where, through the words of Trotsky, we were told to expect not only an honest study of the facts but "a determination of their real connections, an exposure of the causal laws of their movement."

Others, perhaps less concerned with determination, and more concerned with comprehensiveness will complain of facts that are "left out." Short of asking for an encyclopaedia, one hesitates to raise this kind of objection. Yet there are some curious omissions. It is not clear why the Québécois working-class experience should have been virtually ignored in the chapter covering the first two decades of this century (although the rise and fall of the Catholic unions is briefly taken up in a subsequent chapter). Nor is it easy to justify why so little attention is paid to working-class politics at the municipal level in the inter-war years, especially in light of the enormous salience that is given to this in the 1880s. Indeed, it might be said that Palmer's claims with regard to the weakness of labour reformism during the 1920s and with regard to the CCF's lack of a working-class and ethnic base until the 1940s collapses entirely once this municipal dimension is introduced.

Perhaps most troubling of all is the fact that Palmer gives in fact quite little space to working-class *culture* in the twentieth century. One gets a better look at the life and habits of the working-class organizer-intellectual in the first few decades of this century from Penner's *The Canadian Left* than from Palmer's *Experience*. Additionally, the labour temples, the benefit and aid societies, and the ethnic newspapers are given very little attention in their own right. As for the chapter covering 1940-80, Palmer's sympathies and interpretations are radical but in his primary concentration on labour organization and labour politics, he is quite conventional. Given that he is clearly aware that the trade union is *not* the centre of working-class life, one might

have expected him to search out other dimensions of contemporary working-class experience, or to give us at least a lead toward undertaking a study of the transformations in working-class culture in the modern era that the Centre for Contemporary Culture Studies has been attempting to do for Britain. Even as regards the trade unions, one might have expected more attention to be paid to their internal life, to their varied modes of local, regional, and national organization, to some discussion of the *cultural* dimension of union participation for activists, (e.g. the social role of conventions). This is not necessarily a matter of asking for original research for the kind of book that obviously must rely on secondary sources. Rather one has the feeling that material that would be considered a gold mine regarding the nineteenth century is left unexamined on the shelf for the modern era (e.g., sociological studies of Canadian community life, surveys of working-class attitudes, etc.)

Palmer is unable to deliver all that he promises, but he still delivers a great deal. This is certainly the best Canadian labour history survey yet written or that is likely to be written for quite some time.

Leo Panitch
York University

Labour History (Labour History Provincial Specialist Association of the British Columbia Teachers' Federation), 1977-1982.

IN SLIGHTLY MORE than a decade the pendulum of education in B.C. has had its course reversed. It has been transformed from an abundant and expanding resource to one which is struggling for survival. The cause of the reversal is the restraint programme of the Bennett government which is threatening and even eliminating gains made by teachers throughout the 1970s.

On a much smaller scale teachers face another loss — the termination of the Labour History Association. Over the past seven years teachers in the B.C. Teachers' Federation have been working to introduce labour histories into the curriculum in B.C. public schools. In 1976 they formed the Labour History Provincial Specialist Association, an organization which was unique in Canada. This was "the first time that so large a group of teachers in any federation has associated themselves together for the purpose of making labour's history an integral part of the educational system of B.C." Although its membership remained small, the PSA was remarkably productive. It produced a journal, *Labour History*; a film, "For Twenty Cents a Day," which was shown at festivals in Berlin and Edinburgh; slide/tape shows, "These were the Reasons" and "Strike;" in-service workshops for teachers; and conferences.

In January 1983, the executive of the association decided it must "change its methods of promoting the teaching of labour history and of providing a service to its membership." In other words, the association closed its books. It may or may not resume its activities in the future. The association's reasons for termination were a shortage of funds for providing journals, an inability to fulfill its obligations to its members, a lack of new active members, and new directions taken by some members.

This decision will affect many teachers since the association has provided a quantity of resource material for teaching labour studies. Furthermore, although members of the association will continue to be involved with the development and implementation of labour studies programmes, issues such as government cutbacks to education or province-wide examinations will likely take precedence over curriculum development.

The association's publication — *Labour History* — represents one of the

association's attempts to provide resource material about the history of working people. The journal was non-academic and addressed itself to an audience of teachers, high-school students, and members of the trade union movement. Ten issues of *Labour History* have been printed since 1977. This article will review the journal, focusing on its motivations, content, successes, and failures. Prior to the review, the major goals and objectives of the Labour History Association will be outlined to provide background information about the journal.

The Labour History Association grew out of teachers' frustrations with a social studies curriculum that failed to prepare students for their futures as workers. Colleen Bostwick, a past editor of *Labour History*, commented on the situation for students in an article about child labour:

Today in North America and Britain, those under 18 spend a good deal of their time in public schools. Yet what do they learn of their predecessors? There is hardly any recognition of the thousands of young people and small children whose lives were so shamefully ground into the foundation of industrial capitalism. That time seems so long ago and so unrelated to our world — but is it? Among the most exploited workers today are young people under 18 years old.

The association set out to redress the imbalance in the curriculum. Its major goal was to promote a recognition by teachers and students of the contribution of working people and their trade unions to the development of B.C. and Canada. To realize this goal, the association proposed to research and develop materials about labour studies.

The proposed resource materials were intended to cover the history of working people and emphasis was placed upon exploration of such developments as struggles for the eight-hour day, higher wages, and workers' compensation. From the inception of the Labour History Association there was opposition from conservative elements in the federation. To

avoid political alignments within the federation and further criticism, the association attempted to adopt a position of neutrality. This meant it presented the history of unions as a history of tensions between employees and employers. It avoided such issues as the American domination of Canadian trade unions or class biases in the schools. Although this perspective was limited and simplistic, this approach enabled teachers to confront the anti-union attitudes of most students.

The editorial policy of *Labour History* was to give positive consideration to the historic role of working people, mainly in B.C. and Canada, both in relation to work and within society. For practical reasons material in the journals was organized by themes. These were: sectors of B.C. labour (logging, fishing, mining, public sector employees, Indian workers, child labour, and railways), the Depression, and fiction. Original research, oral histories, articles reprinted from labour publications, literature, reviews, lesson plans and bibliographies formed the bulk of published material.

Two issues of *Labour History* dealt with logging (Vol. I, No. 1 and Vol. II, No. 2). The first issue, which also doubled as the association's newsletter, was a composite by the executive. Its lead story, "The IWA," detailed the growth of the union and the struggle between communist and non-communist factions within labour. The second issue contained a collection of short articles about logging in the 1930s. It presented material reprinted mainly from the *B.C. Lumber Worker*, the publication of the Lumber Worker's Industrial Union. The content of the items centred on the organization of workers and strikes for increased wages and improved working conditions.

The issue on fishing (Vol. 1, No. 2) addressed teachers and students. Reviews of books and audio-visual material, lesson plans, and a guide to labour material from the Special Collections Division at the University of British Columbia Library

were presented and a number of articles were reprinted from *The Fisherman*, published by the Pacific Coast Fisherman's Union, the predecessor of the United Fishermen and Allied Workers' Union. These articles focused on organizing cannery workers (mainly native and Japanese women) and strikes in 1900 and 1936.

The most active period in B.C.'s mining history was from 1900-1914 and received treatment in Vol. I, No. 3. The feature article, "The Story of B.C. Mining," contrasts the history of two B.C. mining centres, Rossland in the Kootenay region and Vancouver Island. In Rossland the Western Federation of Miners went on strike in 1901 over the discriminatory hiring policies of the mine manager. Strikes in 1903 and 1912-14 by miners on Vancouver Island were over the right to unionize.

Material covering public sector employees (Vol. II, No. 1) was directed specifically at a high school audience. The writing style was deliberately simplified and general. Articles explored briefly the histories of the Vancouver Municipal and Regional Employees Union (VMREU), the Canadian Union of Public Employees (CUPE), and the B.C. Government Employees Union (BCGEU). Excerpts from a 1945 report over the question of affiliation by the B.C. Government Employees Association to the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada have also been reprinted.

The issue on Indian workers in B.C. (Vol. II, No. 3) considers both the Indian point of view and the attitudes of government and industry. "Indian Workers in B.C." is a summary of Rolf Knight's book on the history of Indians in industries such as fishing, logging, and long-shoring. Oral histories with two Indians from the Sechelt Indian Band present their work experiences. Reprinted government records and newspaper items illustrate the racist attitudes towards Indians within the government and industry.

"All Work and No Play: Children in

the New Industries" introduces the theme of child labour (Vol. II, No. 4). The introduction reviews the use of children in factories and mining operations in Britain and North America as well as the growth of legislation to eliminate child labour. Excerpts from the Royal Commission on the Relations of Labour and Capital include a description of the factory system in the 1880s and testimonies that are graphic illustrations of child labour in Canada.

The issue on B.C. railways (Vol. III, No. 1) consists mainly of reprinted items. These include an excerpt from *Raincoast Chronicles* about logging and the railway, the history of the CPR in Vancouver, a report of a strike by CPR workers in 1885, and collages on the IWW and working conditions on the railways. There is also a short essay about the Canadian Northern strike of 1912.

During the Depression (Vol. I, No. 4), the struggles of unemployed workers were against more than unemployment and poverty. There were political struggles against fascism, and trade union struggles to organize and to protect and extend the rights of workers. "The Hungry '30's" illustrates the ineffective role of all three levels of government and the consequent response of the unemployed to government solutions. An interview with Syd Thompson relays his experiences in relief camps and his involvement with the Relief Camp Workers' Union. Activities of the unemployed are covered in articles — the "On-to-Ottawa Trek" and "The Regina Riot" — reprinted from *Sound Heritage*. Selections from *Bloody Sunday* by Steve Brodie report the activities of the RCMP and Vancouver city police in evacuating 1,200 men from the Vancouver Post Office on 19 June 1938.

The last journal is devoted to working-class fiction (Vol. III, No. 2). Literature includes prose about strikes, an excerpt from *One Proud Summer* by M. Hewitt and C. Mackay, and a short story, "The Task Eternal," in addition to poetry

about unemployment. A poetry unit and writings by students about their prospects for employment provide suggestions for writing assignments for secondary school students.

Most issues also contain reviews, lesson plans, songs, and bibliographies. Reviews of books, films, and audio-visual resources are geared to teachers. The lesson plans are in varying stages of completion. Some are ready to use, while others require additional teacher preparation. Songs are accompanied by explanatory articles by Phil Thomas, a collector of folk songs that were common throughout B.C.'s history. The bibliographies aim to serve both an adult and an adolescent audience.

Issues in *Labour History* are presented as a history of tensions between workers and employers. They are generally reviewed in a straightforward, unprovocative, and perhaps somewhat simplistic manner. Articles tend to portray only the workers' struggles while attitudes or activities of the employers are usually ignored. This may have been shortsighted. An article in "Mining" (Vol. 1, No. 3) referred to and criticized the Royal Commission of 1903 that investigated the industrial difficulties in B.C. No details of the commission were given. Excerpts from the Royal Commission may have been valuable resource material for teachers to allow a more complete analysis of the workers' struggles by students.

Those issues of *Labour History* which do present information from opposing sectors include "Indian Workers" (Vol. II, No. 3) and "Child Labour" (Vol. II, No. 4). "Indian Workers" provides material to contrast the work lives of the Indians with racist government and managerial attitudes. "Child Labour" includes several testimonies from factory owners and workers which reveal the use of child labour in Canada. The presentation of material from opposing sectors gives a more accurate view of the com-

plexities and difficulties for workers in their struggles.

Labour History has contributed valuable resource material about labour studies in B.C., particularly through oral histories and original research. The association's executive recognized the urgent need for material on labour studies. "Labour studies needs to be captured and put into usable form to educate the public. It must be captured quickly. When the live activists die, a part of B.C.'s history will be lost and pieces for future generations will be missing."

Although the association intended to organize numerous professional development seminars, it was more active with production than with implementation. As mentioned above, the association made important contributions to labour studies in B.C. Given the fact that the group of active members was small, the association was notably productive. Furthermore its production and distribution of resource material throughout the province facilitated the process of teaching labour studies. However, the association neglected to educate teachers about the use of the journal or other resource material. It also failed to recruit new and active members. Instead, the association tended to cater to its supporters and to overlook the problem of educating unconvinced teachers.

Labour History attempted to reach three audiences — teachers, high school students, and members of the trade union movement. This wide focus reflected the goals of the Labour History Association. The association aimed to raise the awareness of teachers and to encourage them to recognize that labour history is an integral part of general education. It sought to promote an understanding among teachers and students of the unique role of the B.C. labour movement in the development of B.C. and Canada. Finally it recognized the affinity between teachers and trade unionists and the need to develop connections with the trade union movement.

Teachers interested in developing lessons about labour studies tended to seek material which was lesson-ready. Students who were unfamiliar with the history of labour needed basic material about such topics as the sectors in opposition, the issues behind the workers' struggles, and the difficulties encountered by workers in affecting change. Members of the trade union movement were interested in material about the history of their own union or industry. Addressing such a wide audience may have been a mistake.

Although the concerns of the three groups overlap, the needs of teachers and students are significantly different from the interests of trade unionists. Teachers sought material which was ready to use. However, articles often required further preparation by teachers, and many teachers were unwilling to make the effort to translate the material into a lesson. As a consequence, the potential of *Labour History* was not developed fully in the classroom.

My connection to the association was as editor of *Labour History* for the past two years. The production of the journal was largely the responsibility of the editor(s). Although executive members did contribute articles occasionally, the executive tended to have a supportive but passive role. This problem might have been dealt with in one of two ways. Ideally funds would have been available to employ a researcher for the journal. However, funding was always a problem for the association both in producing the journal and in professional development workshops. A more practical solution in producing the journal might have been to work as a collective. Although funding would still have been a problem, the work load for the editor(s) would have been reduced.

Despite these criticisms, the termination of the Labour History Association and *Labour History* will be a loss to teachers in particular. Other Provincial

Specialist Associations of the BCTF will provide resource material about labour issues. Also, the Labour Studies Working Group, a committee comprised of teachers and personnel from the Vancouver School Board has spent two years developing curriculum material on labour studies. The lessons were to be piloted in the fall of 1983. However, it is unlikely that the quantity of resource material produced about labour studies will be maintained.

Ellen Moffat
Vancouver

Judith Fingard, *Jack in Port: Sailortowns of Eastern Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press 1982).

JUDITH FINGARD has ventured into the mid-nineteenth-century Canadian sailortown, that "challenge to the bourgeois notions of order and modernity," (6) with a mind "to rescue from obscurity those merchant sailors and the shoreside milieu in which they moved." Fingard has looked at the raw and the rowdy, the strange and the sordid of the bustling ports, and she has written a "largely descriptive" portrayal of "the ways in which the institutions and demands of society shaped and conditioned the drama of seafaring and how shipboard concerns, in turn, fashioned the sailors' experience on land." (3) There was much to see: the maritime working class was becoming increasingly international in composition, and was experiencing harsher exploitation and deteriorating working conditions; but there also existed in the ports a persistent labour shortage, relatively high wages, recurring desertion, and increasingly strenuous efforts by the state and private entrepreneurs to "rationalize" the maritime labour market. These are the key features of Fingard's impressive survey of "Jack in Port" in Quebec, Saint John, and Halifax.

Professor Fingard calls our attention to the peculiarities and contradictions of the "free market system" of maritime labour in nineteenth-century Canada, and particularly to the scarcity and seasonality of labour that conditioned so many other aspects of the system. Since wages were significantly higher in Canadian than European ports and since sailors "regarded desertion as the most effective way of protesting against specific [and worsening] conditions of employment," (145) seamen ran in droves from their ships once docked at eastern Canadian wharves. This autonomous initiative by sailors threw the labour market into disarray, cut sharply into merchants' profits, and provoked intervention from the state and from private labour-market organizers known as "crimps." The state sought to "regulate" the labour market, "ostensibly to promote order and fairness in the shipping of seamen, but in reality to discourage desertion and crimping and thereby serve the needs of capital." (30) Crimps, many of whom were formerly mariners, usually ran taverns and boarding-houses in sailortown, and managed to accumulate remarkable political clout through organizations such as the Boarding House Keepers' Association of Saint John. These "sailor-brokers" or, less generously, "sailor-stealers" lived in close proximity to seafaring men, established "both comradely and exploitative relationships" with them (196), and declared themselves to be the land-based managers of the sailors' labour power. They were prepared to back up this declaration with gangster-like methods against any who doubted their sincerity. Fingard leaves us with the unmistakable impression that mid-nineteenth-century port towns witnessed what was nearly a civil, but extremely uncivil, war over that coveted commodity called maritime labour. It was a war waged legally and extra-legally, in statute and in blood, in the courts and in the streets, among sailors, crimps, captains, shipowners, and magistrates. The author

does much justice to its many complexities.

Yet for all its many strengths, this is a study which as a whole is something less than the sum of its parts. This is partially the result of the decision to investigate and describe the institutional matrix within which sailors lived their lives. The emphasis, as indicated by the title of the book, falls upon "Jack in Port" rather than Jack at Sea. But this decision tends to delimit the understanding of "the drama of seafaring" and "the sailors' experience." Crucial matters receive far too little attention. We get no sustained discussion of the social and class relationships within the workplace, the ship. We get no analysis of labour discipline, but rather only a few references to brutality and sadism. And in place of a survey of the seaman's full experience of work, we get a short discourse on the merchant captain's experience of difficulties in getting seamen to work once in port. In short, we get relatively little on the ways in which seamen were exploited *as labourers*, too little on the relations and activities so utterly necessary to the international movement of commodities and the accumulation of capital.

A second reason why the book is better in its parts than as an interpretive whole lies in the author's decision to make it "largely descriptive in nature." The study consequently lacks certain concepts or concerns that would have given it a greater sense of unity and closure. Fingard, for example, says little of seafaring culture: there are only eight pages (74-81) on "The Seafarer's Outlook," and these consist mainly of examples and descriptions of songs, obscenities, and the few material possessions sailors had. More attention to and analysis of culture would have allowed us to understand more of the sailors' collective perspective on the nature of life at sea, as well as their strategies for survival and prosperity in this very difficult world. The institutional and descriptive emphases of *Jack in Port*

sometimes combine to push the sailor himself — his life, thoughts, hopes, and fears — into the background. Occasionally a strong and clear voice is heard, as in the tar who in December 1867 disclosed in court that "he had no idea of endangering his life on the 'briny deep' while others lived in luxury ashore on the proceeds of his toil." (153-4) One wishes to hear more of such voices.

But perhaps this is asking too much, for the "obscurity" into which Judith Fingard ventures on this rescue mission of sailors and sailortown is dark and deep. *Jack in Port* represents a fine contribution to our knowledge of the dramas of seafaring life, and it will be profitably read by anyone interested in nineteenth-century social, labour, or maritime history.

Marcus Rediker
Georgetown University

William Repka and Kathleen M. Repka, *Dangerous Patriots: Canada's Unknown Prisoners of War* (Vancouver: New Star Books 1982).

LATE IN THE SPRING of 1940, the Phoney War came to a shattering end. The feeble but civilized assumptions that war could be waged without the horrors of 1914-18 dissolved before Hitler's *blitzkrieg*. By June, Britain stood alone in Europe. Canada found herself the senior ranking ally in a struggle against Hitler in which the odds seemed hopeless.

Ten months before, in his customary fashion, Stalin had liquidated the "anti-Fascist" crusade with a Nazi-Soviet pact. Having commanded "full support to the Polish people" at the outset of the war, Tim Buck, Canada's Communist leader, had dutifully revised the line. "Withdraw Canada from the Imperialist War" was the new command, within days of the outbreak of war. Communist newspapers like *The Clarion* focused on Britain's impe-

rial iniquities and left the Nazis strictly alone. Hard at work in the labour movement, Communists found the times propitious to organize and to strike. As the Nazis swarmed into Norway, the Communist-controlled Canadian Seamen's Union tied up Great Lakes shipping for a week. As Hitler's tanks entered Paris, a Communist organ in Toronto proclaimed: "Canadian capitalism, not German capitalism, is our main enemy."

One result was that 110 Canadian Communists, among them Bill Repka, found themselves lodged in internment camps at Kananaskis, Alberta and at Petawawa, Ontario. They shared their accommodation with a rather larger number of Nazi and Fascist sympathizers and Montreal's corpulent mayor, Camilien Houde. Much later, the Repkas set out to interview the Communist veterans of the experience and, after Bill Repka's death, the book has been published, presumably as a timely warning of the threats to civil liberties posed by the Trudeau government and its security legislation. How could such earnest and innocent anti-Fascists suffer such a fate when their only offence was to rally the workers?

The collected interviews do not, of course, provide any background to the government's decision. The Communist divergence into the Molotov-Ribbentrop treaty and the ensuing carve-up of Poland has no place in the Repka account. Nor has the wrenching of loyalties which, as so often, sent some of the most principled party members out of its ranks. This is a pity. There were sound, if cynical, reasons for the Soviet-Nazi treaty. Many Ukrainians, as one interviewee admits, rejoiced at the destruction of Poland. Giving unquestioned loyalty to the Soviet Union rather than one's homeland has been an accepted requirement of Communist membership and the rejection of patriotism is no longer, surely, a form of moral turpitude. Yet none of these problems have been addressed. Instead, without exception, the interviewees express

an injured rectitude as though a country suddenly and desperately at war should have tolerated their innocent little efforts at sabotage.

Those involved may well have felt innocent and some were naive. The humiliation they felt at their arrest, the misery of separation from families, the bitterness of sharing their ordeal with Canada's tinpot Fascists and Nazis is apparent. We are now too aware of the horrors of Hitler's concentration camps and Stalin's gulags, to say nothing of the prisons of modern Chile and Argentina, to stoke up much indignation at their treatment. Internment camp guards were elderly veterans, content to live and let live. Even the camp commandants at Petawawa and Kananaskis and later at the Hull Jail obviously did not fit their monster costumes. If the plight of Communist internees has largely been overlooked, no sensible person would wish it to supplant our awareness of the inexcusable internment of 22,000 Japanese-Canadians in 1942 or the mass round-up of so-called "enemy aliens" in the previous war.

In due course, history revolved again, the Soviet Union became an ally instead of a mysterious but menacing enemy and Canadian Communists emerged, after a well-organized campaign which the Repkas chronicle, to become cheerleaders in the Great Patriotic War. Undoubtedly their hearts were in the struggle more ardently than in earlier efforts to undermine the war effort from 1939 to 1941. Indeed the Communists played a major role in the booming labour movement, expanding organization, rising to positions of influence and winning Liberal government gratitude for selfless patriotism in contrast to the "adventurist" CCF.

As a human, sometimes amusing and often touching story of people caught up in a wartime tragedy, *Dangerous Patriots* has a certain appeal. However, the special pleading, largely from Joe Zuken, that this is also a tract against the current security legislation will not work. By

suppressing substantial relevant information, this is the kind of book that gives the Left a bad name. In 1940, summoned to intervene on behalf of Jacob Penner, the ailing CCF leader, J.S. Woodsworth, was characteristically straightforward. Those who lived by communism, he suggested to Mrs. Penner, were in a poor position to turn to liberalism in time of war:

Underlying the action of the authorities is the whole conception of communism, its objects and methods and further, the question as to whether a man can give his allegiance to the Soviet State and still retain any real loyalty towards a state organized under what is known as a democracy. Of course I note that you use the phrase "democracy" but I cannot see that a dictatorship of the proletariat, whatever its supposed advantages may be, bears any close resemblance to the ideals underlying what is generally accepted as "democracy". (Woodsworth to Mrs. J. Penner, 29 July 1940. PAC Woodsworth Paper, 1003)

Needless to say, these are the issues the Repkas did not raise.

Desmond Morton
Erindale College
University of Toronto

Eileen Sufrin, *The Eaton Drive: The Campaign to Organize Canada's Largest Department Store, 1948 to 1952* (Toronto: Fitzhenry and Whiteside 1982).

AS A TEENAGER, I worked for Eaton's during the rush season — one of the many young female part-time workers that the retail trade relies upon to keep labour costs down. My mother's commitment to the Eaton's empire was more sustained. She began work as a salesclerk in the Saskatoon store in the late 1950s and worked there until her retirement in the mid-1970s. Eaton's, following through on its motto "The Greatest Good to the Greatest Number," now pays my mother \$60 a month pension. Often the women working with my mother expressed the fear of los-

ing their jobs if they supported the union. Much of the resistance to unionization in the retail trade described by Eileen Sufrin in *The Eaton Drive* rang true to my own memories of experiences "working for Timothy."

Eaton's was no ordinary department store. When Timothy Eaton, founder of the Eaton mercantile empire died in 1907, he had already amassed an estate with a total value over \$5½ million. "Timothy" remained the great patriarchal head of the company long after his death. The myth of his kindness, his concern for the welfare of his staff, survived the decades. Even after criticizing the store's policy of sexual discrimination, which permitted men to rise to managerial positions while women remained blocked at assistant manager, my mother would then add: but "old man Eaton was good."

Timothy was thus a most effective ideological weapon in Eaton's battle to maintain absolute control over their employees. The Canadian labour movement's challenge to that control is well documented in this very readable book on the 1948-52 union drive at the Toronto Eaton's store. Eileen Tallman Sufrin, the author and key organizer of the drive, tells the story from a union point of view. She documents the day-to-day activities of labour's effort to break the back of the retail giant. The book is descriptive rather than explanatory. Sufrin recounts in great detail the leaflets issued, the day-to-day running of the union office, the people who worked there, and the responses of the various employees to the drive. Each step of the drive is documented, but for readers seeking a broader understanding of the reasons for the drive's failure, the book falls short.

Sufrin situates the drive within a well-documented outline of the history of the store. Past attempts to unionize in 1912 and 1934 tell the reader something about the retail giant that unions have not been able to conquer. The Toronto Eaton's complex is an impressive mercantile empire,

having embraced over 16,000 employees at the time of the drive, stretching over a dozen work locations, and covering five square blocks of central Toronto. The *segmented workforce*, divided into a myriad of departments, and fragmented by status differences based on the commodities they sold, was not easy to move toward collective action, despite the common denominator of low wages. Eaton's was able to take advantage of the segmented workforce in its promotion and pay policies, which discriminated on the basis of age, sex, and marital status. The Canadian unionists had their job cut out for them. The Eaton's Drive initiated new techniques in union organizing. It cost the CIO-CCL approximately \$200,000 over four years and took the resources of seven organizers in what remains today the most significant attempt to establish retail unionism in Canadian labour history. It failed. The study of its failure should become required reading for all those active and interested in unionized labour.

According to Sufrin, about two-thirds of the department store employees in 1951 were women. The work environment for men and women was generally quite distinct. The problems of organizing men and women were also different. Although she addresses this factor in her work, Sufrin's ability to explain the context of women's work and their resistance to union efforts falls short. In a very interesting chapter, "Collars, White and Blue," Sufrin outlines the number of the store departments, their employees, and an overall impression of each division's receptivity to unionization. There is no breakdown of department employees by sex. We can infer from her description of the departments most resistant to the union, however, that they employed a large number of women. By Sufrin's account the first union members came from the traditionally male sectors of the firm: the shoe salesmen, the delivery and mail order rooms, and the restaurant. The example of the almost all male shoe

salesclerks was an interesting one, for although Sufrin fails to comment on it, their circumstances provided an interesting contrast between male and female employees in the firm. They had a habit of socializing together after work and traditionally this has been one of the important features in the success of union efforts. The factories, where a large number of women were employed were never effectively unionized. Women, tied to the double day, were in no position to socialize after work. Sufrin admits that women on the sales floors were the hardest to organize. "Most women at Eaton's were well aware of the fact that compared with men they were second class salesclerks in pay and promotional opportunity." Yet, this awareness did not necessarily draw them to the union.

The decision to tackle the headquarters of the Eaton empire is not adequately explained in the brief, three-page chapter entitled, "Why Toronto?" In the light of recent events in organizing the Brampton and St. Catharine stores, I would have liked to have seen a more thorough explanation of the strategy on which this decision was based. The major reason Sufrin offers for the choice was that, "Eaton's Toronto staff included a strong mix of blue collar workers and white collar salesclerks." This is later treated as a block to union organizing and not a reason for it. The fact that RWDSU had already acquired a list of several hundred Toronto employees who had expressed interest in unionizing seems to have been the real deciding factor.

Sufrin's strong point remains her ability to describe the day-to-day life of the campaign. Detailed descriptions of tactics and "gimmicks" used to catch the interest of staff, excerpts from articles in *Flash*, Eaton's employee magazine, comments from union activists and sympathetic employees, copies of leaflets distributed to the employees, and sixteen pages of photographs show the extent of the effort waged to bring Eaton's employees into the union

fold. Throughout we obtain a vivid picture of the endurance and patience necessary to wage the battle. For example, her description of the Kafka-like machinery of the Ontario Labour Relations Board shows us how effectively such state machinery can be used to advantage by employers. In addition, Eaton's ability to muzzle the press meant that very little about the drive was known outside the union movement itself. Because of this factor public sympathy, so important in such a long campaign, was never effectively developed. When the vote finally came over a year after the application had been filed, the stalling had worked. Sufurin cites these factors as major elements in the battle.

There are gaps in the story and certainly academic labour historians will find few answers to their questions concerning the politics of labour. In an effort to present her readers with a picture of the day-to-day activities of union organizing, Sufurin merely skims the surface in her discussion of larger union issues. Much of the book's weakness rests in its inability to articulate trade union political strategy and its impact on the union drive. Her commitment to documenting the nuts and bolts of the campaign means we can not expect much emphasis on the broader trade union context in which the campaign was waged. For example, her brief explanation of the politics of the Retail Wholesale Department Store Union (RWDSU) are mentioned only in the context of its effect on the financial assistance to the drive. Yet much more was at issue.

In 1948, a battle for political control of the RWDSU developed in the U.S. and the immediate result was the lifting of the jurisdiction of the union over department stores. Eileen Sufurin describes this period of union history briefly in a chapter entitled "Orphaned by the Storm." I find it hard to imagine that the whole dispute seems to have gone on over the heads of the Eaton's organizers. Sufurin's explanation: "Perhaps, Norm Twist, RWDSU Canadian Director, who must have known how

serious the situation was in his union, did not wish to upset our group with the details, or perhaps we were just too busy to delve into the matter," seems to gloss over the political consequences of this issue. She tells us about the dispute in the International, a dispute with grave consequences for the CIO as the RWDSU was its only retail union, and we are led to believe that Canadian unionists Charles Millard, Pat Conroy, and the others on the Department Store Organizing Committee of the CCL had little input into these decisions. But the results for the drive were catastrophic: the staff organizer from RWDSU, Gus Sumner, returned to the U.S.; financial aid for the campaign (\$2,500 a month) dried up; changes in sponsorship, from the RWDSU to the ACW, and then to the Congress Department Store Organizing Committee certainly caused considerable damage to the unionizing effort. The shift of jurisdiction for organizing department stores to the Amalgamated Clothing Workers brought \$2,000 back into the Eaton Fund, but by the end of 1949 this source had collapsed. The International of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers in New York "had decided that, thanks but no thanks." Somewhere between the lines is yet another chapter in the history of the politics of trade unionism.

All of this was linked to the Cold War in the trade unions. As an active CCFer in the labour movement, part of Sufurin's previous job with the Steelworkers in B.C. was political. The aim was to reduce the communist influence in the B.C. Federation of Labour and it was successful. In the battle for control of the CIO unions in Canada, the implications of this dispute were surely not lost on the CCL's Department Store Organizing Committee or on Sufurin. The Eaton Drive took place in the midst of the battle against the communist influence in the union movement. Although it took five years to eliminate effective communist influence in the CIO-CCL, the continuous red-baiting placed the "House of Labour" on shaky

ground. Taking on a major union drive under these circumstances may have been premature.

The Eaton Drive thus forces labour historians to address many issues left unexplored by Sufrin herself. With the defeat of the Eaton campaign, the gains made in unionizing the retail trade were in fact minimal. By 1954 only 7 per cent of the workers in this sector were organized, most of them in food retailing. There were only six agreements in the Canadian department stores at the time, covering only 3,000 workers. These were shared by the three main unions, the two AFL unions, Teamsters and Retail Clerks International, and the RWDSU of the CIO. The account of this defeat should surely hold an important place in the literature of the Canadian labour historians. Lynn Williams described it as a "watershed event, which marked the end of a spirit of 'we can conquer all' optimism in the industrial unions in Canada, created by the grinding but dramatic victories in the survival struggles at Stelco and Ford and elsewhere subsequent to the end of the war." Certainly the approach to organizing in the retail trades was greatly affected by this loss. The momentum of such a campaign was never achieved again and Local 1000 organizer Fred Dowling's disappointed comment at the announcement of the vote, that "it will take another twenty years to organize Eaton's again" appears optimistic in the light of recent events.

Mercedes Steedman
Laurentian University

Bill Freeman, *1005: Political Life in a Union Local* (Toronto: Lorimer 1981).

UNITED STEELWORKERS OF America Local 1005 at the Stelco works in Hamilton, Ontario is a powerhouse in the USWA structure, tightly linked to the area staff and national office, and through it to the international headquarters in Pittsburgh.

It had 12,500 members in 1981, contributing along with USWA 6500 at INCO the lion's share of Canadian dues. Using company and union sources from McMaster University's Labour Archives, and drawing on more than 40 interviews with the leaders, Freeman analyzes the ups and downs of politics within Local 1005 for the previous 46 years. It is an important contribution to our understanding of the internal dynamics of Canadian labour.

He raises many crucial questions. What is the nature and extent of union politics? Does USWA 1005 confirm Robert Michel's iron law of oligarchy, and Seymour Lipset's *Union Democracy* theory? The latter, in studying the ITU, found oligarchy in small locals which were dependent on the International, but independence and democratic opposition (between "left" and "right" slates) in the large locals. Ignoring the political economy within which unions must work, Lipset implied that such slates emerged not from the lived contradictions of class and workplace, but in an exceptional "middle class" of workers with high income and above-average security.

Freeman disagrees. Unlike the American sociologist, he argues that class tensions are inherent in slate ideologies, which in turn set different economic goals for the union, and mobilize the feelings of rank-and-file members. Moreover, he shows that USWA 1005 slates emerged from a work hierarchy sharply graded in skill, pay, status, and ethnicity, divided among six major Stelco mills. But he also finds serious weaknesses in union democracy. Of 12,500 workers (and their 300 stewards) only 150 attend membership meetings. Only 80 are eligible, by their attendance and other criteria, to run in the executive slates.

Underlying the camaraderie of the picket line are grievances never addressed by later contract clauses, as well as resentment of strike hardships at home. Somewhat against his own ideological persuasion, Freeman admits that every

walkout has "major repercussions." Any leader too closely identified with a strike will lose support.

So fierce have been the fights for union and job security, for seniority and a grievance/arbitration system (viewed later as "rigid," time-consuming, and costly), for contracts to catch up with inflation and technology, for better pensions, safety and health — that each generation of leaders rests after its battle. Factions and ideologies then emerge. Yet the long struggle against corporate power by successive slates makes workers feel that "their interests are being adequately defended," that there is a rough "balance of power."

On one hand, the union's efforts "legitimize the existing political and economic system in the eyes of the rank and file." On the other, class power sets legal and bureaucratic limits to union action. Since the 1946 Rand Formula, unions have been required to police their membership as a condition of their existence. Stelco still writes all residual powers into the contract as "management rights." Union and wage security was bought at a very high price, says Freeman:

... unions agreed that they would allow management the right to direct the workforce... [and agreed] not to strike or disrupt production during the life of the contract. In effect, what unions did was agree to give up the struggle for the real democratization of the industrial system. (259)

Thus for all its "brilliance and militancy," Local 1005's political system does not touch the deeper problems.

Contrary to Freeman's theory of union democracy, but starkly outlined in his own evidence, is the fact that "institutionalized" opposition at the top is more a by-product of clauses in the union's constitution, than of slates and ideologies. USWA's "member in good standing" rule severely limits participation, and has at least twice been abused to deny rival leaders the chance to run for office. Purges

and the resulting feuds, with one brief interval of "freedom of the press," have split the local for as long as fifteen years. The local's own election procedure ensures that even when one leader wins a 70 per cent majority, rival slates will hold some executive posts. Such machinery ensures that some union officials will always be opponents. No slate winning a majority can completely control union policy. Every meeting becomes a factional battle, with shifting alliances among slates, and "loose fish" within them the main source of stability. But presidents who make alliances with other slates are often charged with "betrayal" of their ideology.

The point is borne out by a coup against 1005's president, Cec Taylor, only two years after Freeman's claim that he was the best hope for the future. Taylor was suspended, and thereby lost his "good standing," at the August 1983 monthly meeting by a 66-65 vote. He was defeated by ex-members of his own slate, joining other factions led by 1005's vice-president, Bryan Atkinson (a former grievance chairman, Taylor's ally on the 1960 steward's slate from which Taylor split to lead the left — itself later allied with splits from the autonomy slate). Atkinson replaced Taylor as president.

His rivals then copied some of Taylor's high-handed procedural methods to muzzle opposition: refusal to recognize speakers and sudden adjournments. The International and Canadian staffers, with whom Taylor had long feuded, supported insurgents in their attack on his slate's "misuse" of the 1981 strike fund, itself a phony issue. The old vendetta was being waged over 1005's financial autonomy, aggravated by Stelco layoffs (in 1984 the local has only 9,500 members) which eliminated many young Taylorites, a drop of over 30 per cent in USWA membership and finances, and Taylor's battle to win control of health and pension funds from the company (he lost). Added to these issues dating from the 1981 strike were

charges of betraying the slate (there had been splits over his choice of candidates for the executive in 1982). In the ensuing battles in every local meeting, there were months of delay of steward grievances and health committee reports, the key labour-management "1.02 committee" and the union health clinic were shut down, and negotiation plans for the 1984 contract stalled.

Far from marking a new era, Cec Taylor's rise and fall exemplify the problems in Local 1005. He had been a shrewd, able, and popular president who supported NDP political action and various left causes, helped get women back into Stelco, called for local control of finances and safety, and maintained real wages when all about were losing theirs. But the mass layoffs after his 1981 strike victory engendered fears of firing among workers with twelve or thirteen years' seniority. A rising tide of unsatisfiable discontent drove him into increasing isolation, shattered his slate, and swept him away. Stelco claims falling profits and an actual deficit of \$40.8 million in 1982; it will probably use this as ammunition in contract negotiations. Layoffs continue. Yet the company's retained earnings have remained stupendous, stabilizing at 1960 levels (in constant dollars). This dynamic relationship between workforce, wages, and profits must be analyzed. In 1935-75, according to the book's appendix, Stelco's plowbacks averaged nine times the level of declared profits and dividends, productivity increased six times, the workforce tripled, and (we learn from other sources) real wages also tripled. Freeman's neglect of these trends is problematic, as is his skimpy treatment of voting patterns in the local, which if more thorough might have led him to some new insights in his otherwise admirable history of leadership in USWA 1005.

The rank and file are seen, but not heard. Freeman and much Canadian union history have tended to neglect how we

experience our daily lives and work-places, our bodies, our families, and primary work groups. However, some cogent comments on Stelco conditions, and the discontent, sexism, and family roles that accompany them, have just appeared in *Union Sisters* (eds. L. Brisikin, L. Yanz) and *Hard Earned Wages* (ed. Jennifer Penney). From some of the "Women Back Into Stelco," we hear about the repressed violence, boredom, and dehumanization of the Hamilton mills, the ways workers and their wives retreat into rigid sex roles from a "badly organized" and "authoritarian" workplace. Here is the badly-needed grassroots material to complement Freeman's leadership study. Debbie Fields, a coke oven worker, says:

Real political leadership has a lot to do with the heart as well as the mind. It has a lot to do with loving people that you're struggling with. You're my brother, you're my buddy. . . .

These women show how caring, connectedness, and solidarity can and have been created on the shop floor. We must look at this process from the primary work group up, not from the top down.

David Millar
University of Saskatchewan

Hayden Roberts, *Culture and Adult Education: A Study of Alberta and Quebec* (Edmonton: University of Alberta Press 1982).

FOR MOST CANADIANS, formal education ends when full-time work begins. Once having mastered "the three R's" and the discipline requirements of the education system, most students dutifully graduate to the world of work and gladly leave their school days behind. Hayden Roberts' study dismisses this traditional pattern and examines one of the most important pedagogic innovations of the last 25 years — continuing adult educa-

tion. The author chooses Alberta and Quebec for case studies.

The book offers much more than a description of adult education programmes in the two provinces. Roberts' objective is to prove that the "policies, structures and processes" of adult education in Alberta and Quebec directly reflect the dominant social philosophy and culture of their respective regions. In Alberta, a conservative province with a history of multiculturalism and religious diversity and a current attachment to free enterprise and individualism, Roberts finds that adult education programmes emphasize personal development and economic advancement. The author concedes that the principle of cooperativism as practised by the United Farmers of Alberta in an earlier era forms a significant but fading exception to the rule. In Quebec, Roberts claims that a history of Catholicism, nationalism, and collectivism, and the recent triumph of social democracy over a more traditional conservatism, have produced adult education programmes that stress community enrichment and social welfare over personal gain. With minor qualifications, the author concludes that most adult education programmes in Alberta and Quebec sponsored by government and non-government institutions, native organizations, trade unions, agricultural societies, and cooperatives comply with his thesis.

Labour/Le Travail's readers should be particularly interested in Roberts' chapter on trade-union education. In this area, the author could have extended his thesis to include a comparison between Quebec and all of English-speaking Canada. Of all the provincial federations of labour chartered by the Canadian Labour Congress (CLC), the Quebec Federation of Labour alone exercises complete control over its education programmes. In addition, independent labour centrals in Quebec, such as the Confédération des Syndicats Nationaux (CSN) and the Centrale de l'Enseignement du Québec (CEQ),

sponsor their own courses. Although the Alberta Federation of Labour (AFL) has an impressive record of educational activity, Roberts claims that most AFL-sponsored programmes consist of "tool" courses that address specific duties of union representatives and shop stewards. Union education in Alberta also suffers from government and business opposition, the AFL's reluctance to treat paid educational leave as a priority in bargaining sessions, and the province's relatively high wage rates and employment levels which pacify most rank-and-file workers. On the other hand, in Quebec, a nationalistic labour movement with a recent history of syndicalism, a more favourable provincial government, and the presence of more than one labour central provide the groundwork for a more active and radical tradition of union education.

More revealing is a comparison of the stated objectives of trade-union education inside and outside of Quebec. A joint Labour Canada-CLC statement issued in 1977 announced that the primary objective of union education was "to encourage a better informed union membership and smoother collective bargaining, to help labour to participate more fully and knowledgeably in social and economic matters." It is arguable that the CLC consented to this conciliatory position in order to make off peacefully with its share of a ten million dollar government grant. But the CLC's own policy on paid educational leave states that "it is in the interest of the employer to have experienced and responsible shop stewards and other workers' representatives in their undertakings." In Quebec, the education director of the CSN, G. Grenette, offers no such accommodation. Frenette states that the objective of union education is "to encourage and organize a united front of workers, first of all in the factories, then in their neighbourhoods, in their towns, in their industrial sector and even their country." While the CLC strives to play a more influential role in the unfolding of the

capitalist universe, labour centrals in Quebec, the CSN and the CEQ in particular, sharpen the lines of the class struggle.

The book is not without its shortcomings. Roberts' choice of Alberta and Quebec as case studies is problematic in itself. By limiting his study to a comparison between Canada's only French-speaking province and one of nine English-speaking provinces, the author indiscreetly mixes together the elements of provincialism, regionalism, nationalism, and culture. A more serious problem is Roberts' bureaucratic, top-down approach to his subject. At no time does the author place himself or the reader in an actual classroom situation. By concentrating primarily on policy, Roberts ignores the dynamics of the live classroom which often determine the nature and value of an educational experience irrespective of stated objectives or location. This is especially true at the Labour College of Canada where students bring a wealth of political and work experience with them. The author also pays the price of writers who follow closely on the heels of the present. The recent labour-government imbroglio in Quebec brings into question the sympathetic relationship between the Parti Québécois and the labour movement. Finally, Roberts misspells "labour" throughout the study, even in proper names, and mangles a few other names and dates.

In a thoughtful and intelligent fashion, Roberts' book draws deserved attention to the important connection between culture and education. More significantly, the study demonstrates that continuing adult education, whether for recreational or revolutionary purposes, comprises a vital component of a progressive society. Herein lies the book's most important message.

John Bullen
Erindale College
University of Toronto

Wallace Clement, *Class, Power and Property: Essays on Canadian Society* (Toronto: Methuen 1983).

IF A MARXIST analysis of Canadian society was called for, no sociologist was better qualified to undertake the task than Professor Clement. As a student of the late John Porter, Clement's early work could be considered an effort to elaborate on the thesis of Part II of *The Vertical Mosaic*. From this study came his interest in elite theory. *The Canadian Corporate Elite* carried further Porter's attempt to identify the major figures in the Canadian business world and to establish how through attending the same schools, belonging to the same clubs, and becoming cross-appointed to the boards of directors of the major business, financial, and industrial corporations in the country, they had come to constitute a distinctive group. Already, however, in this study, as its title suggests, Clement had departed sharply from Porter's interest in social inequality, of which elitism was an expression, to singling out the corporate elite as the dominant force in society. Elite theory as developed by Clement became Marxist theory.

The ten essays in *Class, Power and Property* afford an indication of the shifts in focus of Clement's work over a span of years, the first essay having been published in 1974. This essay on the changing structure of the Canadian economy and the two which follow on the characteristics of the Canadian corporate elite and the uneven development of a mature branch-plant society elaborate a thesis made familiar by Clement's early published works. In the introductory note to the third essay, however, he offers a hint of the changing focus of his work by the remark "This paper's assumptions remain somewhat trapped within an elite perspective but are struggling to escape."

The essays which follow gradually build the theme which give to the volume its title "Class, Power and Property."

Now quotations from Marx and various Marxist scholars become more frequent. The analysis of the capitalist class and the Canadian state in the fourth essay, Canadian class cleavages in the sixth, class and property relations in the ninth, and property and proletarianization in the tenth are couched very much in Marxist terms. The fifth essay is given up to a spirited criticism of the findings of the Bryce commission on corporate concentration and the seventh and eighth to an analysis of the Canadian mining industry involving in the first of these two essays a critique of H. A. Innis.

Any reader of this volume of essays has to be impressed with the range of knowledge of Professor Clement and his capacity to order the facts in what appears to be a convincing manner. *Class, Power and Property* certainly will constitute one of the major texts in a Marxist analysis of Canadian society. This volume, together with his other publications, clearly establish his position as one of the leading sociological scholars in the country.

Yet one cannot help but wish that Clement had given greater recognition to the limitations of the Marxist theory when applied to Canadian society. Some of the essays assume more the character of an advocacy of the Marxist position than of its critical application. Not so far from the thrust of the Communist Manifesto is his declaration of faith in the concluding sentences of the fourth essay. "As long as Canadian society," he writes, "continues to be shaped by the capitalist mode of production, the most powerful class will be the capitalist class. As long as capitalists control the means of production and circulation, they will use their power to ensure that the Canadian state will operate to their best advantage. And their best advantage does not represent the common interest of most Canadians." If the underlying assumptions of this statement are accepted there is not much a non-Marxist can say about Canadian society.

There can be no quarrel with a good deal of the Marxist analysis, respecting for instance the relations of labour and capital, the role of the state in protecting property rights and thereby enhancing the interests of the capitalist class, and the effect of capitalist concentration in weakening the position of independent commodity producers. I am not persuaded, however, that the social system operates in such a simplistic fashion as the Marxist would have us believe. Elite theory even as expounded by Porter leaves many questions unanswered and the number of questions mounts as the theory comes to be expounded by Clement in Marxist terms. One has to ask how meaningful is the view of business leaders acting as a collective body as a result of their attending the same schools, belonging to the same clubs, and serving on the same corporate boards of directors. The conception of a corporate elite offers no clear notion of how the process of decision-making operates in the world of business.

Even less persuasive is the Marxist analysis of the relationship of the capitalist class to the state. Growing up in Alberta many years ago I had few doubts that as a result of financial contributions to the major political parties, lobbying, and other means of making their influence felt, the actions of governments were determined by such bodies as the CPR, the banks, the farm implement manufacturers, and the Winnipeg Grain Exchange. This naive view of the relation of business to government has died hard. The very mention of the different kinds of business, railway companies, banks, manufacturers, insurance companies, etc., acting to further their interests in dealing with the government, makes evident how far these different interests have been apart in seeking to influence over past years the actions of government. More than that, of course, have been the pressures exerted on government by such other bodies as labour and farmers. No government could survive if it failed to take account of the interests of

these bodies which have the means to command the support of many thousands of voters.

Much more could be said in the way of a detailed criticism of the application of Marxist theory to the analysis of Canadian society. I have, however, a more serious complaint to make of the work of such sociologists as Clement. The preoccupation with the capitalist system has led either to the dismissal of many problems of society as of no account, or to the analysis of such problems within a narrow Marxist perspective. If the very existence of the capitalist system, of course, is considered the only problem that matters, then the preoccupation with it as a social phenomenon is made to appear justified. In the end, it is this narrowness of approach which constitutes my main criticism of *Class, Power and Property*. From reading it the student of sociology will learn much about the workings of the capitalist system, the structure of the social class system, and the organization of power and property relations in society, but there is much that he or she will not learn about the real social world in which people live. Not much if anything more, I am bound to say however, will such a student learn about the real social world from reading a Parsonian analysis of society. All of which is to say that we need less of Marx and Parsons in our sociology and more of Robert E. Park. So speaks a sociologist of an earlier generation.

S.D. Clark
University of Toronto

Donald J. Patton, *Industrial Development and the Atlantic Fishery: Opportunities for Manufacturing and Skilled Workers in the 1980s* (Toronto: Lorimer 1981).

EVERY SO OFTEN something solid to bite into can be found in the garbage can. In this case the garbage can is this volume and its commissioner, the Canadian Institute for

Economic Policy. The CIEP's stated "intention is to contribute in an innovative way to the development of public policy." (ii) The author's aims are: 1) to map out the manufacturing opportunities, the "backward linkages" (1) that the 1977 200-mile limit opens up to Canadian and especially Atlantic Canadian enterprise; and 2) to assess and to alter existing fisheries policies in order to facilitate entrepreneurship and workers' retraining. Better policies will bring the east coast fisheries, east coast manufacturing, and east coast workers into the late twentieth century of technological strength. Boys oh girls oh boys.

Recent years have proven this volume to be a lie. Gases and liquids abound, but there are no chunks in the can. The crisis in the east coast fisheries has intensified; bankruptcy and job losses have allowed the state to intervene not for expansion but for the salvage of big capital. That crisis, seen in Patton's analysis to be merely a cyclical economic downturn, is in reality deep — social, economic, cultural, and political. The crisis is capitalism and state centralization and concentration of the east coast fisheries: the planned "final solution" to the persistence-through-struggle of semi-proletarian and independent fishermen and families is the intended shutdown of hundreds of coastal communities.

Patton is almost entirely wrong in his visions of growth. But the move to state capitalism he supports is very real indeed, as is the enforced proletarianization of the fisheries and the impoverishment of its "surplus" population. With the Kirby Report as its justification, the entire east coast fishing industry has been restructured by the state for full control by big capital. The CIEP's "innovative" policies are towards state capitalism and forced "primitive" accumulation, and against the expressed interests of petty producer households.

In the light of emerging state capitalism, the crucial fisheries struggles in the 1980s are precisely the crucial

struggles of the 1970s and then some. The fight against full proletarianization by semi-proletarian families proceeds: for example, the Maritime Fishermen's Union and its blockade of Pictou Harbour continues and expands. But in the 1980s these struggles by semi-proletarians have been added to by the emergence of collective struggles against proletarianization by some of the most independent (and formerly anti-collective, anti-worker) petty producers in the inshore fisheries. Readers of this journal may well be accustomed to writing off such class struggles, like Marx tended to do, as the reactionary-utopian musings of backward people who never would learn the (historically incorrect on a global scale) iron necessity of total proletarianization. Come on, you might say in your sexist-dogmatic-centric way, let's get back to true labour, full-lifetime proletarian issues.

But consider the burning of two Department of Fisheries and Oceans enforcement vessels in Pubnico Harbour by "pirates," members of three southern Nova Scotian communities, the last of the independents if ever there were. The second largest cop force in Canada, the DFO enforcement division, clamped down on the most successful independent petty producers in Atlantic Canada in order to enforce regulations against these lobster fishermen that would ensure the destruction of the inshore fisheries. It is currently impossible to haul lobsters without breaking some law. It is also impossible to make a living by following the laws and, indeed, trap limit laws in lobstering have never been followed by most fishermen since their enactment in 1968 and they have never been enforced until 1983. Fishermen were given huge grants and cheap loans to get bigger boats to break the laws in; DFO researchers used to hold a "brick wall" theory about lobsters off Nova Scotia in order to support offshore capitalists, i.e., somewhere about fifty miles offshore was a barrier separating one supposed species of lobster from another; DFO biologists

still believe that lobsters cannot swim. In this context burned boats is the minor news; the major news is that the growing organized solidarity of the women and men of these communities is principally progressive — with other primary producers, and against big capitalism and big government. In fact, though not yet in full awareness, these "fisherfolk" are waging a battle for workers control of the workplace and community control of the community.

We'll see whether their links with workers increase and intensify. Keep an eye on these "backward" struggles; they may well provide the stiffest refutation of Patton's backward linkages.

R. James Sacouman
Acadia University

Maureen Fitzgerald, Connie Guberman, and Margie Wolfe, eds., *Still Ain't Satisfied: Canadian Feminism Today* (Toronto: Women's Press 1982).

TEN YEARS AGO. Women's Press in Toronto published its first book, an anthology of writings from the Canadian women's movement. That book was an important event; it provided a Canadian perspective on significant topics and a sense of the movement. The stated intent of the present volume is to provide an update of that earlier book, one that gives a picture of the "development and maturation of the women's liberation movement in Canada." This is an ambitious project since the Canadian women's movement is an extremely diverse phenomenon with a wide variety of organizations, strategies, and ideological differences. The book, consisting of over two dozen articles written from a number of viewpoints, is remarkably successful, considering that diversity. The articles give detailed accounts and analyses of many of the important areas of struggle. Having these accounts in one place not only provides an essential reference but also allows one to see the common threads that run through

the different issues and approaches. This is the strength of the volume and it is certainly going to be required reading for both those working in the movement and those trying to understand it. The book does have weaknesses, but these are mostly in the form of omissions.

One of the most interesting things about this collection is the evidence that it gives for both continuity and change in feminist theory and practice. The collection begins with an article on abortion, an appropriate choice since this was the first major issue that feminists tackled. As a friend pointed out, she would have thought that by now there was nothing new to be said on this subject, and she was surprised and pleased by the insights in this article. Especially important are the arguments for replacing the concept of "abortion rights" with that of "reproductive rights" and the thoughtful discussions of "single issue" organizing and of the bases of appeal of the "new right."

The three articles that immediately follow deal with violence against women and these show more clearly still the development of feminist analysis since the movement began fifteen years ago. While rape, pornography, and battering were included then in lists of "issues," the demand for "control of our own bodies" meant, in practice, simply a fight for freely available contraception and abortion. The extension of the idea of control of one's body to include freedom from violence and the understanding of that violence as a central feature of social control is a major development in present feminist theory. It is one of the omissions in this volume that the process by which this understanding developed is not treated in any detail. This process of change and development has come out of what the introduction to the volume calls the "fragmentation and political diversity" of the movement — in this particular instance out of the continuing tension between the radical feminist focus on patriarchy, i.e., the institutionalized oppression of women by men, and the

socialist-feminist focus on class. Taken as extremes, each position leaves out important factors and one of the strengths of the women's movement has been the ability of both sides to learn from each other and to move toward some middle ground, however shifting and tenuous. Thus, strategies described by the articles in this section derive in large part from the radical feminist attack on patriarchy, which insists on the primacy of the personal and the individual, specifically the power that individual men have and use over individual women. They also draw however on the socialist-feminist insistence that blaming individual men is not sufficient — there must be an understanding of the structures that support the individual's power. The two currents in feminism have in fact strengthened each other. The articles that deal with the violence that men use against women are not anti-male. They present a coherent political analysis, one of considerable sophistication that is not only compatible with radical or socialist-feminist points of view but is essential to them.

The section that deals with women in the workforce and with problems of organizing is a good example of both the strengths and weaknesses of the book. The problematic relationship between working women and the trade union movement is covered both from inside unions and from outside. The article on feminist unions in particular serves as a detailed specific example of why autonomous women's organizations are necessary. Some important specific workplace issues — equal pay, health hazards, entry into non-traditional jobs, and sexual harassment — are well represented in the other articles in this section. However, there is no overview of the actual state of organizing — no analysis of trends or successes and failures. There is no discussion, for example, of the fact that the feminist unions are not expanding; no overall analysis of the chances for successful organizing of women workers by either the feminist or

other unions. This is a major omission. One of the features of the Canadian economy since the World War II has been the increasing entry of women into waged labour and a good case can be made for this being an important factor in the emergence of the second women's movement. We are now entering a period of crisis for capitalism and it seems clear that the conditions that led to women's entry into waged labour and to the growth of trade unions are changing. The implications of this for feminists' struggles in the workplace are clearly of great importance and there are Canadian feminists who *are* thinking about such problems. It might even be unrealistic to expect a complete analysis but even a general report on trends would be interesting. The article on feminist publishing, admittedly dealing with a much smaller subject area, is a good example of the kind of overview that might have been included.

Historically, the women's movement in Canada has been shaped by women from the dominant culture — white, heterosexual, and, if not necessarily middle class, at least not among the very poor. The bulk of the articles in this book are written by and for this constituency. In contrast, the articles in the "Double Oppression" section, along with an article on lesbian sexuality in another section of the book, are written by "minority" group women — lesbian, immigrant, and native — for the assumed "mainstream" constituency of the book. This means that the articles are essentially written from the outside — they describe the special conditions of oppression of the group and offer suggestions as to how solidarity might work. While the two lesbian articles are written from this perspective, they are notable for their insistence that lesbians are not simply another "minority" with specific differences in oppression from mainstream women. The authors of these articles take the stance that "heterosexism" must be recognized as a dominant factor in the lives of all women. The two articles are in fact

contributions to the still developing debate between two extremes in feminist theory (which can be characterized very roughly as an insistence on the one hand that heterosexism is *the* essential factor in women's oppression and the opposing extreme that social and economic factors are the only important ones) that is already leading toward some middle ground and a richer theory on both sides. This is the same process noted above as one of the strengths of the women's movement.

The final article is the only one in the collection that deals specifically with the general question of priorities, of "how best to achieve our objectives." It is a transcribed interview/discussion with socialist feminists from the Toronto International Women's Day Committee and, while a number of important points are raised, the discussion format serves mainly to whet the appetite for more. The article, in effect, provides an outline of important topics. Unfortunately, some of these are treated so briefly that, if one doesn't already understand the issues, it would be hard to grasp the significance of the remarks. For example, someone mentions that one of the roles the collective plays is to bring single issue groups together to support each others' struggles. Unless one has a sense of the strengths and weaknesses that come from the diffuse nature of the movement, much of the content of this statement is lost. In spite (or perhaps because) of these limitations, this concluding article is worth a second reading.

Overall, Women's Press has offered convincing evidence that the women's movement is alive and well in Canada and I'll look forward to their next installment, which should be due about 1992.

Margaret Benston
Simon Fraser University

Yvan Lamonde, Lucia Ferretti et Daniel Leblanc, *La culture ouvrière à Montréal (1880-1920): bilan historiographique,*

Col. "Culture populaire." (Québec: Institut québécois de recherche sur la culture 1982).

YVAN LAMONDE, ASSISTÉ de Lucie Ferret et Daniel Leblanc, publiait, au début de 1982, *La culture ouvrière à Montréal (1880-1920): bilan historiographique*. Cette étude constitue le premier volume de la collection "culture populaire" de l'Institut québécois de recherche sur la culture. Les auteurs se proposent d'établir un bilan des connaissances acquises et à acquérir "en histoire ouvrière, urbaine et socioculturelle de Montréal" relativement aux années 1880-1920. Ils veulent en même temps "décrire et comprendre la culture ouvrière dans sa totalité." (147)

Après avoir souligné deux caractéristiques fondamentales de la culture ouvrière, la pauvreté et la dépendance, ils évaluent le poids démographique des travailleurs dans la population de Montréal. Puis, ils s'expliquent sur les limites temporelles assignées à leur étude: 1880-1920. Selon eux, cette période est marquée par plusieurs phénomènes qui "contribuent à la formation d'une première culture des travailleurs montréalais à l'époque industrielle." (41) Ils procèdent ensuite au bilan des connaissances acquises quant à l'espace ouvrier et domestique, à la famille et au milieu de travail, à l'action et à la culture ouvrière, aux loisirs et aux perceptions de classes.

Les recherches sur le monde des travailleurs québécois et montréalais sont en général récentes et encore peu nombreuses. Aussi ce bilan porte-t-il sur un nombre de travaux restreint, les uns publiés, les autres à l'état de thèses. Les historiographes en tirent de multiples informations et nombre de données chiffrées. Ainsi leur chapitre deuxième est constitué presque en entier de tableaux reproduits de leurs oeuvres.

Dans ce bilan, les historiographes ont toutefois omis d'exploiter des oeuvres importantes, même si elles ne portaient pas spécifiquement ou uniquement sur les

travailleurs québécois ou montréalais. Parmi ces études, se trouvent deux synthèses: *Trade Unions in Canada*, de H.A. Logan (Toronto: Macmillan 1948), et *Histoire du syndicalisme au Canada et au Québec, 1827-1959*, de Charles Lipton (traduit de l'anglais, Montréal: Parti pris, 1976). Cette dernière étude est cependant mentionnée dans la bibliographie. Et aussi absent de ce bilan, le célèbre *Rapport de la Commission royale d'enquête sur les relations du capital et du travail* (1889) qui, dans la section consacrée au Québec, étudie particulièrement la situation montréalaise des années 1880. La métropole était d'ailleurs bien représentée parmi les membres de cette commission d'enquête, dont faisait partie un journaliste de *La Presse* qui s'était fait une spécialité des questions ouvrières.

Il se dégage de cette étude que les travailleurs montréalais formaient un bloc homogène, caractérisé par la pauvreté et la dépendance. Il semble que conclure ainsi, c'est faire abstraction d'une certaine diversité. N'existait-il pas, dans ce désert de pauvreté et de dépendance, quelques oasis où la vie était meilleure, les salaires plus élevés, les conditions de travail plus avantageuses? A-t-on fait un inventaire complet de la situation de toutes les catégories de travailleurs? Qu'en est-il, à titre d'exemple, dans les décennies 1900 et 1910, des nombreux employés des entreprises ferroviaires, dont Montréal était la "plaque tournante"? La situation des autres centres ferroviaires du Québec de ce temps indique bien que les cheminots menaient une existence meilleure que celle qui est décrite dans ce bilan (cf. Jean Gosselin, *Portraits de cheminots*, Les Éditions Mikadoo Enr., 1982). Il existait sans doute d'autres catégories de travailleurs qui ne pourraient non plus faire l'objet d'un nouveau chapitre des *Misérables*. On ne pourra donc avoir une image de la totalité des travailleurs montréalais tant qu'on ne possédera pas des monographies sur les différentes catégories de travailleurs. D'ici là, il est

peut-être imprudent d'accoler à ces travailleurs, une étiquette unique.

D'autre part, la période étudiée elle-même semble immobile. On ne tient pas tellement compte de l'évolution considérable qu'elle subit: avènement de l'électricité, de l'automobile, augmentation des investissements, agrandissement considérable des manufactures, des usines, dont plusieurs passent de quelques dizaines d'employées en 1880 à des centaines dix ou vingt ans plus tard. Ces faits ont dû marquer drôlement la culture de l'homme de 1910-1920. Les conditions de vie et de travail des décennies 1880 et 1890 ont dû s'améliorer quelque peu avec le retour de la prospérité, au début du XXIème siècle, et produire des retombées non seulement sur les détenteurs des cordons de la bourse, mais aussi sur leurs employés.

Quant aux thèmes abordées dans ce bilan, il en est un qui a été un peu relégué dans l'ombre. La période étudiée (1880-1920) en est une d'exploitation du travail des enfants, voire des bambins. Des centaines d'enfants ont oeuvré à l'époque dans les manufactures montréalaises. Ils étaient soumis aux horaires des adultes, mais recevaient des salaires bien inférieurs. Les amendes et les sévices corporels étaient leur lot. Plusieurs n'avaient aucune possibilité d'acquérir une instruction même élémentaire. Ils furent condamnés à demeurer des manoeuvres et des illettrés. Le chapitre septième, qui consacre une section au travail des femmes, était tout indiqué pour traiter du travail des enfants. Or, à peine trouve-t-on, ici et là, quelques notes sur la question.

Lamonde *et al.* ont inséré des tableaux qui, à première vue, semblent concluants et significatifs. Des valeurs sûres. Cependant, quelques-uns appellent des réserves. Ainsi en est-il du tableau 11, p. 60, intitulé "Diocèse de Montréal, paroisses catholiques romaines érigées entre 1830 et 1919." À lire ce tableau et surtout son titre, il ne s'agit pas ici des paroisses de la ville de Montréal seulement, mais aussi de tout le territoire envi-

ronant, qui comprenait d'autres villes et des régions rurales. Il s'en suit que les "nouvelles paroisses" mentionnées sur ce tableau n'ont pas nécessairement été créées à Montréal. Et le tableau n'est plus significatif pour montrer l'augmentation de la population, contrairement aux affirmations des auteurs. (50) De plus, une comparaison des tableaux 11 et 12 semble confirmer qu'un bon nombre des paroisses créées l'ont été en dehors de la ville de Montréal.

Sur une couple d'autres tableaux, on relève aussi des "distractions." (tableaux 20 et 21, pp. 109 et 110) On y mentionne les effectifs syndicaux de la CTCC en 1919, 1920, et 1921. La CTCC n'ayant été fondée qu'en 1921, les auteurs ont-ils voulu indiquer par là les effectifs des syndicats catholiques ou nationaux qui existent dans certain diocèses: Chicoutimi, Québec, Trois-Rivières? ... D'autre part, le tableau 21 semble avoir subi, lors de sa fabrication ou de son impression, "d'irréparables outrages," aurait dit Jean Racine. ...

Quelques rectifications seraient également nécessaires au sujet des origines du syndicalisme catholique. Lamonde *et al.* placent la fondation des premiers syndicats catholiques à Chicoutimi en 1912. Or, la Fédération ouvrière de Chicoutimi, fondée par Mgr Eugène Lapointe, date de 1907, et un premier syndicat catholique existait à Québec dès 1901. (R. Parisé, *Le fondateur du syndicalisme catholique au Québec, Mgr Eugène Lapointe* [PUQ 1978], 26; CTCC, *Cinquantième anniversaire de la naissance du syndicalisme au Saguenay, 1907-1957* [Chicoutimi 1957], 9, 15).

Selon Lamonde *et al.*, "ce n'est qu'en 1908 que l'Église produira pour la première fois un énoncé de principe sur le syndicalisme catholique. ..." Affirmation qui étonne: *Rerum Novarum* ayant été publiée en 1891. À Chicoutimi, c'est dès 1903 que Mgr Lapointe, de retour de Rome, tente d'inculquer les principes de l'encyclique aux ouvriers réunis en cercle d'études. La même année, il prononce le

sermon d'ouverture au congrès des travailleurs catholiques à Québec. (R. Parisé, *op. cit.*, 8)

Le livre est bâti selon un plan qui semblait sans doute fonctionnel. Cependant, nous nous demandons, par déformation professionnelle peut-être, pourquoi les deux premiers chapitres n'ont pas été fusionnés en un seul et coiffés d'un titre unique. D'autre part, une lacune importante apparaît dans la présentation de la bibliographie: on fait fi de l'ordre alphabétique, qui s'imposait même si les listes de titres sont brèves. De même, pourquoi ne nous indique-t-on pas la référence précise pour chacune des citations, au lieu de nous renvoyer globalement à l'oeuvre, sans indication paginale. (19, 20, 70, 71, 125) De plus, ce livre, qui se veut un outil de travail, serait plus pratique s'il présentait des tables pour les sigles, les tableaux, les thèmes étudiés et les noms des auteurs cités.

Lamonde *et al.*, terminent leur volume par une sorte d'appendice bibliographique à cinq volets. Les trois premiers ont trait à la culture ouvrière québécoise, canadienne et internationale (Grande-Bretagne, France, et États-Unis). Les deux derniers portent sur l'historiographie urbaine de Montréal et sur son histoire socioculturelle (1880-1920).

On peut s'étonner de voir apparaître, dans une bibliographie de "la culture ouvrière à Montréal (1880-1920," une section internationale consacrée à l'historiographie de la France, de l'Angleterre, et des États-Unis. Le choix de certains titres de cette section surprend également: ils se rapportent à des périodes antérieures ou postérieures aux années 1880-1920, ou possèdent un caractère tout à fait local et particulier. Ainsi, pourrait-on se demander, quelle est la pertinence, dans cette bibliographie, de travaux tels que *The Making of the English Working Class, 1780-1830*, de E.P. Thompson, et *Les mineurs de Carmaux, 1848-1914*, de Rolande Trempe? Les bibliographies ont sans doute voulu être utiles aux chercheurs

d'ici en leur signalant de bons travaux réalisés à l'étranger, ceux-ci jouant le rôle de modèles et d'aiguillons. Mais les auteurs ne nous indiquent pas les critères qui les ont guidés dans le choix des titres de ces brèves bibliographies, dans l'ensemble excellents et assez connus. Opérer un choix de quelques dizaines de titres dans la masse des publications françaises, anglaises et américaines sur la vie ouvrière relève du défi. Quoi qu'il en soit, les listes de titres présentés seront utiles. Elles le seraient sans doute davantage si on y avait inséré des guides bibliographiques et des revues spécialisées. Ainsi la bibliographie française pourrait être complétée, entre autres, par l'excellente revue, *Le Mouvement social*, et par le *Bulletin*, publié annuellement par le Centre de recherches d'histoire des mouvements sociaux et du syndicalisme (Université de Paris I). *Mutatis mutandi*, on peut faire les mêmes remarques sur les bibliographies britannique et américaine.

Dans les bibliographies canadienne québécoise et montréalaise, des guides généraux auraient sans doute également eu leur place de même que les revues publiées par des départements de relations industrielles des universités canadiennes. D'autre part, les sources, les archives sur la vie ouvrière et en particulier sur la culture des travailleurs étant diverses, éparées, et parfois difficiles à repérer, on aurait fait oeuvre utile en y consacrant une section de la bibliographie.

Dans cette bibliographie, la cinquième section, qui est un essai bibliographique sur l'histoire socioculturelle de Montréal (1880-1920), est particulièrement intéressante. Même les initiés y feront des découvertes. Dommage que cette section soit placée à la toute fin du volume: elle risque d'être vue comme d'importance secondaire.

Ces observations que nous soumettons ici ne doivent pas voiler l'appréciation globale et positive que nous portons sur ce petit livre. Il témoigne d'un travail de recherche opportun: il est utile pour les

chercheurs d'avoir une vue d'ensemble des travaux poursuivis dans leur domaine par leurs collègues ou leurs prédécesseurs. Il n'est pas moins nécessaire de connaître les domaines inexplorés ou à peine entamés. Dieu sait combien de fois Lamonde et ses associés, tout au long de leur inventaire, ont pointé des champs en friche, des questions qui attendent des réponses, ou plutôt qui attendent les chercheurs. Ceux-ci voudront compléter le travail entrepris, d'autres s'attacheront à combler les lacunes où rien n'a été fait.

Jean-Guy Genest
Université du Québec à Chicoutimi

Jean Gérin Lajoie, *Les Métallus 1936-1981* (Montréal: Boréal Express 1982).

LA GRANDE CRISE des années 1930 sonne le glas de la première vague de cette idéologie du progrès qui plongeait ses racines dans *Les Lumières*, la "Richesse des nations" et la Révolution Industrielle. Les "roaring twenties" conduisent au dérapage du jeudi noir et au carambolage effroyable des années 1930-1933 alors que des milliers d'êtres humains sont broyés dans leur chair et dans leur âme. Le syndicalisme est emporté par le ressac; baisse des salaires, mais surtout licenciement et chômage, remettent en cause les gains syndicaux antérieurs. Ces années de "misère noire" sont porteuses d'amertume et de révolte; d'espoir aussi. C'est dans ce contexte, négligé par l'auteur, qu'il faut situer l'émergence et la diffusion des idées et des idéologies communistes et socialistes avec lesquelles maints syndicats auront maïlle à partir. Car d'autres solutions pour sortir de la Grande Dépression s'imposeront; ainsi le "New Deal" de Roosevelt et la version édulcorée des Bennett et des Mackenzie King. Heureusement cette atmosphère effervescente donne naissance au Cooperative Commonwealth Federation (CCF) et mar-

que le coup d'envol du syndicalisme industriel.

Ses promoteurs sauront stimuler la mobilisation des travailleurs non-syndiqués ou syndiqués sur la base du métier que le déploiement du capitalisme et le développement industriel ont battu en brèche. C'est pourtant cette forme d'organisation syndicale qui prime jusqu'à la formation du "Committee of Industrial Organizations" (CIO), en 1935. Le syndicalisme industriel que défend John L. Lewis est toujours en butte à l'opposition conjuguée 1) du patronat ("Big Business"), qui contourne l'esprit du "Wagner Act" en favorisant la mise sur pied de syndicats indépendants par le biais de l'"Employee Representation Plan;" (2) 2) de l'"American Federation of Labor" ("Big Labour"), dominée par les syndicats de métier, qui expulse le CIO, en 1936; 3) de la Confédération des Travailleurs Catholiques du Canada (CTCC); 4) et, enfin, de l'État ("Big Government") qui, par ses lois du travail, timides et insuffisantes, freine les revendications favorables à la démocratie industrielle. (10) Cette idée du syndicalisme industriel, naguère proposée par les Chevaliers du Travail et reprise plus tard par l'"Industrial Workers of the World" et la "One Big Union," est maintenant le cheval de bataille des communistes, des socialistes et des membres du "Committee for Industrial Organization." L'auteur ne s'attarde pas à en établir la paternité. Ce qui lui importe, c'est qu'on procède au nouveau partage des pouvoirs que la Crise actualise; ce qui compte, c'est que le nouveau contrat social préside au brassage et à une nouvelle donne des cartes, puisque les "maîtres des pouvoirs économiques absolus avaient produit le désastre." (10) L'atout c'est le syndicalisme industriel dont les quatre "idéaux" sont: 1) "grouper et constituer l'organisation de la masse de tous les travailleurs de la même usine;" 2) "création d'un syndicat qui constitue l'organisation de la solidarité des travailleurs à l'échelle de l'industrie

toute entière; 3) regroupement de tous les travailleurs de l'usine et de l'industrie dans un *syndicat unique*; 4) droit des travailleurs de vivre la "démocratie industrielle" c'est-à-dire, si j'ai bien compris, droit à la syndicalisation et reconnaissance des représentants qu'ils élisent à tous les paliers. (9-10) Ces idéaux correspondent aux objectifs du "Steel Workers' Organizing Committee" (SWOC), constitué en 1936, et recouvrent en partie les revendications des travailleurs de Stelco. Cette grève ouvre le volume et sert de point de départ à l'histoire tumultueuse des métaux québécois.

La compagnie Stelco possède une usine, sur la rue Notre-Dame, à Montréal. Depuis 1932, les salaires horaires ont reculé de 33,5 cents à 29 cents. Or, en 1936, l'industrie sidérurgique affiche une reprise qui laisse les salaires intacts. Pourtant les employés des petits ateliers de fer ornemental de Montréal touchent alors un taux horaire de base de 35 cents que leur confère un décret promulgué en vertu de la Loi de l'extension juridique; ils bénéficient, en fait, de la "convention collective" signée par l'"Union canadienne de Montréal des travailleurs en fer et en bronze ornemental," qui deviendra en 1941 le local 2366 des métaux. (15) Les travailleurs de Stelco sont désireux de corriger l'iniquité de leur situation. Mais leur objectif est plus grand; ils fondent un syndicat qui regrouperait tous les travailleurs de leur usine (journaliers, opérateurs de machines à clou, faiseurs de boulons, etc.), puis ceux des autres usines Stelco avant de joindre dans un même syndicat tous les travailleurs de l'industrie métallurgique canadienne. (9) L'enjeu est énorme. En contrepartie, la compagnie offre deux augmentations successives de 10 pour-cent, qui rehausseront le taux salarial horaire à 35 cents, plus la formation d'un "plan de coopération," que l'auteur ne définit pas. Cette réponse sera accompagnée de congédiements et de licenciements qui tueront dans l'oeuf cette première tentative de syndicalisation. Un

autre exemple qui illustre "les misères du syndicalisme industriel" (16) est celui de l'entreprise montréalaise Cuthbert. Les travailleurs de cette fabrique d'accessoires de plomberie y font vainement une grève d'un mois, en 1938, pour obtenir la "restauration de l'échelle de salaires en vigueur en 1929" (15) et la reconnaissance syndicale. Cette grève perdue entraîne le démantèlement du syndicat. Échec et mat.

La Loi du cadenas de Duplessis veut aussi mâter le syndicalisme. C'est ainsi qu'en 1938 des militants syndicaux de la métallurgie, dont l'organisateur Lucien Dufour, sont victimes de perquisitions et de "saisie de tous les documents syndicaux" (15) par des agents de la police provinciale. Cette loi répressive et odieuse entrave momentanément l'organisation du syndicalisme industriel au Québec. Cependant, pour ne pas monter le cas du Québec en épingle, il faut savoir que les syndicats industriels canadiens sont rares à cette époque; les principales exceptions à cette règle sont le Canadian Brotherhood of Railway Employees (CBRE), les bûcherons de la Colombie-Britannique, les travailleurs de General Motors d'Oshawa, ainsi que les mineurs de charbon et le tout récent syndicat des métaux au Cap-Breton. (16) Ce serait méconnaître la réalité des rapports sociaux de production, dans une formation sociale donnée, que de croire que, "mutatis mutandis," les relations de travail prévalant au Canada et au Québec vont s'accorder instantanément à celles de nos voisins du Sud. De même, lorsqu'on discute du retard des législations ouvrières canadiennes, convient-il de prendre en compte l'état de dépendance de l'économie canadienne et la peur des patrons de voir s'implanter ici "un syndicat à l'échelle de toute la métallurgie américaine," (23) mais aussi le décalage temporel et la différence organisationnelle qui séparent le "Congress of Industrial Organizations" américain et le Congrès canadien du travail. Néanmoins, on ne saurait

nier — sauf la "Trade Union Act" adoptée par le gouvernement de la Nouvelle-Écosse, en 1937, pour donner l'existence légale au syndicat des métallurgistes de Dosco, à Sidney — qu'il faut attendre la Loi des relations ouvrières du Québec et le décret fédéral CP 1003, en 1944, avant que le Canada-Québec soit doté d'un pastiche du "Wagner Act" de 1935. Et encore, faudra-t-il attendre l'année 1959 avant que le court gouvernement Sauvé n'adopte une loi qui ordonne la "réinstallation d'un travailleur congédié pour activité syndicale" et n'impose "le fardeau de la preuve à l'employeur." (19) C'est le mouvement d'appui à Théo Gagné, le leader du syndicat de Murdochville, que l'indécrottable Noranda Mines Co. a congédié qui pousse le gouvernement à passer cette loi. Bref, une société ne se réforme pas mécaniquement; encore faut-il en activer les transformations. L'auteur le sait. C'est ce que Silby Barrett et Charles Millard, directeur canadien du CIO de 1937 à 1942, avaient compris lorsqu'ils incitèrent, en 1939, leur comité de coordination à déclarer que le "temps est venu de lancer une croisade canadienne pour la démocratie industrielle." (27)

Silby Barrett était en charge de l'organisation syndicale des métaux canadiens depuis que John L. Lewis — président nord-américain du syndicat industriel des mineurs de charbon et fondateur tant du "Committee for Industrial Organization" (CIO) en 1935, que du "Steel Workers' Organizing Committee" (SWOC), l'année suivante — l'eût nommé à la direction du district 26. C'est un district autonome; c'est celui des mineurs de charbon de la Nouvelle-Écosse; ils sont affiliés au "United Mine Workers" américain. (17) Ce syndicat, dont la naissance remonte à 1879, est exemplaire. Il sert d'inspiration au récent syndicat (local 1064) des métallurgistes de Dosco que Barrett institue à Sydney en 1937. La compagnie Dosco possède aussi une usine à Montréal qui embauche quelques 300 travailleurs. C'est à ce laminoir, "Peck Rolling

Mills," que le syndicalisme industriel fait sa première percée dans le secteur métallurgique québécois. Barrett, le directeur des métaux canadiens, n'est sans doute pas étranger à l'adhésion du local 2174 à son syndicat, en 1940. Laurent Lecavalier en est le représentant dans la métropole. Les conditions de travail dans cette usine exigüe, équipée d'un mauvais système de chauffage et d'une aération inadéquate, sont déplorables. (33-4) Il en va de même des conditions salariales, toujours hypothéquées par les coupures des années 1931 et 1932 qui avaient entraîné une chute du taux de base horaire à 22,5 cents. Des augmentations subséquentes permettront aux salaires d'atteindre un taux de base horaire de 30,7 cents auquel il est plafonné depuis 1937. Ces conditions s'apparentent à celles de "Canadian Tube" qui paient 30 cents l'heure, mais sont inférieures à Stelco où les travailleurs touchent 35 cents. D'autre part, la durée hebdomadaire de travail est longue; en théorie, elle doit être de 54 heures; en réalité, un quartier des salariés de Peck Rolling Mills travaillent au-delà de soixante heures et "sept d'entre eux au-delà de 80 heures." (34) C'est le cercle vicieux: pour obvier au manque à gagner que génère leurs salaires, les travailleurs doivent travailler plus longtemps et à taux simple.

Ils déclenchent donc une "grève pour sortir du 'cheap labour.'" (34) Elle commence le 23 avril et se prolonge jusqu'au 7 juin 1940. On y conteste le gel des salaires en temps de guerre que le gouvernement fédéral a décrété. Le décret est une consécration du principe des disparités économiques régionales. En effet, les salaires québécois sont bien inférieurs à ceux que touchent les métaux de Dosco, à Sidney, de Stelco, à Hamilton, et d'Algoma, à Sault-Sainte-Marie où le salaire horaire de base est de 45,5 cents. Le syndicat réclame la parité salariale et exige l'établissement des salaires sur une base industrielle plutôt que régionale. La partie patronale refuse et conteste la légitimité du syndicat. Ce dernier, alléguant

que le décret fédéral lui permet de se prévaloir de la "loi d'enquête sur les conflits industriels de 1927," (32) demande la création d'une commission de conciliation et d'enquête pour statuer sur la validité de leurs réclamations. La commission crée un précédent en décidant de tenir un vote au scrutin secret, et sous la surveillance gouvernementale, pour dénouer l'impasse de la reconnaissance syndicale. (33) Les travailleurs sont incontestablement solidaires de leur syndicat. C'est quand même une entorse à la législation canadienne du travail qui, avant 1944, n'oblige pas "l'employeur à reconnaître un syndicat même quand celui-ci a gagné un vote majoritaire." (33) On tergiverse. Finalement le gouvernement augmente le salaire minimum dans les usines de guerre; puis promet aux travailleurs de Peck Rolling Mills de reconvoquer la commission d'enquête. Dans ces circonstances les travailleurs votent le retour au travail. Circonspect, l'auteur indique que "la représentation et la survivance syndicales des travailleurs montréalais de Dosco ne seront assurées en fait que dix ans plus tard, à l'issue de la grève de 1950 à l'usine Canadian Tube" (33) acquise entre temps par Dosco.

Néanmoins, ce premier syndicat des travailleurs de la métallurgie, au Québec, a une existence officielle depuis le 22 mai 1942. (58) Ils sont mieux connus alors sous le nom de "United Steelworkers of America;" progressivement on les désignera comme les Métallurgistes unis d'Amérique avant d'être finalement identifiés au terme de Métallos dont la première utilisation remonte à 1960. Cinq années plus tard c'est le journal du syndicat, *Le Métallo*, qui est lancé; on tire profit d'un journal de grève, *Le Piquet*, que les mineurs de Manitou-Barvue, à Val-d'or, ont publié durant l'hiver 1963-64. (147) Ce journal répond au grand objectif de "démocratie industrielle" que ce syndicat a toujours voulu appliquer dans son organisation interne. (10, 17, et 60)

L'implantation du SWOC au Canada

est l'oeuvre conjointe de Silby Barrett et Charles Millard. En dépit d'une certaine confusion introduite par l'auteur (17 et 60) nous croyons pouvoir établir, avec réserve cependant, les fonctions de l'un et de l'autre. De fait, entre 1937 et 1940, Barrett cumule les postes de directeur des mineurs de charbon, directeur des métallos canadiens et président canadien du "Congress of Industrial Organizations;" puis en 1940, lors de la création du Congrès canadien du travail il devient le vice-président de cette organisation que Charles Millard présidera jusqu'en 1942. À cette date le territoire nord-américain est divisé en 39 districts qui élisent chacun un directeur au bureau exécutif des métallurgistes que dirigera Millard, jusqu'en 1945, tout en assumant, je présume, son rôle de député cécéliste ("Cooperative Commonwealth Federation") à la législature ontarienne où il fut élu en 1943. (62) Donc, en 1945, les Métallos tiennent leur élections de district; Charles Millard et John Mitchell sont élus à la direction de leur district respectif: le premier au district 6 (Ontario et Québec) et l'autre au district 5 (les Maritimes). Ils battent ainsi leurs adversaires communistes, soit George MacNeil et Tom McClure. Aux élections de l'année suivante, Millard est réélu tandis que J.C. Nicholson devient le nouveau directeur du district 5, qui inclura le Québec à partir de 1947. (61) De son bureau de Sidney (N.E.), Nicholson "s'occupait fort peu de la marche du syndicat au Québec." (103) Conséquentement, en 1950, cette tâche échoit au directeur canadien, Charles Millard, qui assume ici l'organisation de l'action syndicale jusqu'au moment où, en 1956, William Mahoney lui succède comme directeur. L'année suivante, Mahoney s'entend avec Nicholson pour que la direction du syndicat au Québec." (103) Conséquentement, en 1950, cette tâche échoit au directeur canadien, Charles Millard, qui assume ici l'organisation de l'action syndicale jusqu'au moment où, en 1956, William Mahoney lui succède comme direc-

teur. L'année suivante, Mahoney s'entend avec Nicholson pour que la direction du syndicat au Québec relève officiellement du directeur canadien; puis il confie à Pat Burke, assisté d'Émile Boudreau et P.L. Gélinas, le rôle de "coordonnateur régional pour l'ensemble du Québec." (104) L'auteur est heureux de cette unification de la direction du syndicat au Québec; il est non moins satisfait de voir Pat Burke remplacer R.J. Lamoureux, président de la Fédération des unions industrielles du Québec (FUIQ) depuis sa création, en 1952, et l'un des "acteurs importants du désordre antérieur," (104) à la vice-présidence de la nouvelle Fédération des travailleurs du Québec (FTQ), en 1957.

Toujours est-il que Pat Burke est "nommé plutôt qu'élus" (157) au poste de coordonnateur des Métallos à l'échelle du Québec. Cette situation dure depuis deux années lorsque l'on soulève la question, en 1960, de constituer le Québec en district autonome. Là aussi, c'est le temps que ça change! L'opposition principale à cette sécession vient du directeur ontarien du district 6, Sefton, qui craint qu'elle ne soit "le prélude de la scission en deux districts de l'Ontario et de l'Ouest canadien." (158) Burke succède à Nicholson comme directeur du district 5 (Québec-Maritimes), en février 1961; il s'est fait élire avec le mandat de séparer le Québec. Ce sera effectivement le cas lorsque, le 1 juin, le Québec devient le district 5. En 1968, les 6,500 syndiqués des Maritimes seront réintégrés aux 28,500 métallos du Québec au "vif désappointement" (167) de Jean Gérin-Lajoie qui dirige les destinées de ce syndicat depuis trois années. Il convient de souligner la grande modestie et l'objectivité de l'auteur lorsqu'il raconte les péripéties de cette dure bataille électorale de 1965. (159-166) Il l'emporte, de justesse, sur le candidat Jean Beaudry que supporte Pat Burke dont le seul défaut était son unilinguisme. (161) Il affronte et bat le même adversaire, en 1969; par ailleurs, il est élu par acclamation à ce poste de directeur de dis-

trict en 1973 et 1977. (232) Enfin, en 1981, c'est Clément Godbout qui devient le nouveau directeur de ces Métallos que bien des Québécois identifient à celui qui, après un militantisme syndical d'une trentaine d'années, dont une quinzaine à leur tête, (5 et 243) consacre un dernier douze mois à "la recherche documentaire et à la rédaction" (5) de leur histoire.

Applaudissons cette initiative des Métallos qui lui ont confié cette tâche. Dorénavant, outre leurs traditions orales, ils ont leur histoire. Cet ouvrage démontre le potentiel documentaire que recèlent des journaux comme le *Steel Labor* et *Le Métallo*. Ils constituent, avec les archives canadiennes du syndicat, "toutes déposées aux Archives publiques du Canada," (249) l'essentiel de sa documentation puisque les archives québécoises, données à l'Université de Montréal, n'étaient pas encore complètement inventoriées et classées. Nous soulignons le mérite énorme de cet auteur qui, pour n'être "pas historien de formation, ni écrivain," (6) n'en fait pas moins oeuvre d'historien de façon objective et prudente.

Ces qualités indéniables nous semblent ternies par l'usage indifférencié des termes communiste et marxiste, (39) mais surtout par cette rétrospective chasse-aux-sorciers communistes. Le cas Lucien Dufour témoigne de notre suspicion. L'auteur tout en se demandant si la victime était communiste, admet ne rien connaître de Dufour si ce n'est qu'il fut perquisitionné et qu'à "défaut d'informations directes, il faut dire que Dufour était sans doute au moins un sympathisant du Parti communiste car le syndicat des Métallos est arrivé au Québec dans les wagons du Parti communiste." (24) Que prouvent ces allégations? Il est facile d'être sympathisant communiste dans le Québec des années 1930. Un autre cas, que l'auteur aborde avec autant de préjugés, est celui de Laurent Lecavalier. Ce dernier aurait le rare démérite d'avoir démissionné comme représentant des Métallos, le 17 juin 1941, "en accusant

les Métallos de tiédeur dans leur appui" (39) aux grévistes de Peck Rolling Mills. Et pourtant il nous semble que Lecavalier pouvait avoir raison de déplorer le second vote favorable à la fin de la grève. Aurait-il prévu le dénouement que le retour au travail risquait de produire? Car, à l'exception de la hausse salariale, dont nous avons parlé, l'auteur admet que "les travailleurs connaîtront finalement l'échec." (38) L'échec, relatif selon nous, de cette grève commande-t-elle à posteriori la quête d'un bouc-émissaire? Lecavalier était peut-être marxiste, communiste ou sympathisant communiste, mais qu'on le dise carrément et qu'on nous prouve en quoi cette affirmation aurait un intérêt historique. Autrement, que l'auteur reconnaisse qu'il formule une "opinion partisane" ainsi qu'il l'écrit à propos du syndicat Mine-Mill qui aurait été "expulsé du CIO aux États-Unis et du CCT au Canada à cause... de la subordination de leur action syndicale au dogme marxiste et au Parti communiste." (75) Ainsi l'auteur, ne se départissant pas de son sens critique, mise sur le jugement de son lecteur. Cette question de la présence et du rôle réel ou appréhendé des communistes y gagnerait d'être repensée et objectivée. Les faits d'opinion sont aussi des faits historiques. Un autre beau sujet serait d'étudier ce pan de la tradition orale, imbue de passion, de préjugé et d'idéologie, que les leaders syndicaux, leurs milieux également, propagent — inculquent à leurs émules — à l'endroit et à l'envers des uns et des autres ainsi que des organismes, leurs concurrents trop souvent, qu'ils représentent. Tel n'est pas l'objet de ce volume. Quoiqu'il ne soit pas facile de passer de l'action militante partisan à l'étude scientifique, c'est une gageure que l'auteur relève avec brio. Nos remarques précédentes ne visent qu'à souligner qu'il eût été préférable que ces bavures en soient exemptes.

C'est en effet une parution qui vient combler une lacune de notre historiographie française. Le volume de Gérin-

Lajoie complète avantageusement *l'Histoire du mouvement ouvrier au Québec (1825-1976)*, et, les *Éléments d'histoire de la FTQ...* de François Cyr et Rémi Roy, ainsi que la thèse de Michel Grant. En dépit d'une facture aguichante, ce n'est probablement pas le genre d'ouvrage qui connaîtra une diffusion large chez les travailleurs. Même si l'auteur évite les pièges "de la statistique abstraite ou ceux de la nomenclature fastidieuse," (208) il colle encore trop au modèle aride des études universitaires. Par contre, l'éditeur a réalisé un beau travail: présentation soignée, texte aéré, marges latérales agrémentées des caricatures que Roger Paré dessinait pour le journal *Le Métallo*. (15) Les marges logent également des commentaires explicatifs et des photographies de travailleurs et de militants. Caricatures, illustrations, et photographies allègent la forme de cet ouvrage déjà habité par les hommes. L'auteur sait qu'ils seront toujours l'âme du syndicalisme, même revêtu de sa chape institutionnelle. Le choix de Gérin-Lajoie est de ressusciter la lutte permanente des Métallos pour se tailler une place au soleil, en se dotant des outils que sont l'acquisition et la défense de leur droit à la syndicalisation. En somme, ce combat, "épopée" dit l'auteur, (243) est aussi la geste d'homme comme Charles Smart, (66) Nick Léveillé, (70) Jos Rankin, et Edouard Goguen que ce livre sauve de l'oubli. Voilà ce que raconte l'auteur, sans verser du tout dans l'hagiographie et le panégyrique. Il fallait donc expliciter les résultats sans estomper ni "les luttes qui les ont produits," ni la diversité du monde ouvrier et syndical, ni "le désordre concret des négociations les plus décentralisées et les plus fracturées de tout le monde industrialisé." (208) Cette forme d'exposé est lisible de chapitre en chapitre.

Le plan du volume se conforme à une trame chronologique, découpée en phase décennale, qui constitue autant de chapitres. Ce choix est discutable. Après "les

années 1930. Les échecs des débuts" (15-27) qui se déroulent sur une toile de fond empreinte de l'atmosphère de la crise, l'auteur aborde "Les années 1940." (31-62) Cette période de guerre marque vraiment "la naissance" du syndicalisme industriel que les travailleurs de Peck Rolling Mills imposeront dans les faits, même si ce n'est qu'après la grève de "Canadian Tube" que sa survivance est réellement reconnue. Les grands objectifs des métallos durant les années de guerre seront, outre la reconnaissance syndicale, l'obtention de la parité salariale avec leurs camarades des grandes usines du Canada anglais et l'établissement d'un "contrat national unique dans la sidérurgie canadienne." (41) Faute "d'une législation ouvrière uniforme et nationale" (44) qui aurait permis l'atteinte de cet objectif et devant l'opposition du patronat, les syndicats devront se rabattre sur le "pattern bargaining." Cette forme de "négociation par modèle" (45) consiste essentiellement, comme dans le cas d'Algoma (45) ou celui de l'Iron Ore, à Schefferville et à Sept-Îles, (143 ss) à différer les dates d'échéance des contrats de travail de sorte qu'ils puissent modeler leurs projets de conventions collectives sur les clauses avantageuses obtenues ailleurs, mais surtout aux États-Unis. L'inéluctable "pattern bargaining" devient monnaie courante durant les années 1950. (chap. 3) C'est la décennie du décollage. (63-112) Les grandes luttes des métallos consistent alors à briser le cercle d'une dépendance économique canadienne qui consacre le principe colonialiste d'une disparité salariale entre le Québec et les États-Unis. (88) "Les principales revendications des Métallos québécois et leurs principales grèves seront des luttes de rattrapage." (93) C'est ainsi que plusieurs groupes de travailleurs réussiront à doubler leurs salaires (88-89) durant ces dix ans, en plus de faire entrer dans les usines le système d'évaluation des salaires, le "Cooperative Wage Study." (90) C'est par ses luttes, ses réa-

lisations et la croissance de ses effectifs syndicaux (65) que le "canard s'arrache de l'eau." (11) En prenant de l'altitude on mesure mieux les turbulences d'un monde industriel que caractérise la diversité: les couches de travailleurs vivent des conditions variées et ont des attentes hétérogènes. La formation syndicale, l'information et l'action politique (95-102) sont nécessaires pour vaincre la force d'inertie de gouvernements conservateurs et de compagnies réactionnaires comme la Noranda Mines, dans le Nord-Ouest et à Murdochville, et Ingersoll-Rand à Sherbrooke. (115) La conscience syndicale s'impose aussi pour passer à travers les nuages de ces divergences entre la Fédération des unions industrielles du Québec (FUIQ) et la Confédération de travailleurs catholiques du Canada (CTCC) qui obscurcissent le climat unitaire (103-112) en gestation depuis 1955. Même si la CTCC reste à l'écart, ce que l'auteur déplore, la création de la Fédération des travailleurs du Québec (FTQ) va bénéficier aux Métallos.

La récente FTQ et son syndicat des Métallos, puis la nouvelle Confédération des Syndicats Nationaux (CSN) sont déjà à l'heure de la Révolution tranquille quand l'équipe dite du tonnerre prend le pouvoir en 1960. Ils sont le fer de lance de l'"identité québécoise" (ch. 4) que chantent poètes et chansonniers. Par étape, les Métallos affichent leur idéal souverainiste lors de leur assemblée annuelle de 1972. Enfin, en 1978, ils appuient le Parti Québécois que dirige cet homme qui, dans les années 1960, supportait les Métallos dans leurs luttes pour civiliser les grandes compagnies minières.

Georges Massé
Université du Québec
à Trois-Rivières

David M. Gordon, Richard Edwards, and Michael Reich, *Segmented Work, Divided Workers: The Historical*

Transformation of Labor in the United States (New York: Cambridge University Press 1982).

MANY BOOKS BECOME significant because they define important new questions, whether or not these are successfully answered, and whether or not the methods and evidence at hand prove particularly satisfying in their own terms. The volume considered here arrives at a position of major importance via the diametrically opposite route: it poses some received, even tired, historical questions that end up being almost incidental to a strikingly original approach to finding answers, a framework on which the authors hang an imposing reconceptualization of the history of American political economy.

Neither the understated title nor the book's opening pages quite hint at the scope of what is to come. The authors start with a review of the debate about the dual labour market hypothesis, and they outline their own reformulation — tripartite, not dual, and segmented, not divided. Lest such concerns seem technical or internal to Marxist theory, the authors argue their centrality to one of the oldest chestnuts roasting in historiographical and political fires: the problem of explaining the quiescence of American labour, especially politically, and the historical failure to generate or sustain "a working-class agenda" and "a serious labor-dominated political party." Indeed, the Big Question. (A friend reportedly found it handed back on a student's garbled exam essay as "the Wino Socialism problem" in the United States.) Seeking this venerable grail, the authors set out to sketch the history of divisions among American workers.

Almost as soon as they unpack their analytic framework, however, it becomes clear that the big question is a horse trotting behind a self-propelled cart. Gordon, Edwards, and Reich argue that the issue of American exceptionalism cannot be usefully considered until a variety of problems informing traditional approaches

are remedied. The most central of these trace to the deficient sense of historical process and transformation that has confined so many Marxist analyses to deductive modeling, where ideal types march woodenly through historic categories. Among non-Marxists, the same deficiency has led those wrestling with the question to static generalizations about class and culture, and only moderately less ahistorical ones about race and ethnicity. In general, the authors argue, historical analysis of the evolving economic system remains detached from the analysis of society, labour, and politics.

This has particularly hobbled understanding the role of class struggle, seen in many analyses merely as a structural consequence of capitalism's evolution, or, alternatively, as a kind of historical independent variable by many of those most sympathetic to the claims of working-class agency. With a more integral sense of the role of conflict in political-economic change thus suppressed or detached, a dialectical understanding is impossible almost by definition, and its history cannot even be sketched. Accordingly, the authors hinge their work on an analytic framework capable of linking the evolution of capitalism and the history of struggle, and showing how both are expressed in the transformations of labour over time.

This framework presents the history of work, labour markets, the working class, and indeed American society itself as an expression of the interaction between the "long swing" dynamics of economic activity, and a complex — their most original contribution — termed the "social structure of accumulation." Basically, this includes all those historical forces, institutions, and factors "external to individual capitalists or firms, but internal to capitalism in general," from social conflict to labour organization to the role of the state to evolving cultural structures and values.

The relationship between accumula-

tion and such a broadly defined social structure supporting it is necessarily unstable, the authors show, and history can be read as the record of that instability. Capitalism's fundamental need for profits and growth exploits the possibilities of a given social structure of accumulation beyond the point of diminishing returns; the result is not only an economic crisis, but a political-economic crisis, involving struggles over alterations permitting this structure to fit capitalism's evolving form and needs. And to the very extent the alterations work, their obsolescence becomes inevitable, and the cycle of crisis is repeated. In a manner reminiscent of Kuhn's paradigm-shift concept of historical process, the authors see American history moving unevenly through this rhythm of stability, dissonance, conflict, and resolution, with new social structures of accumulation taking gradual shape within the faltering and decaying forms of their predecessors, suddenly leaping into prominent maturity amidst a sustained crisis, and then beginning an inevitable disintegration.

In this manner, the authors detect three major, overlapping phases in the history of work and labour under American capitalism: proletarianization (1820s to 1890s) homogenization (1870s to 1940s), and segmentation (1920s to the present). When the book turns to examining each of these in detail, the cart/horse reversal really comes into play: the particular problem of divisions among workers seems most exciting as an illustration of a more general approach to history, rather than the latter solving a particular mystery to any very satisfying degree.

A model that sounds complex, even cumbersome, in the abstract, turns out to work extraordinarily well in practice. Indeed, beyond a number of fascinating new insights, it is remarkable how what we already know — about labour history, for instance, or the development of the corporation, or innovations in technology, or immigration, or the role of women in the

workforce — seems more understandable, explicable, and powerful in the straightforward narrative context generated by the categories of this model. When conceptual deduction and a broad range of historical particulars link up so solidly, the result seems almost self-evident as soon as it is stated — the telltale sign of a very formidable historical synthesis. The result is, simply, the most useful and stimulating general overview we have of the linked history of American work, workers, and capitalism. It should have all the influence of Harry Braverman's classic study of the degradation of work, and it deserves more, since to understand changes in the social structure of accumulation demands more concrete historical analysis, and works better in diverse circumstances, than does Braverman's essentially deductive approach to the implications of capitalism for the labour process.

The big question, it should be said, survives this analysis unanswered, in part because a dynamic theory deals more easily with change than with phenomena conceived, in the usual formulation of the question, as persistent. The broad lines of the argument also diminish its ability to work on very particular historical problems close up — which is what the generalizations of Wino Socialism reduce to when taken seriously. An hypothesis in which both homogenization and segmentation can produce similar results, and in which both tendencies co-exist in time but in opposed historical motion, is at a disadvantage in demonstrating that divisions among workers are central determinants of collective values, behaviour, and political action.

Interestingly, however, such weaknesses actually confirm the importance of the general approach, since they stem from narrowing the framework to the particular dimension of labour division. The social structure of accumulation concept, however, is much broader; it not only permits, but actually invites similarly dialectical consideration of factors the authors

are perhaps too easily faulted for slighting — such as the lines of working-class culture, the nature of broader political institutions and values, and the complex cultural role of race and ethnicity. In other words, readers should not let less-than-definitive answers to the Wino Socialism issue obscure the broader power of the book's historical synthesis. If this is seen as an initial illustration of a more general, open-ended historical method, its power and significance will be better appreciated.

It also helps to remember the persistent emphasis on the active role of workers themselves in shaping both long swing and the social structure of accumulation. This had always been easy to appreciate in periods of organization and insurgency. But it tends to be less clear in understanding times — such as the present — when labour appears in near-chaotic retreat before an assault of capital, an assault that can seem beyond resistance or deflection because of the wave of structural economic transformation it claims to be riding.

For meeting such situations, this book's dialectics offer needed encouragement. While the authors could not be called optimists, they use their framework effectively to argue that recent developments are evidence of both a long swing economic crisis, and the exhaustion of the current social structure of accumulation based on labour segmentation, a structure whose power rests on the stability of the so-called labour consensus of the postwar decades. The current restructuring of the workforce and the assault of capital, in effect announce that we have entered a period of immense change, the inputs into which, this book's model shows, are far more diverse, and the outcomes far less determined, than they initially can seem. Unless one feels the postwar balance to have been ideal, this destabilization thus represents a moment of historic opportunity around which the forces of labour can

crystallize and organize, even if the means are not immediately evident.

The real success of the volume, as this suggests, is to provide valuable tools for combining economic analysis and the study of historical contingency. It sketches a method for making better sense — common sense, really — of American social history, more than can be offered by rigid developmental models or a pluralist American exceptionalism. It demonstrates that the study of political economy can and must be, in practice and in theory, the study of history. In so doing, it suggests that a history which uses the insights of political economy to understand how our world actually changes, may more readily become a tool for change itself.

Michael H. Frisch
State University of New York — Buffalo

Maurice Isserman, *Which Side Were You On?: The American Communist Party During the Second World War* (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press 1982).

MAURICE ISSERMAN HAS written a remarkably interesting book: excellently researched, competently structured, and with a critical approach that is both highly informative and sympathetic. As he says in the opening line to his preface, "The history of Communism in America is bitterly contested terrain," and he has found his way through very complicated paths with a rational judgement that is admirable. He sets out the difficult questions of his subject, and while he does not pretend to provide detailed answers in all cases, the matters he is dealing with are central to an understanding of the American radical past and crucial for the American radical present.

He explains that he is writing a generational history — from the mid-thirties to 1956 — and that he began his research

when the first major source, the Earl Browder papers, had become available at Syracuse University. Since then, during the last decade or so, there have also appeared a number of personal, often moving, accounts of the life and times of communist militants.

Isserman begins with a chapter on the American Communist Party in the 1930s, when Browder stamped his image on the party and when the Comintern had shifted its political line from the disastrous sectarianism of the 6th Congress to the united front and popular front ideas of the 7th Congress of 1935. In a number of respects this is a key chapter in the book. American communists in these years before 1939 began to put down roots into ordinary American life and to develop policies and attitudes that might have provided a long-term basis for the further development of the native socialist tradition. The struggles on behalf of black groups were serious and principled, and their record on unionization, along with close allies such as Harry Bridges, had considerable substance. But there were always problems inherent in their relationship with Moscow and the world communist movement, and in the end the problems overwhelmed them. But down to the outbreak of World War II, the strategy of the popular front was being worked out with imagination and verve. Here, too, there were problems but they were not insoluble. Browder led the party into opportunist ways and in particular played down the importance of industrial and political work on the shop-floor; the party was also notably lopsided on issues of civil liberties. These things happened in other countries, but they might have been corrected, although there was always the Moscow connection which could never be broken. When the war came, and the Comintern pronounced it an imperialist struggle — a fundamental misreading of the international power situation — the Communist Party in America followed the rest of the communist world, with remarkably few defections. Since the

United States was not involved in fighting, the slogan had to be "The Yanks Aren't Coming." Isserman writes the history of this miserable period with sympathetic insight. The Communist Party was badly mauled, and in a number of ways it never recovered from its experiences, despite its growth in the aftermath of the Nazi invasion of the Soviet Union.

The American Communist Party has not been alone in offering unnecessary comfort and encouragement to the reactionary elements in society: the left all over the world has a formidable record in this context. The House Un-American Activities Committee, led by Martin Dies, flourished in the atmosphere of a burgeoning anti-communism, and Browder himself was put behind bars on a passport fraud. What is so dispiriting about this stage of American communist history are the examples that Isserman gives of the self-deception that a simple-minded Marxism, under sectarian stress, can nourish and encourage. Here is Browder on 5 November 1939:

America itself, despite the political backwardness as yet of our working class, is technically, objectively, the country which is the most ripe, the most prepared, for a quick transition to socialism, for which it lacks only the understanding and the will of the masses to that goal.

The Trotskyist groups which have remained simon-pure, and certain other *gauchiste* sects, are in many countries still saying the same thing today: testimony to the intellectual corruption that infects the incorruptible.

The return to anti-fascism which followed the attack on the Soviet Union on 22 June 1941 allowed the Communist Party to continue and expand the policies of the Popular Front days. Browder was released from prison in May 1942 and accelerated the party's turn towards an accommodation with Rooseveltian liberalism; but what pushed Browder into a fundamental revision of the communist position was the interpretation he made of

the Teheran agreements of November 1943. He genuinely believed that the declaration of accord between Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin meant what it said: that a complete and lasting peace would follow the victory over fascism; and that imperialism would no longer exist in its pre-war forms. Within a fortnight of Teheran, Browder was telling a party rally in Bridgeport, Connecticut, that communists "must help to remove from the American ruling class the fear of a socialist revolution in the United States in the post-war period."

Browder was not alone in giving way to illusions during the later stages of the war, although few in other countries went so far as he did. Pollitt in Britain, for instance, also developed markedly revisionist ideas in the year before the war ended, but the harsh realities of the European conflict, as well as the central imperialist role that Britain still played, made it difficult for anyone to stray too far along the Browder path. But Browder himself had developed delusions of grandeur and the cult of his personality was quite widespread. He was, therefore, able to lead the American communists into a wholly false understanding of the world that was emerging from the defeat of fascism. The party for example was muted in its response to the counter-revolution by the British in Greece, and Browder pushed his international economic policy as the answer to "damaging mistakes" like those of Britain in Greece, in which a beneficent American imperialism would work peacefully with the Soviet Union in world reconstruction. It was terrible nonsense, and a terrible tragedy.

Browder persuaded his comrades to dissolve the Communist Party and establish a Communist Political Association which lasted for a year. Then, in May 1945, the famous letter of Jacques Duclos criticizing the dissolution of the Communist Party reached New York, and since this was clearly Moscow speaking, the end of Browder was in sight. The associa-

tion was wound up at the end of July and William Z. Foster became chairman of the re-created Communist Party. The party moved steadily to the left, turned its back upon the many positive attitudes that had developed during the New Deal and war-time years, and embarked upon what Isserman describes as "policies of suicidal delusion." His own summary of what happened to the party in the late forties and through the fifties is worth reproducing:

The American communists held a fortress besieged by overwhelming forces in those years. Whatever judgement one makes of their beliefs and actions, the fact that so many persevered through the worst of the anti-Communist hysteria of the late 1940s and early 1950s stands as eloquent testimony to their courage and commitment. More than a hundred leaders of the Communist party, including many of those who figured prominently in the events of 1939 to 1945, were indicted and convicted under the Smith Act. Many served long terms in prison, and all expected to. Screenwriters in Hollywood, schoolteachers in New York City, and thousands of other people around the country were driven from their jobs for having joined or sympathised with the Party or one of its front organisations, or simply refusing to inform on others. Membership in the Party made one not only a political pariah but a criminal. The 1950 McCarran Act declared that Communists in effect repudiate their allegiance to the United States and in effect transfer their allegiance to the Soviet Union. The law required all Communists to register with the Attorney General and gave the federal government authority to arrest and imprison them in the event of an "internal security emergency."

The crucifixion of the American Communist Party was not yet completed; there were still a few nails to be hammered home. In January 1956, the year of the Khrushchev revelation, and American Communist Party still had about 20,000 members. Khrushchev's account of the Stalinist terror had a devastating impact upon the membership and a raging debate began, the like of which had never before been encountered in communist history. But as in Britain the dissenters lacked

effective leadership against the machine, in America still controlled by Foster. In Britain the central committee remained totally united and opposed to an open debate, and a quarter of the membership fell away. But in America membership was halved by the summer of 1957 and had shrunk to around 3,000 a year later.

The decline of the organized left in America, and the failure to develop a new movement with staying power in the past two decades, is a matter of quite crucial importance for the labour and socialist movements the world over. The weakness of the radical opposition in the most powerful capitalist country in the world is felt and experienced everywhere: at every level of struggle, for elementary decency, against nuclear weapons, and for socialist advance, American imperialism is the main enemy; and the absence of widespread support inside America for progressive policies is a handicap of quite terrifying dimensions. Towards our understanding of the problems of the left in America in the past half-century, Isserman's book is a most valuable contribution.

John Saville
University of Hull

Joel Denker, *Unions and Universities: The Rise of the New Labor Leader* (Montclair, NJ: Allanheld, Osmun 1981).

A SPECTRE IS HAUNTING the American labour movement: the rise of college-trained labour specialists. In 1964 not a single degree programme in labour studies could be found in the United States. By the late 1970s, 47 colleges and universities offered undergraduate and graduate degrees in the field. This spare and readable book by a labour studies teacher at the University of the District of Columbia discusses the history, structure, and problems of these college programmes

designed to serve the needs of American trade unions.

Two forces account for the current crop of labour studies courses: the technological and managerial changes which swept through American business after World War II, and the growth of the labour movement itself. In the first case, effective collective bargaining against corporate giants demanded legal and financial expertise that union leaders and organizers had yet to develop. In addition, contemporary concern with such issues as health and safety, fringe benefits, and media relations encouraged the hiring of labour "specialists."

With tens of thousands of members to serve, large unions also required improved internal communications — including organizers with a combination of social skills and technical proficiency. All of this helps explain the bureaucratization of trade unions (including the hiring of lawyers and other professionals), and the provision of academic training for unionists, workers, and others interested in labour's cause.

The author obviously believes in the functional value of labour studies, but much of the book explores — in a guarded and tentative way — the costs and limitations of such programmes. Gone are the days when adult education courses for workers were cherished for their political and/or academic orientation. In recent years pragmatism is virtually all that matters to workers and their unions. Courses in labour history and the "worker in society" are endured by students seeking degrees, but instruction in bargaining methods and the training of stewards is invariably preferred. A union-sponsored programme at the University of Akron offered courses in both the liberal arts and more practical subjects. The students there avoided political science, world affairs, and economics in favour of public speaking, basic English, and remedial writing.

While unions value and utilize the

skills that labour specialists bring to the job, the academic with little union experience is generally viewed with considerable suspicion. Few unionists are as extreme as Samuel Gompers, who once dismissed intellectuals in the labour movement as "faddists, theorists and effeminate men," but the residue of such characterization remains. As a result specialists are often excluded from the centres of union power — their expertise is used but their advice on political and policy matters is ignored. Frequently insecure themselves, some labour specialists "adopt the fashionable anti-intellectualism of the organizations," thereby depriving their unions of potentially useful contributions. The reverse problem, however, can also exist. Some union lawyers attempt to build their own empires by monopolizing information and knowledge, and treating with condescension other union employees and members of the rank and file. But in general the credibility of those trained in college-based labour studies depends on how consistently they stay out of everyone's way and toe the union line.

Within universities, labour studies face a different problem — the struggle for academic recognition and status. Jealous, politically suspicious industrial relations and business management deans almost always question the need for labour studies. While intelligent academics should be able to distinguish between industrial relations programmes stressing techniques of management control, and labour studies which focus on the union as an organization and the needs of its workers, legitimacy is not easily obtained, and the risks of cooptation are very great. Labour studies programmes tend to test the limits of liberalism within North American colleges and universities, and the narrowness of those limits is frequently discovered. Few universities, for example, will tolerate the hiring of labour studies teachers who have years of union experience but who lack the appropriate

academic credentials. As a result, the teachers hired, increasingly, have no union experience. Hail the precious Ph.D.

This book will undoubtedly be dismissed by union "pragmatists" as ponderous theorizing, even though the demand by unions for labour specialists trained in universities and colleges will continue to grow. Labour studies advocates within post-secondary institutions, however, including those involved in the newer Canadian programmes, will find this a useful study. It addresses, without fully resolving, the question of how the teacher maintains political and intellectual integrity in the face of both union and university conservatism.

Paul Axelrod
York University

Stephen A. Marini, *Radical Sects of Revolutionary New England* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press 1982).

THIS BOOK EXAMINES the emergence of the first radical counter-attack on the Calvinist tradition in the hill country of central, western and northern New England between 1790 and 1820. The Freewill Baptists, Shakers, and Universalists, Marini argues, forged "complete and countervailing religious cultures out of the raw materials of rural New England society." (7) By 1815 this radical Evangelical movement had reached its zenith, and by 1840 other groups such as the Methodists, the Christian Connection, and the Church of Latter-Day Saints had come to dominate the alternative religious scene. The legacy of this movement is the pluralism and diversity that has persisted in the American religious tradition to the present day.

Marini's analysis of the social and economic environment of the hill country adds a new dimension to the social history of post-revolutionary New England. The centralized towns of Massachusetts and

Connecticut, it seems, were not duplicated on the frontier. The typical town consisted of 500 to 1,800 people and was spread over twenty to 30 square miles. The region did not develop commercially and remained "in the best of times a marginal subsistence economy, and in the worst of times an agricultural disaster." (29-30) In contrast to southern New England, property was more evenly distributed with one-third of the land owned by the wealthiest 10 per cent of the population and the remainder divided into estates of under 500 pounds. In the absence of stable non-familial institutions such as churches, schools, and courts, the family assumed a more critical role than in southern New England. Unlike Philip Greven's Andover, for example, younger generations did not have to emigrate to obtain land and a living. Land was readily available and labour was scarce.

These conditions of social and cultural fragmentation, Marini argues, rendered the hill country especially vulnerable to the radicalizing impulses of evangelical religion. Given the weakness of the congregational establishment in the hill country, and the "localist, egalitarian, and tribal view of the settlers and their institutions," (39) the frontier was fertile ground for religious radicalism. Thus the Shakers, Universalists, and Freewill Baptists emerged from the irrelevance of traditional congregationalist ideals and polity. A commitment to celibacy, mutual confession, the necessity of the new birth, and a belief that the Second Coming had already begun took the Shakers considerably beyond their origins in the experiential religion of George Whitefield and the New Lights. The Universalists proclaimed that all of humanity was to be touched by God's grace and thereby denied the Calvinist doctrine of limited atonement and predestination. The Freewill Baptists declared that God neither saved nor damned anyone and that individuals were free to decide their own spiritual destiny. The widespread success

of these sects indicates the marginality of Calvinism on the frontier by the end of the eighteenth century.

Marini combines a sensitive appreciation for the nuances of sectarian doctrine with a rigorous analysis of the social milieu of the hill country. Sharply etched portraits of Mother Ann Lee, Caleb Rich, and Benjamin Randel provide the reader with the best assessments available of early American charismatics. These strengths, however, are offset by several faulty judgements and missed opportunities. Marini's claim that social classes were relatively undifferentiated is based only on a crude estimation about the distribution of property, a rather mechanistic assumption about how people arrange themselves in a new society. Like much of the literature in American religious history, moreover, *Radical Sects of Revolutionary New England* seeks to explain the peculiarly American character of religious movements, and thus it avoids a comparative perspective. Mother Ann Lee's biography bears such a striking similarity to British millenarian Joanna Southcott that the two demand comparison. Southcott's rejection of sexual relations emerged from her belief that women were to compensate for Eve's sin by redeeming men from Satan through celibacy. By pursuing the comparison, Marini might have explored the different ways that men and women on the frontier experienced the intervention of the spirit in their lives.

The book also suffers from its conventional but annoying celebration of religious pluralism. Long after historians have jettisoned the concept of uniqueness inherent in Hartzian liberalism, and the notion of America as a melting pot society, religious historians continue to write about religious pluralism as if it were a given, not an ideology. *Radical Sects of Revolutionary New England* is a promising book, for it opens up the relationship of radical religious culture to gender, class, and the complexity of social relationships in an undeveloped region. But

Marini follows the conventions of American religious historiography so closely that his innovations are geographical and topical rather than analytic.

Bruce Tucker
Cincinnati, Ohio

James Oakes, *The Ruling Race: A History of American Slaveholders* (New York: Knopf 1982).

THE PAST SEVERAL decades have witnessed a remarkable renaissance in the historical revision of American slavery and the black experience in bondage and "freedom." The benign plantation world of U.B. Phillips, wherein white master and black slave lived in more or less symbiotic harmony, has gone the way of all myths, destroyed by a "new" scholarship at once more critical and disciplined, more rigorously methodological in approach, more ideological in perspective, and more sensitive to the grim reality that was slavery in colonial and antebellum America. While the whole tragedy of slavery and its racist legacies have been American issues, it is the South which has received the bulk of attention, and rightly so. It is here that the institution of slavery developed as nowhere else, and here where most early black Americans lived out their lives of sometimes quiet, more often rebellious desperation. And it is the black American who has occupied the centre stage of modern historical enquiry, as slave, as victim, as dispossessed, and as survivor.

This revisionist historiography of the South, of slavery, and of the black American role in the shaping of America, has its roots in the timeless studies of John Hope Franklin, E. Franklin Frazier, Herbert Aptheker, and Frank Tannenbaum in the 1930s and 1940s. The major contributions of Kenneth Stampp and Stanley Elkins in the 1950s charted new paths, and together with the more recent works of the Han-

dlins, David Brion Davis, Winthrop Jordan, Edmund Morgan, George Fredrickson, Gerald Mullin, Eugene Genovese, and countless other fine scholars, all have constructed a new historical synthesis.

In part, the aim of contemporary scholarship has been to reassess the economic and social underpinnings of the slave system. In part, the object has been to challenge old assumptions and crude stereotypes. What has emerged is a picture of a cruelly exploitative, costly, and underproductive economy based on white authority and capital, Amerindian land, and black slave labour. Throughout we glimpse the consequences of a blatantly racist white society humbling and humiliating its black American labourers with daily insult, frequent punishment, and too often death. What appears most clearly, however, is the long-denied strength and dignity of the black American in bondage. They were not the caricatures of indolence and ignorance argued by generations of racist sympathizers, but a people of courage and faith, energy and imagination, determined to survive to freedom. In short, the rewarding efforts of a generation of new scholars has given us an informed image of the black American, and given some 25 million slave descendants a proud heritage hitherto ignored.

However, lost in the shuffle of the past has been the master class, according to James Oakes in *The Ruling Race*. While it is now clear that we can speak with some assurance about black Americans as slaves, and have recreated their world in more realistic terms, for Oakes, the same cannot be said of the white American as master. Somehow there has been kept alive the long-held stereotype of a genteel, white, pretentiously paternalistic plantocracy ruling an orderly world of loyal and obedient black servants. Oakes' argument is that the "ruling race" was not typically the patriarchy of legend, nobly presiding over feudal domains, and the symbols of the South were rarely the "big house," mint juleps, and beguiling south-

ern belles. These, for Oakes, are a function of fiction, not history, a "Gone With the Wind" creation, not a reality. The principal thesis set out in *The Ruling Race* is that the slaveholding class was much more diverse than usually supposed. There were some 400,000 slave-owners by 1860, but few were truly "planters," that is, owners of twenty or more slaves, and less than 2.5 per cent were the aristocrats of legend.

Statistically, the "typical" slaveholder was white, male, Democrat, evangelical Protestant, a native of the South, 44 years old, in some form of agriculture, and owned eight to nine slaves. As Oakes points out, the only surprise here is that "the middle-aged white farmer with perhaps a handful of slaves quickly disappeared from the history books, replaced by a plantation legend that bears little resemblance to historical reality." Statistics further obscure the diversity of the class. In included women, immigrants, blacks, Amerindians, urbanites, and professionals. Intellectually and ideologically they shared few things in common other than a lust for gain, "increasingly obsessed with economic prosperity." Oakes thus portrays the slaveholding class as crass economic opportunists in pursuit of success, individual achievement, social mobility, territorial expansion, and equal opportunity for land and slaves. They were a restless and greedy group, pushing southward and westward, all the while believing that political democracy — for white Americans — and a capitalist economy — for white Americans — assured the American traditions of freedom and liberty — for white Americans. If they thought of the black American in bondage at all, slavery was but a means to various ends — racial subordination, individual advancement, southern prosperity, and "American greatness." If they held any ideology in common, it was a synthesis of racism and a gospel of prosperity, liberalism, and capitalism, all of which needed slavery to uphold and assure suc-

cess. Most would agree with the *Richmond Enquirer* which in 1856 argued, "Freedom is not possible without slavery."

One is almost sympathetic to the tiny slaveholding minority Oakes calls the "Masters of Tradition," the paternalists who eschewed the ugly materialism of their contemporaries. But if they are best remembered in history, in truth they were swept aside by the rise of the commercial market, the broad distribution of slaveholding wealth, the diversity of the class origins, and the appeal of economic and political liberalism. In any case, the patriarchs were no less guilty in the brutal process of enslavement and in the commitment to white supremacy. The black American slave, racially distinct as labourer and capital asset, was dehumanized by the vast majority of whites, masters and would-be masters, paternalists, and materialists alike. Oakes raises the question of how the slaveholding class, so "American," so "patriotic," could remain so steadfast in its commitment to slavery, going to war to defend it. The answer he gives would seem to be a tragic combination of greed, racism, and a misguided notion of what was meant by political democracy.

The Ruling Race is an important reinterpretation of the South, very much in tune with revisionist historiography. One could query whether the "samples" taken of selected countries and individuals are sufficiently representative to close debate on the nature of the slaveholding class. And while he takes issue with the plantation legend, he does not explain at all well its survival. In the final analysis, he de-emphasizes the racial dimension of the American slave experience; that is, race surrenders place to economic and political considerations. Perhaps more could be said of white racial attitudes as they evolved after 1619 to demonstrate that by the nineteenth century, racial discrimination was a "given," a readily acceptable and unarguable premise, at least until

challenged by the north and the black American community. These points aside, James Oakes has written a very good book indeed, a social history of a dominant class in the American experience whose fanatical commitment to capitalism and political liberalism came close to destroying a nation and a people.

Robert McCormack
University of Winnipeg

Ronald L.F. Davis, *Good and Faithful Labor: From Slavery to Sharecropping in the Natchez District, 1860-1890* (Westport, CT: Greenwood 1982).

THIS AUTHOR, WHO teaches at California State University in Northridge, has produced an important work. He sought to elucidate the source of the sharecropping system in the post-Civil War South. The traditional view explained this as due to a lack of fluid capital on the part of former slaveowners (with which, presumably, wages might be paid) and, in particular, the alleged instinctive "laziness of the Negro," a view founded on unadulterated racism.

Some earlier work challenged the conventional view, notably Joel Williamson's *The Negro in South Carolina During Reconstruction* (1965) and William McFeely's biography of General O.O. Howard (1968), but Professor Davis's book persuasively demolishes it. The betrayal of reconstruction meant the failure to distribute the land to those who tilled it. Two efforts followed: the notorious "Black Codes" of the former slaveowners, and then the policy favoured by the Union military, that is, instituting a pitifully and rigidly low-waged labour system with direct hour-by-hour supervision by the planters, which was too reminiscent of slavery to be abided by the freed people.

The latter rejected the effort; they sabotaged it, ran away, went on strike, and threatened more dire action. They

would not willingly accept wages varying from \$4.00 to \$15.00 a month, with planters deducting from that at every excuse: late reporting to work, excessive time for lunch, "idling," being sick, and unexcused absences. An average of 26 per cent of promised wages never materialized. Further, the gang character of the work and the direct supervision by whites made the likeness to slavery too great.

Under the draconian wage system in the late 1860s, "the hands became increasingly insubordinate" and "were practically out of control." The hope for land ownership gone, the Afro-American people retained an "overwhelming desire for independence, in their daily work and lives." In addition, there was the fierce desire — particularly among the women — to get out from under the direct presence of the white boss and to work as part of a family group. The latter point deserves greater emphasis than it receives in this book.

The author, seeing the active role in history of the black people, concludes "that sharecropping originated largely in the freedmen's insistence upon the arrangement." Fixed rent tenancy was better since it afforded enhanced individual freedom. A minority achieved this, but generally the odds against it were too great.

The planters, retaining ownership and possessing control over what, where, and when to plant, and general control over credit and over the ultimate marketing of the crop, were finally able — abetted by institutionalized and brutal racism — to impose a sharecropping system marked by abject poverty, awful suffering, and, even more than the author indicates, widespread outright peonage. Here the role of the merchants and of the northern bourgeoisie, aided as all the propertied classes were by state power, were of basic importance. The book is good on the significance of the merchants but would have been strengthened had more attention

been given to the penetration of northern capital.

In passing, the author shows that the idea of U.B. Phillips, first expounded in 1913, as to the greater "efficiency" of plantation slavery as compared with later "free" labour is false. He notes it was adopted by Vann Woodward, Stanley Engerman, and Robert Fogel, but demonstrates how faulty the view is. (13, 161-3) Davis seems unaware that W.E.B. Du Bois had carefully refuted this aspect of Phillips' mythology contemporaneously (see *The Crisis*, March 1913).

The author's conclusion merits direct quotation: "the key determinant was the freedman's refusal to work except in some type of sharecropping system or arrangement. Planters literally were dragged kicking and screaming into that system. Unable to force the freedmen to work for fixed wages in a gang setting, planters accepted sharecropping because they had no choice in the matter." (190)

One objection: the repeated use of "freedmen" when meaning freed people is jarring — the more so as black women were of decisive consequence as workers and as militants in this phase of Afro-American history, as in that history in general.

Herbert Aptheker
San Diego, California

Bruce M. Stave, ed., *Modern Industrial Cities: History, Policy, and Survival* (Beverly Hills: Sage Publications 1981).

HOW IS THE POWER structure of a society related to the nature of its cities? What is the relative weight of government and private enterprise in the shaping of the urban environment? Questions such as these represent the direction which an increasing number of social and urban historians are taking in their work. This collection of papers from a conference on the dynamics of modern industrial cities held

at the University of Connecticut in 1979 addresses these questions, albeit in a somewhat haphazard fashion. The conference organizer and editor of the volume, Bruce Stave, has provided something of a sense of continuity by a useful preface and introductions to each of four sections: the role of the family and neighbourhood; housing policy as an aspect of social control; the economy of cities; and the survival of industrial cities. A feature of each section is the commentaries originally delivered at the conference, which give a good sense of the controversy and disagreement raised by any discussion of the notion of power.

The provision of housing is central to the subject matter of many of the essays with authors usually relating housing to the larger questions raised above. Three major essays will be discussed here; these present sharply differing views and illustrate the extent to which contrasting ideologies affect the conclusions reached. Brian Berry, a geographer and planner, takes a traditional social science stance by assuming that we live in a neutral world where private market forces shape where and how we live. According to Berry, the American government's role in the city-building process has been relatively passive, at most enhancing the objectives of private enterprise. This is as it should be, he argues, for the result has been to promote household wealth through ownership. In spite of growing evidence about the government's activities in this area, Berry remains oblivious to the state's role in accentuating the abandonment of American inner cities by all except the poorest in society. But Berry does admit the revitalization of central cities would require "enlightened leadership" to prevail "over the normal business of politics."

A more convincing explanation of how the urban environment is shaped is offered in Kenneth Jackson's analysis of U.S. government housing policy between 1918 and 1968. In a detailed outline of

several of these policies, Jackson clearly shows how the federal government institutionalized racial and class discrimination in the housing market by its mortgage insurance system which encouraged the white middle class's flight to the suburbs and hastened inner-city neighbourhood decay. In Jackson's blunt words, "the basic direction of federal housing policies has been toward the concentration of the poor and the suburban dispersal of the better off." Whether obviously discriminatory policies can be seen as a deliberate effort at social control remains questionable, however. As Christine Rosen asked in her commentary, were these policies perhaps simply designed to minimize the government's investment risk? At any rate, these policies failed completely as social control measures as shown by the urban riots of the 1960s.

The issue of housing policy and social control is also discussed by Lutz Niethammer in an attempt to place nineteenth-century European housing reform into a broader analysis of the nature of industrial capitalism. The writings of Edwin Chadwick, James Hobrecht, and Frederick LePlay are chosen as representative of the health, space, and family concerns of middle-class reformers. In Niethammer's view, even the most liberal of these reformers accepted the need for authoritarian control of the urban poor, for these liberals regarded the lower working classes as savage and immoral and hence a threat to social stability. But these reformers were not merely lackies of the capitalist class. They represented a middle ground between the alienated masses and the complacent ruling group. The failure of reform, Niethammer believes, was the result of their attempts to impose middle-class norms on the working class rather than dealing with the slum problem at its source by changing the economic structure of society. Again it is a question of determining an individual or a group's motivation; Niethammer dismisses the reformers' humanitarianism as ideological

rather than practical. And like Jackson, he demonstrates that the benevolent state described by Berry is a myth.

Like most volumes which originate from the papers of a conference, this collection is a hit-and-miss affair, but the major issues raised merit further consideration by those of us studying North American communities. In particular, it should be possible to combine what labour and urban historians now often do separately. For example cities and towns can be regarded as the arenas wherein larger social forces such as class conflict play out their roles. This involves an understanding both of the power structure of a society and the urban processes at work in a specific place. Certainly many commentators agree that a political economic approach is "the looming frontier" in urban analysis.

Gilbert A. Stelter
University of Guelph

Gwendolyn Wright, *Building the Dream: A Social History of Housing in America* (Cambridge, MA: MIT 1983).

THE DREAMS IN Gwendolyn Wright's book are a series of thirteen ideals that have motivated residential designs and their realization from colonial times to the present in the United States. She has sought to encapsulate in each discussion the social concepts of the proponents, the translation of these values into the built environment, the style of life accommodated by the housing, and its success in meeting the aims that engendered it. Wright's concern is with ordinary housing, with housing with a public history that can be studied through time, and with an experience of living in the houses that has already been recorded. Her book offers a synthesis and a criticism, building on existing scholarship in history, sociology, and planning among other disciplines. Her criticism is informed by a

view of architecture that stresses its social commitments rather than its technological refinement, and that evaluates design in its capacity to serve the needs of residents rather than in its adherence to stereotyped models.

Commencing briefly with a discussion of the houses built by Puritans in New England, Wright continues to the national period, with chapters organized in general chronological order on the first half of the nineteenth century, later responses to industrialization, the influence of the progressive movement and early planning, and finally the intrusion of government authority and bureaucracy as a crucial framework for housing the poor and the suburbanites. The current attractiveness of urban rehabilitation, and its consequences, conclude the discussion. There is a varied list of topics, focusing primarily on urban housing, with the exception after the colonial period of chapters devoted to plantation housing and the rural cottage. The details offered in the discussion of housing for workers in the early industrial towns contrast nicely with the later treatment of the company town, both environments having been designed by and managed for the interests of the capitalists exclusively. As portrayed, the basic idea behind the schemes had changed little, although the later industrialist was operating in different economic and social circumstances and on a grander scale. The difference in the responses to these programmes, as suggested by Wright, is left tantalizingly without explanation. The attention to suburbia focuses more clearly on the way in which the buildings were used and on the social evaluation of them. A concept of "domestication" informs the chapters on the bungalow and the planned residential communities of the early twentieth century. The legislation of standards, the arrival of government programmes, and the intrusion of official planning into the provision of housing concludes the survey. The poor and those who may be able

to afford the "American dream" receive separate treatment, having been targeted by different government programmes. The aims of government interference are articulately described, as are the controversies over policies.

Innovation in domestic architecture creates the agenda for this book, while its diffusion is less fully noted. One of the pleasant surprises is a chapter on early apartments, how they were distinguished socially as well as architecturally from tenements, and why they arose. By the time they became a widely accepted and copied form of urban living in America the author has turned to yet another idea gaining momentum. This is a history, then, which is more concerned with introductions than consequences, although it acknowledges that each type of residence has a long-running history of its own subsequent to its inauguration. There is a certain disjuncture from chapter to chapter arising from this emphasis. It is not always clear where the ideas being applied to housing arise or what their long-term consequences turn out to be.

For the work of an architectural historian there are surprisingly few plans of domestic dwellings and little analysis of such expected topics as building materials or room arrangements. There are, however, a number of telling photographs of interiors, including a few kitchens. A number of cartoons and graphics punctuate the text and convey pretty unequivocal messages. These come not so often from contemporary architectural journals as from advertisements or editorials addressed to the reading public.

This is a book with a broad mandate to be explored within 329 pages. It is fresh and full of suggestions; it is grounded in wide reading and a consistent purpose. It improves as it progresses, and it challenges the reader to consider a broad and imaginative sweep of America's past and present residential environments. This book should provide a useful model for scholars who wish to understand the social

processes as well as the design values under the eaves.

Peter G. Goheen
Queen's University

Alice Kessler-Harris, *Out to Work: A History of Wage-Earning Women in the United States* (New York: Oxford University Press 1982).

OUT TO WORK is an ambitious book which focuses on the transition to waged work by women in the United States from the colonial period to the present. Unlike more specialized studies, like Nancy Schrom-Dye's *As Equals and As Sisters* (1980), a monograph on the Women's Trade Union League, or Susan Strasser's *Never Done* (1982), a study of housework, Kessler-Harris sweeps over the entire chronology of women's work. Her book is divided into three main sections: the formative period from the colonial era through the Civil War; the era between the Civil War and World War I which pinpoints the influence of the domestic role-ideal on women's work; and finally the period since 1920 in which women have emerged from the imposed dichotomy of marriage/job to a position where women's work is no longer cyclical, varying according to family size or life-cycle, but the norm for the majority of the female population. Relying on government reports and commissions, trade union records, surveys by middle-class women's groups, literature, autobiography and other resources, Kessler-Harris sketches a compelling portrait of wage-earning women in the United States which is both informative and well-written.

What were the turning points for women workers? A brief chapter on colonial women's work provides the departure point for the author's analysis of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, a period she views as problematic for women's economic independence because

as the putting-out system diminished in importance the mills and factories began to dominate. Between 1790 and 1830 the farm wife experienced startling changes in household organization as she no longer produced her own yarn and cloth, thus reducing the need for extra labour, a point first explored by Nancy Cott in *The Bonds of Womanhood* (1977). The 1820s and 1830s witnessed a brief flurry of promise for mill girls taking advantage of labour shortages. The experience, nevertheless, was fundamentally different for women compared to men, Kessler-Harris maintains, because women "entered the wage labor force without expectations of upward mobility, justifying their participation in terms of patriotic duty, of family commitment, or sheer survival." (22) For women, the results of the economic transition to unrestricted laissez faire capitalism were clearly negative, particularly from the point of view of wages and working conditions. By the last two decades preceding the Civil War, "material conditions of women working for wages declined substantially." (60) More competition and reduced wages faced women who found fewer factory jobs (with Irish and German immigration) and fewer opportunities for home work. By the Civil War it was more difficult to be both respectable and employed in waged labour.

The decades before the Civil War were crucial in solidifying the identification of women with domesticity. Reinforced by what the author terms the "domestic code," male workers were encouraged to throw obstacles in the paths of wage-earning women as changes in technology and work organization threatened the traditional male crafts. In a defensive reaction, male workers became party to the domestic code as a way of protecting their jobs. Thus the idea of the "family wage" seems to have had its beginnings in the United States before it appeared in Europe.

In the post-Civil War period, Kessler-

Harris documents the growth of working women's organizations and the class tensions generated by differing notions of the "working woman's problem" as defined by middle-class women's organizations and working-class ones. Black and ethnic women's increased participation in the labour force fundamentally altered the previously homogenous female workforce. Race and ethnicity operated to circumscribe the types of work open to women, as recent studies have confirmed. In general, however, shifts occurred in the female labour force which cut across these divisions of race or class — shifts such as the increasing number of married women in paid work after 1890. Middle-class college women began to carve out areas of employment for themselves as well. Despite the demonstrable growth in the numbers of women working, trade unions and some middle-class women's groups maintained the desirability of eliminating women from the workforce rather than organizing them. While vocational education and manual training were pushed as solutions, underlying these suggestions was a very home-centred notion of the female role. The identification of women with the home and family led to demands for protective legislation. Kessler-Harris points out, however, that protective labour legislation might have led to improved conditions for all workers, not just women; protection, however, came to signify an alternative approach to women workers' unionization, an approach shared by trade unions and women's organizations. Trade union leaders feared that protective legislation for men might undermine their motivation for unionization.

The final turning point in the saga of women's work occurs in the period after World War I with the dramatic growth in the 1920s of married women's work, solidification of women's position as workers during the Depression and some improvements in minimum wages and hours fostered by New Deal labour codes.

These codes also forced the AFL to reconsider organizing practices to include women; by 1936-39 the CIO drives also contributed to increases in numbers of women unionized in the new industrial areas of auto, electrical, etc. Furthermore, Kessler-Harris provides a much-needed revision of views on the impact of World War II on female employment trends, seeing the limited improvements as continuations of trends begun in the 1930s rather than as a dramatic turn-about. Her account complements recent work on this period of women's history, notably more focused studies such as Karen Anderson's *Wartime Women* (1981). Perhaps her most noteworthy contribution in this section is the discussion of the 1950s, traditionally viewed as a step back from the gains of the war period. Kessler-Harris finds the family-centred 1950s a surface phenomenon which hides essential shifts in government policy and material pressures for more married women's work to keep up with new consumer demands in the family. Titling her chapter on the post-war period, "The Radical Consequences of Incremental Change," the author thoroughly revises our notions of the basic shifts in women's work since the beginnings of World War II.

Most recently, the civil rights and anti-poverty programmes of the 1960s produced some clear gains for women, albeit inadequate ones. The numbers of women in skilled, predominantly male trades rose considerably, although women remained a very small percentage of these workers. By 1970, over 40 per cent of married women worked for wages and large numbers of women with young children entered the labour market in proportions which surprised economic analysts, thus altering the previous pattern of drop-out during the childrearing years.

Despite clear evidence of women remaining in the labour force and a growing number of female heads of households, as well as the need for a two-

income family to make ends meet, women have not succeeded in achieving fair treatment in the labour market. The women's movement of the late 1960s continues into the 1980s struggling to come nearer that goal. Kessler-Harris's synthesis of the history of women's waged work in the *United States* offers an interpretive overview which will benefit historians as well as supporters of the women's movement seeking an insightful account of the major shifts in women's work.

Out to Work is a synthesis grounded in a theoretical understanding of the relationship between women's work in the family and in the labour market. Kessler-Harris acknowledges first the important debt owed to feminist sociologists and historians who have insisted on treating domestic and paid labour as aspects of a single phenomenon. Second, well-versed in the contributions of labour historians such as David Montgomery and Herbert Gutman, she has brought together the insights of both labour and women's history in this book. Third, Kessler-Harris reasserts, although not completely successfully, the notion of an "ideology" of womanhood which held sway in the United States from the early nineteenth century until the last two or three decades, although she maintains that noticeable chinks were visible by the 1920s and 1930s. Kessler-Harris integrates the discussion of the ideology of womanhood throughout and clearly perceives alterations in its effect; what is most problematic for the reader, however, is the lack of a clearcut summary of this powerful motivating force and the failure to treat this as an historically variable phenomenon which must be explained rather than asserted. While Kessler-Harris avoids the artificial dichotomy between material conditions and ideology which has plagued much of the earlier material on women's work, she has not grappled successfully with the thorough integration and historical relationship between the two.

Despite this, *Out to Work* far

surpasses anything published to date for its synthesis and its general sensitivity to these theoretical questions and debates. It is a book that deserves a wide readership.

Linda Kealey
Memorial University of Newfoundland

Daniel E. Sutherland, *Americans and Their Servants: Domestic Service in the United States from 1800-1920* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press 1981).

IN NINETEENTH-CENTURY America, just as it was in Europe and in Canada, domestic service was the most important occupational category for women, in terms of sheer numbers. As Daniel Sutherland points out, "until 1870, at least 50 percent of America's gainfully employed women were servants." Domestic service, because it did have such importance in the history of women's work, is obviously deserving of attention, and Sutherland's book contributes to our knowledge of domestic servants and their employers.

Sutherland's book provides a survey of who hired servants; who was hired; what work servants did; and what the perceived problems of employers and employees were. Sutherland has done considerable research in private family papers, magazines, newspapers, books, and in government documents, and he provides a useful and extensive bibliographical essay. The book provides considerable information outlining the participation of native-born white, immigrant, and black Americans in the occupation. When he is discussing the ethnic and racial origin of American servants, he stresses that outside the South, the majority of nineteenth-century servants were white. In his discussion of race and ethnicity, he effectively makes the point that in America the social stigma against

domestic service was reinforced by race and ethnic prejudice.

In addition to providing a narrative account of domestic service as an occupation, Sutherland is also concerned with the "servant problem." The approach he has taken in dealing with the problems faced by servants and their employers is an attempt at neutrality. Problems between employers and employees were created by the existence of false expectations on both sides: "Both servants and employers expected too much, both gave too little. This created servant problems without end."

The superficiality involved in Sutherland's attempts at neutrality reflect the book's major weakness. This is a well-researched scholarly book, but the author's unanalytical, uncritical approach means that his wealth of research material emerges merely as chatty anecdote. And he seems to accept unquestioningly both the justice and the inevitability of the structure of social class in nineteenth-century America.

He also virtually ignores the question of gender. While he is aware that 90 per cent of servants employed in nineteenth-century America were female, he gives no attention to the fact that housework, whether done for pay by servants, or done without pay by wives and daughters was not simply performed by females, but was seen as a "natural" female occupation. It is true that some of the most interesting analyses of this question — works like Dolores Hayden's *The Grand Domestic Revolution* (1981) and Susan Strasser's *Never Done: A History of American Housework* (1982) — appeared in book form either simultaneously with Sutherland's book or after it, but both Strasser's and Hayden's work were available to Sutherland in other forms, as was the work of Ruth Schwartz Cowan. One has to assume that Sutherland was simply not interested in this question.

In scope and subject Sutherland's book must be compared to David M.

Katzman, *Seven Days a Week: Women and Domestic Service in Industrializing America* (1798). Katzman, like Sutherland, provides a survey of employees, employers, of the occupation itself, and of the problems associated with the occupation. While Sutherland does indeed provide more information than Katzman does about certain aspects of the subject — he gives a more detailed, more fully researched account of employers of servants — Katzman's account of the nature of domestic service from the point of view of the servant herself is fuller and more perceptive.

Deborah Gorham
Carleton University

Barbara Melosh, *"The Physician's Hand": Work Culture and Conflict in American Nursing* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press 1982).

INTEGRATING THE experiences of women workers with analyses of the working class has proven an elusive goal for many labour historians, in part because the majority of women workers have not been employed in the goods-producing sector of the economy which labour history has traditionally studied. In *The Physician's Hand* author Barbara Melosh has shifted the focus of labour history to the service industry of health care, presenting a sophisticated feminist approach to the history of American nursing and a challenging theoretical critique of several important sociological and historical concepts.

Melosh centres her study on the work cultures which have emerged within American nursing since 1920. The majority of nurses, facing shifts in the structure and content of their work, approached nursing from the culture of apprenticeship. This work culture was grounded in nurses' practical "craft" training in hospital schools, and directed nurses to seek

employment in private health care where they were able to apply their skills as independent workers. Throughout the chapters on nursing training, private duty work, public health nursing, and hospital nursing, Melosh describes the work experiences of rank-and-file nurses as they resisted nursing leaders' attempts to make the craft training and tradition obsolete.

These nursing leaders — whose records have served as the basis for standard nursing histories — approached their occupation from a second work culture of professionalism. Seeking professional status for nursing, leaders attempted to increase nurses' academic credentials and achieve supervisory roles for nurses in hospitals and public health programmes. Melosh is extremely critical of professional ideology for women, past or present: "As a strategy for nursing, professionalization is doomed to fail; as an ideology, professionalism divides nurses and weds its proponents to limiting and ultimately self-defeating values." (16)

The author's rationale for this position, presented in her first chapter "Not Merely a Profession," is powerful and convincing. Accepting a revisionist definition of a profession, Melosh goes beyond, arguing that nurses have never achieved true professional status and cannot. The professional status of doctors has depended upon, and continues to depend upon, the subordination of nurses. More importantly, a women's occupation cannot be a profession because that status is gender-specific, and women are the "second sex." As Melosh explains: "the service component of professional ideology held different implications for men and women. Men, to establish their professional legitimacy had to assert a stronger claim to service: women, to achieve the same end, had to escape the diffuse notion of womanly service." (25) Further studies examining how individual nurses, as well as members of other female-dominated occupations such as home economics,

responded to the contradictions of professional ideology are needed to test fully Melosh's thesis. Still, "Not Merely a Profession" is an important addition to the growing field of literature on professionalism.

Approaching nurses as workers rather than as emerging professionals leads Melosh to focus on the culture and consciousness developed on the job, and thus situates *The Physician's Hand* well within the tradition of American labour history established by authors such as David Brody and David Montgomery. At the same time, Melosh is critical of labour historians for failing to address the development of service industries in the twentieth century, and the key role women play in these increasingly rationalized sectors of the economy.

In particular, Melosh sees her research on nurses as raising questions regarding Braverman's theory of "deskilling." Melosh argues that nurses have always been "the physician's hand," and as such have been responsible for the execution rather than decision-making in health care. However, the increase in medical knowledge since World War I has prompted a significant extension of the scientific and technical skills of nursing, and has increased nurses' authority relative to both doctors and patients. To readers familiar with Braverman's work, it is clear that nurses' skill increase is not merely the upgrading of workers which he discussed in his concluding chapter of *Labor and Monopoly Capital*, and that contrary to Braverman, nurses have not been successfully structured into the "middle layers" of employment. In fact, attempts by hospital managers and nursing leaders to rationalize health care and leave nurses as a managerial elite have failed: the specialized nature of modern medicine has created a need for more nurses rather than fewer, and nurses themselves have struggled to maintain patient care as an integral part of their work.

While this argument hints at ways in which conceptualizations of deskilling and workplace control may be revised by examining service industries, it is unfortunate that Melosh does not enter into a more direct or extensive discussion of Braverman's approach.

The question that remains unresolved throughout the book is whether nursing's rank and file, despite its structural position within health care and its growing disillusionment with professionalism, considered itself part of the working class. Melosh is sensitive to the ambiguous class-consciousness of nurses, as well as to the "serious ethical questions" (201) strikes and walkouts pose for workers committed to patient care. The author thus concludes *The Physician's Hand* with strategies for contemporary nurses to ally with other non-professional health care workers and extend their collective workplace control. But more information regarding nurses' historical relationships with other health care workers such as midwives or ward-aides would illuminate the degree of nurses' broader class-consciousness in the past.

Detail of this kind is limited in this study, given Melosh's sources. She relies primarily on national sources such as popular and prescriptive literature, and editorials and letters in nursing journals, exploring the regional, ethnic, and urban-versus-rural distinctions in nurses' experiences. Melosh acknowledges that she is painting in "broad strokes," leaving the task of painting the detail of her canvas to other research and other researchers. It is hoped that other researchers will follow Melosh's lead. *The Physician's Hand* is a tightly organized, smoothly written, and accessible study. It successfully restores to significance the experiences of nursing's majority, while suggesting ways in which the experiences of working women can inform our understanding of labour history. Further research of this kind is essential if we are to create labour history

sensitive to issues of both gender and class.

Kathryn McPherson
Simon Fraser University

Margery W. Davies, *Woman's Place Is at the Typewriter: Office Work and Office Workers 1870-1930* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press 1982).

WOMAN'S PLACE Is at the Typewriter is a highly readable and richly detailed account of the transformation and feminization of clerical work in late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century United States. Its primary focus is a careful study of changes in the nature of office work itself, from the job of the messenger or office boy to that of the private secretary. But Margery Davies also aims to dispel a number of popular myths about the prominent place of women in clerical work. She discards the oversimplified view that the invention of the typewriter was responsible for the influx of women into the office, and she argues that the roaring ideological debates about women's moral and physical suitability for clerical work were mostly a matter of justification after the fact. She directs our attention instead to a complex web of changes in the organization of capitalist production, through which a new place for women, at the bottom of the clerical hierarchy, was created. She emphasizes that this change represents a major transformation in the occupational as well as sex structuring of the labour force, and that it can only be understood as a reflection of the "interaction between patriarchal social relations and political economic forces."

The process of change which Davies traces, in a good deal more detail than other recent writers, will be familiar in its outlines to most readers. In the antebellum South, clerical positions were relatively few in number, the chains of com-

mand were simple and personal, and most workers had the opportunity to prove their talents and work their way up. Indeed, as Davies points out, until the early nineteenth century, clerks were actually apprentice capitalists. By the turn of the century, however, the scale and shape of business had altered drastically, increasing the volume of record-keeping and thus the demand for clerical labour. With this expansion came a greater division of labour, specialization of knowledge, and the growth of hierarchical structures of power and control. The benevolent paternalism of the past gave way to rationalized and depersonalized relations between employers and employees, and the practice of upward promotion of clerks was substantially eroded.

The entry of women into this rapidly changing office environment is attributable to a number of factors in concert with one another. Davies emphasizes the primacy of demand and supply factors: the greatly increased demand for clerical labour, and the greatly increased supply of females with the appropriate educational background. As part of these trends, she points to the increasing tendency for educated males to aspire to higher positions, thus removing themselves from the available pool of clerical labour, and the attractiveness to employers of the ready supply of women at half the price of males. Davies names as secondary factors — those which eased and facilitated rather than "caused" the entry of women into the office — a number of changes specifically related to the organization of the work process: the increased division of labour, and with it the creation of new job categories; the invention of the typewriter, which she says was "such a new machine that it had not been sex-typed as masculine;" and the successful experiment in hiring women by the U.S. Treasury Department during the Civil War. In addition to all of these more or less immediate factors, however, Davies repeatedly stresses that the "roots" of the

process of feminization lay outside the job itself, in the changing structure of capitalist production and the changing economic organization of family life which led to an increase in the number of females seeking waged work. These latter factors remain largely outside the scope of her study.

The outstanding strength of this account is the contribution that it makes towards establishing an historical and materialist approach to the study of women's place in the labour force. Beginning with a popular focus on cultural myths and ideological debate, Davies directs attention to historical changes in the organization of productive relations (including the family economy) as the proper locus for any explication of women's experience. She then produces a substantial piece of such an investigation in a highly accessible and informative manner, written in a style that is predominantly descriptive rather than analytical. These are very large steps in the right direction.

On the other hand, a major weakness of Davies' account is that it creates something of a surfeit of "factors," which continue to rest uneasily in relation to one another throughout the book. Davies has a tendency to use a kind of serial procedure, stringing factors together in a linear fashion, assigning priorities to them, rather than discovering the analytic links between them. In managing this difficulty, she occasionally falls prey to oversimplifications of the kind that she is otherwise at pains to avoid, such as the unfortunate statement in her conclusion that the feminization of clerical work "was simply the result of the exigencies of demand and supply" (emphasis mine). Such a statement does not do justice to the complexity of her own work.

Amidst these difficulties, the book falls short of any real breakthroughs in an analysis of gender and the labour process, and is a little disappointing in this respect. Davies' use of concepts such as "patriar-

chy" and "capitalism" remain a little wooden, set apart from the lively anecdotal material, and the politics of the account seem to falter on this disjuncture.

Analytic breakthroughs aside, this work does shed some light on the contemporary debates about transformations in the clerical labour process under capitalism, although Davies addresses herself only marginally to this literature. The main thrust of her account is quite consistent with the Braverman tradition: she puts scientific management ahead of technology as the motive force of change, emphasizing the rationality of capitalism, the specialization of tasks and knowledge, and the control of work geared to maximization of profit. She provides some revealing as well as entertaining historical anecdotes about the problems of employers who characterized as "conservatism" the stubborn resistance to change which they met from their clerks and bookkeepers. Though she does not dwell on class consciousness per se, she gives considerable visibility to conditions which she says have tended to "discourage clerical workers from seeing their situation in class terms." Among these she specifies patriarchal as well as paternalistic social relations. Davies uses the term "proletarianization" without reference to the disagreements that are attendant on its use, in contrast for example to Graham Lowe's lengthy discussion of whether the concept as it is used in the literature is too blunt an instrument to display the changes in clerical work. In the end, Davies' thesis and Lowe's are not inconsistent: feminization has masked internal processes of differentiation within clerical work, and thus disguised the processes of degradation and proletarianization of the work. Davies' account provides the detailed view into the processes of differentiation on which Lowe's more careful theoretical distinctions depend.

In sum, then, this is a useful book. For those who have followed the labour process debates, Davies' historical evidence

will be open to further interpretation from a variety of points of view. For those who are new to the field, the book is an excellent, if mild-mannered, introduction.

Nancy S. Jackson
University of British Columbia

Margaret W. Rossiter, *Women Scientists In America: Struggles and Strategies to 1940* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press 1982).

THERE IS NOTHING natural or historically inevitable about the identification of science as a field for men. Science as an occupation was masculinized as it was professionalized in the late nineteenth century, and Margaret Rossiter, in examining the formation of the scientific profession in academia, government, and industry, maintains that women's subordinate place in science from these years was no accident, but was deliberate.

Rather than being non-existent, American women scientists, at least until 1940 when the first of Rossiter's projected two volumes ends, were invisible, buried in the lowest rungs of predominantly male fields, or ignored in their low-status female fields such as public health, home economics, and statistics. Rossiter's fascinating book is at least two studies in one: it brings to light the careers of dozens of gifted women scientists, unfairly obscured, and it is a study of the politics of the sex-typing of a profession from its origins to the subtle and not so subtle modes of its perpetuation.

When women began their concerted push for higher education in the 1860s and 1870s, many interested people could involve themselves in scientific undertakings; the lines between amateur and expert were vague, and even moderately educated people believed that scientific knowledge was accessible to them. By the 1880s and 1890s women had achieved real success gaining entrance to graduate schools

and they had even received advanced degrees in scientific fields. They had joined scientific associations and had found jobs in observatories and museums. "Such incursions brought on a crisis of impending feminization" (xvii) in which alarmed male scientists were able to lay claim to the masculine nature of their work, effecting the ouster of women from most major positions in science. Botany and natural history, which had become especially infiltrated by women scientists, were brutally defeminized. One of the means by which the men managed this was the "professionalization" of science. By raising educational standards and distinguishing between amateur and professional, becoming more stringent as to who would be offered full membership in scientific societies and whose work would be recognized and rewarded as significant science, men in science were able to keep would-be women scientists hovering just inside the doorway of the building they hoped to inhabit fully with the men.

By 1910, the terms on which women were allowed to participate in science, at least to 1940, were set: hierarchically they could occupy low positions — lecture-ships in introductory science courses at colleges without major research resources, assistantships in the research projects of male scientists or in government agencies, secretarial and librarian positions in industry — and territorially they could have certain female fields which yielded neither high enough status nor good enough pay to interest men. This state of affairs was maintained by outright *discrimination against women scientists* and by blindness to the work they did when it came time to distribute, on an ostensibly neutral basis, promotions, research grants, and awards. Assuming women to be naturally subordinate, few in science considered their promotion to be a normal occurrence; when pushed, they blamed the women themselves for their marginal positions and low status by claiming women had produced few scien-

tific geniuses or famous achievers. Many scientific societies refused to elect women to full membership just as many universities or industries would not hire women scientists except for jobs such as Dean of Women or science librarian. To do otherwise was to jeopardize the prestige of one's research programme. People in universities took as normal the tenure track system, anti-nepotism rules, and differential salary scales which all penalized women academics. National Research Council Fellowships not only favoured men over women, but gave women scientists awards solely in "female" areas, thus reinforcing segregation. Rossiter's depiction of the multiple levels of discrimination, often so institutionalized that they became invisible in their normalcy, is superb. Oddly, she leaves out the discrimination produced by the difficulties of combining jobs in science with the demands of wifehood and motherhood.

By 1910, women in science perceived the impasse in their progress. Their strategies varied from the more confrontational publicizing of inequities to the more "realistic" carving out of areas of "women's work" within science. Rossiter suggests that neither approach worked very well in broadening the opportunities for women scientists, especially during the difficult 1920s and 1930s, but she uses unkind language — "strident" — to describe the confrontational strategy. Although one senses that she has not yet fully worked out a stance towards strategy — crucial, surely, for the second volume — Rossiter does have a fine appreciation for the conditions in which women were most vulnerable to internalizing the double standard applied to men and women scientists. She describes their approach during the years without hope as "deliberate overqualification and personal stoicism." (129) They believed that if they were not as good as Madame Curie, they should not expect advancement and recognition.

Rossiter sees the reason for all this

discrimination as male status anxieties which could be alleviated only by not collaborating, not to mention competing, with a less prestigious group, namely women. At the points at which their position was most precarious, e.g., the 1880s and 1890s and the 1920s and 1930s, male scientists apparently were especially fearful of the potential feminization of science. There is no doubt that women's collective lower status made them unappealing colleagues to men, except in reassuringly subordinate capacities, and it is certainly true that senses of masculinity and femininity are reinforced by working in an occupation identified with one's own gender. Nevertheless, although she occasionally and parenthetically suggests that other non-elites such as Jews and blacks were also discriminated against, Rossiter comes very close to saying that fear of feminization on the part of vulnerable males was *the* dominating factor in structuring science. This underplays the degree to which male scientists at the end of the nineteenth century were reacting to the threat of the democratization of science in general. The effort to exclude women from equal participation was part of the effort to impose hierarchy on science, to restrict access to elite white males while coping with the ever-expanding labour created by increased knowledge.

Powerful male scientists' personal insecurities and unfortunate preoccupation with status and prestige are somehow given more importance in Rossiter's analysis of women's subordinate place in American science than is the way in which science as an occupation was structured. Male anxieties are equated with the structure of science rather than viewed as the effect of it. And yet Rossiter acknowledges the structural changes occurring at the turn of the century, and much of her data amplifies the point: "What had formerly been a fairly non-hierarchical collection of independent investigators had become, in some fields at least, highly bureaucratized 'big science' with all the

gradations in status and role that this implied: henceforth, some persons would have to be 'hired hands' on projects directed by others." (72)

A subordinate position for women, as well as general class distinctions, were crucial to the hierarchy established, but the very entrenchment of hierarchy is an equally critical factor, one that became inextricably bound up with the ways in which science has been done. This goes beyond the "fears, insecurities and punitive personalities" (216) of the men. No wonder women did better in science at those times and places in which groups were smaller, more informal, less structured, and no wonder neither strategy they attempted in the period before 1940 worked.

While for much of the book Rossiter's treatment of women scientists in terms of the gender politics of an occupation works very well, there are some points at which I miss a discussion of the culture of science. While we see the impact of the defeminization and stratification upon women scientists, we do not see their effect on the kind of science that has been done. Yet this is crucial, both to the lives of women scientists and to the general population. Scientists tend to cluster in areas where the external rewards are, and are often prone to overspecialization and naivete about political and ethical concerns. Science has been closed off to the amateur by and large. Gone are the all-women scientific clubs of the mid-nineteenth century, focusing on "private learning, mutual growth and contributions to local education and conservation." (75) What if science for the last century had been done on this model, rather than the one based on the desire for individual recognition, personal, institutional, and national prestige, and the ability to get grants? Would there be, as now, two cultures, and would science be only sluggishly responsive to the needs and wants of ordinary people? Would women still be

trying to find a comfortable niche in a field designed for and by men?

Anita Clair Fellman
Simon Fraser University

Rachel Kahn-Hut *et al.*, ed., *Women and Work* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 1982).

WOMEN AND WORK consists of seventeen articles that originally appeared between 1975 and 1979 in *Social Problems*. It is heartening to see a mainstream sociology journal in the space of four years publishing a significant collection of papers devoted to the subject of gender. Furthermore, it is commendable that the editors, instead of allowing the material to remain embedded and hidden in the regular issues of the periodical have made them — all of a uniformly high quality — available to a wider audience.

As the authors note, the papers draw on different theoretical perspectives (conflict, structural functional, and interactional), different levels of analysis (macro and micro), distinct methodological approaches (historical, experimental, and observational), and different feminist perspectives (liberal, Marxist, and radical). Taken together, the individual contributions are a rather odd mixture; they seldom build upon one another, allow the reader to pursue any of the ideas in much depth, or permit one to take account of the inherent contradictions and inconsistencies among the various approaches. Each article is, however, rich in ideas and insights.

Because the range of topics is wide and the theoretical presuppositions distinct, the editors, in their opening discussions and in the introductions to the separate sections, have attempted to extract four general, and important themes: (1) The rigid division of labour by sex in which women manage the home and provide child care while men earn the family income is not natural or inevitable.

Instead this division is a modern construction and the result of special historical circumstances such as protective legislation, the family wage, and sex-segregation of the occupational structure. (2) The prevailing ideology which describes work and family life as essentially different realms is inaccurate. Just as these two aspects of life were not separated in the past, neither are they today. The family is neither a refuge from the "real world," nor does it merely produce use value. Instead the family is a complex economic unit where both women and men, wives and husbands, are involved in productivity and consumption. (3) A definition of women's work must not be confined to participation in the labour force. It must instead include work both inside and outside the home. Because work in the home is unpaid, it is devalued in capitalist societies. Moreover, much of it is so taken for granted that it is often not even seen as work. Even the distinction between the production of use value (products which are consumed directly) and the production of exchange value (products which are bought and sold) is insufficient. Such a distinction ignores many important tasks which are carried out by women, for example, volunteerism and backstage politics. (4) Characteristics which are often associated with gender must be understood to be the result of structural features of the organization of work rather than the result of individual traits or socialization experiences. For example: low pay reflects segmentation of the labour force rather than poor education or lack of ability; absenteeism and labour turnover reflect poor conditions of the job rather than a lack of commitment to employment. Though the editors emphasize these themes somewhat repetitively throughout the book, the issues are not always directly commented on by the individual contributors. The concerns of the authors are much more varied; their essays do not fit quite so easily into the major categories stressed by the editors.

What topics are discussed? Joan Huber develops a sociotechnological theory of the women's movement in which she argues that the contemporary position of women needs to be understood in terms of such historical changes as the decline of fertility, the men's regulation of the labour participation of blue-collar women workers in the nineteenth, and that of white-collar women workers in the twentieth century. Rose Laub Coser and Gerald Rokoff argue that women are absent from high status professions due to the cultural mandate that women ought to "put family first;" any disruptions of female professionals' work activity by their familial responsibilities are seen as illegitimate, whereas the disruptions of work activity by male professionals attending conferences or giving consultations are seen as legitimate. Richard M. Levinson shows how the segregated division of labour is maintained through the process of sex-role stereotyping in the occupational world. In an experiment which consisted of male and female students answering ads by telephone, clear-cut discrimination was discernible in 35 per cent of the cases. Roslyn L. Feldberg and Evelyn Nakano Glenn suggest, interestingly, that previous research on men's and women's employment are drawn from sex-differentiated theoretical models. The "job model" analyzes men's relationship to employment by concentrating on job-related features. The "gender model," in contrast, analyzes women's relationship to employment by virtually ignoring the type of job and working conditions: "When it is studied at all women's relationship to employment is treated as derivative of personal characteristics and relationships to family situations." (67) Barbara Epstein argues that during the development of industrialization, women failed to leave the family work site and move to an industrial work site as men did due to an emerging domestic ideology which stressed that women's primary responsibility was to

rear children, and to be subservient to men.

There are many other contributions which are equally interesting. Joseph H. Pleck writes on the "work-family role system," Patricia Gerald Bourne and Norma Juliet Wikler on women in medicine, Masako Murakami Osako on Japanese professional women, Norman B. Ryder on the future of American fertility, Rose Laub Coser on day care, Jack W. Sattel on the inexpressive male, Pamela M. Fishman on conversations as women's work, Janet B. Hunt and Larry L. Hunt on dilemmas of the dual-career family, Evelyn Nakano Glenn and Roslyn L. Feldberg on the proletarianization of clerical work, Sally T. Hillsman and Bernard Levenson on the job opportunities of black and white working-class women, Rosabeth Moss Kanter on the impact of hierarchical structures on the work behaviour of women and men, and Sally L. Hacker on sex stratification and technological change at AT&T.

Women and Work will thus serve as an excellent text for undergraduate and graduate students. Moreover, for anyone studying the worlds of work as well as those concerned about the position of women in industrialist-capitalist society, this volume will provide a rich source of insights and suggestive hypotheses.

Arlene Tigar McLaren
Simon Fraser University

Chris Aldred, *Women at Work* (London: Pan Trade Union Studies 1981).

WOMEN AT WORK is an important addition to the Pan Trade Union Studies series. The series is written for groups of people thinking of joining a union, new members of unions, those who are just becoming active members, new and less experienced shop stewards, and anybody interested in trade unions today. This particular study concerns itself with the prob-

lem of the disproportionate representation of women in the ranks of trade union activists.

Aldred starts with an examination of the kinds of work that women and men do, pointing out the "hidden" skills women have. She also examines the special problems women face in male-dominated occupations, continues with an examination of the reasons behind sex segregation in the job market, and moves into an in-depth exploration of the "double day." When women view themselves as housewives first and workers second, employers benefit. Having women make this primary identification allows the existence of a reserve army of labour (although she never uses terms like this), and feeds into the real difficulties that women have getting out of the home: a lack of child care and low pay.

There is a chapter on the absence of protection for women afforded by the British legal system, relevant mainly to British conditions. However, Aldred makes the more general point that "women's rights have always been regarded as something of a side issue within trade unions — surprising as men's political rights have always been hotly debated throughout trade union history." The limitations of the legal system in solving the problems of women at work are appropriately noted:

Apart from the kinds of tricks your employer can play, your workmates may think you're off your head to complain about some practice or other that's been going on for years. Would you be keen to try to claim your rights through legal channels? What kind of reaction would you get from your workmates?

The fourth chapter was the most interesting for women in the labour movement as it deals with the structural barriers within trade unionism and within workplaces to increasing women's participation in the movement. The problems of organizing small workplaces where many women work, the large number of women who are part-time workers, and the fact

that lots of women spend their working lives caring for people, have combined with the trade union movement's slowness to deal with issues like equal pay, male distrust of female members, and the inability of women to attend union meetings at the hours that men traditionally schedule them, to minimize the participation of women.

In the same chapter the author looks at alternatives that could alleviate these problems. Suggestions range from finding different and imaginative kinds of good child care, to negotiating for paid time off to attend union meetings, to increasing the understanding of trade union staff and leaders of the conditions under which women work, to affirmative action for educating women into leadership positions. The obvious stumbling blocks often raised in opposition to these ideas are dealt with succinctly and in an unabrasive way.

In a chapter entitled "Participation — Our Own Worst Enemies," the best teaching tool on consciousness raising that I've read in a long time appears. Aldred emphasizes the link between gender and class identification:

Have you ever heard a Miss World contestant mention her trade union as an interest along with the inevitable interest in children, animals, sports or the arts? Obviously most women don't go around trying to be like the ideal women of the magazines or imitating Miss World. But most women do want to be women, not some pale copy of a man. What sort of image jumps to your mind if you imagine trade unionists? Is it different from your image of a "nice woman"?

The book closes with concrete suggestions for action which range from bringing children to union meetings to tactics for lobbying government.

Aldred thus deals with concepts like "women's work," "the double day," "work skills and training," and "equal pay" in a clear, concise, un-threatening manner grounded in a class analysis. *Women at Work* will help women and

men trade unionists to understand the concrete issues and problems facing women in the workplace and the trade union movement.

I recommend this book to anyone working to improve the participation of women in trade unions, to people in positions of union leadership who could use a bit of education on women and work, or to any woman in the trade union movement.

Patricia Lane, Research Director,
Independent Canadian Transit Union
Vancouver, British Columbia

Kevin Harris, *Teachers and Classes: A Marxist Analysis* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul 1982).

THIS USEFUL LITTLE 150-page book provides a Marxist analysis of the class location of teachers. It is written in an accessible style, addressed to teachers as well as academics. It does not provide any startling new evidence or conclusions, but goes over arguments and information in a systematic and critical manner. I immediately thought of it as a potential text to use with student teachers, or in graduate courses with teachers who are taking upgrading courses.

The book starts out with a brief overview of the author's experience as a teacher, and his changing understanding of his relation to the class structure. An upwardly mobile working-class boy, he became a teacher to help other working-class children into the middle class. His growing recognition of the contradictions in this position led him to a Marxist analysis and a position as lecturer at the university. There he has started a magazine, *Radical Education Dossier*.

It is perhaps because of this personal history that some of the best passages in the book are a logical, step-by-step exposé of the errors of orthodox liberal positions on schooling. In sections called "the anyone can, therefore everyone can fallacy"

and "the interference-elimination principle," he shows how teachers are involved in the reproduction of capitalist social relations and how they do not "Educate" (always with a capital E). "The technical job of teaching has been structured within a set of social relations such that the very performance of the technical job itself entails entering into, participating in and perpetuating situations, processes and relations which themselves are antithetical to Educating." (27)

Harris then establishes an "objective" or "scientific" Marxist position on class and class struggle, in opposition to the "ideologically ridden orthodox schema" of social stratification. He outlines the economic, political, and ideological aspects of teachers' work in an attempt to define their class position and locate them in the class struggle.

In the chapter on economic issues he identifies teachers as unproductive labourers, who therefore cannot be simply identified with the working class. He then looks at the contradictions which face teachers: the functions they perform for capital, the process of proletarianization they are undergoing, and the way proletarianization increasingly prevents teachers from engaging in education. In the chapter on political identifications he explores the political functions teachers perform for the state in controlling the working class. In the chapter on the ideological identification of teachers, he argues that the legitimation of schooling rests on identifying schools with equality of opportunity, meritocracy, preparation and selection for employment, and worthwhile knowledge. Teachers work to make schools appear legitimate to their pupils, and in so doing they portray the interests of a ruling class as the interests of all.

The final two chapters of the book summarize the class contradictions that face teachers. "Teachers belong to neither of the major opposed groups in contemporary class struggle, and they are in a contradictory position in that, while their

objective economic conditions very closely approximate those of the working class, their political and ideological relations within the ongoing production process support the capitalist class in its domination of the working class." (130) He concludes that teachers have more to gain by opposing the interests of capital and siding with the working class. A few pages at the end outline what this might mean immediately in the classroom ("Don't provide a competitive ethos," "breakdown discriminative roles") and in the longer term (revolution).

The book is fairly orthodox in its Marxist approach. While I can imagine my student teachers being outraged and ultimately not convinced by its conclusions, the book is a thought-provoking summary of issues with which teachers must grapple.

Jane Gaskell
University of British Columbia

Jean-Pierre Bardou, Jean-Jacques Chanaron, Patrick Friedenson, James M. Laux, *The Automobile Revolution: The Impact of an Industry*, translated from the French by James M. Laux (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press 1982).

THIS COMPARATIVELY BRIEF volume covers the world history of the automobile from its beginnings to about 1980. I am amazed at how much information the authors were able to provide, though many times intriguing incidents of which I was unaware are dealt with in only a sentence or two. There are only 149 footnotes for the entire book, but there is an extensive bibliography by subject and by country (there are only two entries for Canada) and quite a good index. The book is divided into three parts: the genesis of the automobile revolution; the spread of the automobile revolution, 1914-1945; and the triumph of the automobile revolution. The twelve chapters carry individual

authors' names, so that there is not always a single point of view that emerges.

The topics included are quite complete. We learn of early marketing — trail demonstrations, races, autoclubs, auto-shows, and the coming of installment buying; who the early purchasers were — wealthy sportsmen, doctors, businessmen, and engineers; the importance of the bicycle industry — much of the technology used in automobiles first appeared in the bicycle industry; why the early British motor industry lagged — red flag laws and a fascination with the steam engine; the demise of the steam and electric autos; the Wankel rotary engine — a disappointment; the economic, social, and cultural impact of the auto; and details about such interesting events as the erection of the first stop sign in Detroit and the first traffic light in Cleveland, both in 1914, and the opening in 1939 of the first North American expressway — the Queen Elizabeth Way between Toronto and Hamilton.

The authors emphasize higher income per capita and a more even distribution of income as leading to the early expansion of the American auto industry and its subsequent overtaking of the French and German industries, but argue that the importance of the large free trade area of the United States has been over-emphasized since European tariff rates were very low. They argue that the need for capital was not high initially because many firms were already in business and because other firms, including Ford, started as assemblers. High profits could then be reinvested. This seems somewhat at variance with the opinion of other analysts, who have suggested that one feature which led to Detroit's dominance was the willingness of its bankers to lend to the industry.

Considerable space is devoted to Ford, and the authors point out that as he continually lowered the price of the Model T, he was opening the market for cars in the \$1,000 - \$1,500 price range which empha-

sized quality more than a cheap price. Other problems that Ford faced included huge amounts of fixed costs, narrow specialization, and a decline in the ability to innovate. Price decreases, as an industry response, were last tried in the depression of 1920-21. Into this void stepped Sloan and General Motors. "Sloanism" included the decentralized management structure Chandler has written about and the planned obsolescence of models, including annual model changes which began in 1923. This allowed GM to be profitable during the 1930s. "Sloanism" spread to the rest of the world in the early 1960s. The authors see the world industry as becoming a single one with the "world car" pointing in that direction, though they remind us that Europe and Asia may not simply follow the North American model because of more crowded conditions and better public transportation.

The total space devoted to Canada (no footnotes) amounts to a total of two or three pages. The authors say that serious operations got underway when Ford began production in Canada in 1904. They include a couple of domestic producers, Russell and Tudhope, whom they believe were successful for a while, but argue that severe competition drove them out of business about the time of World War I. This, obviously, is not the source to learn about the Canadian auto industry.

About half the book covers the post-World War II era and one long chapter is devoted to labour and industrial relations in this period. They argue that the automobile worker faces the same problems throughout the world, Russia and East Europe included. The problem is that the semi-skilled worker has no loyalty to his firm. He has been paid according to his machine and has lost responsibility for what his machine does. In early periods, the universal machine and the semi-automatic machine demanded some skill, and the worker was not as alienated as he is with the present automatic machine. The result has been high mobility and

high absenteeism. The demands of these workers have focused on working conditions, that is, to be recognized as responsible persons performing useful work. But they face a problem in that unions are often controlled by the skilled workers and these semi-skilled or unskilled workers are often minorities from rural backgrounds. In the late 1960s for example, 30 per cent of the UAW's membership, but only about 5 per cent of the executive, was black.

Attempts to overcome this general problem have involved job redesign. GM took the lead in North America with quality-of-work agreements with the union. Their Tarrytown, N.Y. plant saw absenteeism rates decline from 7 to 2.5 per cent. Most famous is Volvo's Kalmar assembly plant where work proceeds in teams of fifteen to twenty workers who have full autonomy in performing their tasks. The results have generally been satisfactory, but absentee rates remain about 15 per cent and costs are higher. The Japanese have used the quality-control circle to good effect, but they have also moved faster than others in replacing workers with robots and thus eliminating the problem entirely.

Overall, I found this book a good read. It especially helps one to break out of a North American bias. The European authors also help with their perspective on the North American industry. They are probably right in concluding that the automobile has a rich future, but that it will be a more political future as we struggle with pollution, noise, safety, and petroleum problems.

Robert E. Ankli
University of Guelph

Maria Hirszowicz, *Industrial Sociology: An Introduction* (Oxford: Martin Robertson 1981).

THE WRITERS OF introductory texts usu-

ally address several frequently incompatible goals. They should present adequate coverage of the concepts and vocabulary of the field, while not overwhelming new students with too much technical jargon. They should provide a representative survey of substantive issues, often at times of fairly rapid change and emerging interest. They should introduce students to relevant literature in the field, again often in the midst of new developments. They must inform about the major theories, models or paradigms of the discipline, presumably with some degree of impartiality.

Hirszowicz addresses these tasks with a mixed degree of success. The first two chapters of her text — "Industry and Society" and "Man and Technology" — serve as excellent introductions to the basic concepts and orientations of the industrial sociology field. The topics covered in these sections include: the social correlates of industrial development; the convergence thesis and its critics; the notion of post-industrial society; limits to economic growth; technology; the division of labour; and alienation. For intellectual and analytical orientations, she refers to the "European perspectives" of Marx, Durkheim, and Weber, and to the "American perspectives" of scientific management, human relations studies, and organizational theory. Unfortunately, however, the reader is left with the impression that these are mutually exclusive "perspectives." Another slightly disquieting aspect of these opening chapters is that although early reference is made to the significance of "productive forces" for social life (chapter 1), there is little ensuing discussion of "relations of production." With no development of the interplay between productive forces and social relations, the strong impression of abstract technological determinism which emerges in chapter 2 remains unchallenged. Introductory students should be informed that industrial development takes place within economic, political, and social contexts.

The sense of analytical fragmentation becomes even more pervasive in the ensuing, substantive chapters of the text. In essence, these eight chapters reduce to four discussions on the structural integration of labour: one on the ideological integration of labour, one on the institutionalization of labour, one on the intractability of labour, and one on the improbability of labour (i.e., as a viable force for democratization of the industrial process). Space does not permit a detailed examination of the content of these chapters, but some commentary on the general theme of analysis presented in each may prove instructive.

The chapter dealing with small groups in industry relies mainly on the "human relations" and "group dynamics" approaches very much in vogue in American industrial sociology of 25 to 30 years ago, with the irrevocable conclusion that group associations and loyalties on the job remain a primary source of social integration for workers. Nevertheless, in the next chapter on motivations to work, the imperative of coercion is established from the outset: the opening question, "Why do people work?" becomes transformed, within two paragraphs, to, "The question of *how people are motivated to work...*" (emphasis added)

There follows, under the euphemistic heading of "workers' needs," detailed discussions of the scientific management, human relations, psychological, and organizational theory approaches to motivation. The centrality of power as a necessary factor in industry is further emphasized in the chapter on the role of the foreman, wherein the "exchange theory" formulations of Gouldner, Homans, Blau, and others are held to have the best explanatory value. The presumed shift of corporate power in "post-industrial" or "post-capitalist" societies pervades the chapter on managerialism, wherein the role of management is seen to have changed from one of applying the principles of bureaucratic rationality to a rela-

tively limited range of substantive problems to one of managing or controlling *in loco bourgeoisie*. The "post-capitalist" shift is raised again in the chapter on the changing nature (image) of the working class, although this is now couched in terms of "transitional societies" and borrows heavily from the work of Dahrendorf. In the final analysis, the reader is informed that, because of a process of "embourgeoisification," the concept of the "working class" is now "... largely irrelevant, ..." and that "... generalizations about the working class as a whole, in the context of the power of capital, [are] virtually obsolete." The next chapter on trade unions does little to dispel the eclipse of labour: here, Michels and Lipset are called upon to pronounce the decline of union democracy and the rise of union bureaucracy. Paradoxically, however, labour raises its head again in the chapter on industrial conflict, which is almost totally devoted to the subject of strikes. The final chapter on industrial democracy, although very much improved analytically in comparison with preceding chapters, concludes that a greater degree of worker control is impractical because: (a) it didn't work in the Soviet Union; (b) of the complexities of modern technology and the division of labour; (c) of the "organizational requirements" of managerialism.

The author's treatment of the foregoing topics suggests a somewhat ahistorical approach to the subject, but what is neglected in her analysis seems even more disturbing. For example, how is it possible to prepare a text on industrial sociology with scarcely any reference to the role of capital, and to the relationship between capital and labour? What is the significance of the marginalization of capital into petit bourgeois fragments in certain sectors of productive and non-productive enterprise? Given the fact of industrial conflict, is it reasonable to conclude that the only group in conflict is labour? What credibility does the concept of "post-

industrial society" have in the face of growing evidence of global industrial development under the aegis of transnational corporations? What justification is there for cataloguing the data of industrial sociology without any consideration of the context of industrial society?

The reason for these oversights may well be revealed in the author's preface, which contains the following theoretical disclaimer: "In my opinion there is no one best theory to deal with sociological problems, no universal methodology for their successful exploration... the emphasis in this book is on the importance of empirical studies..." In the final analysis, this seems to be a fairly succinct definition of functionalism. The functionalist reluctance to pursue a broad, historically and theoretically informed approach to social phenomena is also revealed in the author's perception of the relationship between history, theory, and evidence, viz., a "... cautious but open-minded approach that critically integrates historical, comparative and descriptive studies into meaningful generalizations." In trying to avoid the dangers of oversimplification, Hirszowicz seems to have erred in the opposite direction of over-complexity. This results in considerable "waffling" over questions of causality, wherein the reader is constantly parried by generalizations about "lack of consensus on issues," "difficulties of interpretation," "lack of clarity in the data," "complexities," *et al*. The sense of complexity is also reinforced by frequent recourse to the "iron cross of sociology:" the ubiquitous row by column tabulation of conceptual representations of social reality.

The author expresses some concern that her book is too specialized in its reference to Great Britain. This concern seems belied, however, by what seems to be an excessive reliance on American functionalist literature of the 1950s and 1960s. This bias is also evident, although to a lesser degree, in Peter Cook's otherwise valuable guide to the literature. To

the readers of this journal, any shortcomings of Hirszowicz's book arising from regional specificity may be far less problematic than the political, social, and historical sterility encouraged by the perspective from which the subject of industrial sociology is approached.

G.B. Rush
Simon Fraser University

Charles F. Sabel, *Work and Politics. The Division of Labor in Industry* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1982).

CHARLES SABEL attempts to synthesize the research on industrial technology, factory workers, industrial organization, and labour movements conducted primarily in Italy, West Germany, France, Great Britain, and the United States. He adopts a long time-frame from 1850 to the present. Although he never states specifically at the outset his purpose, there are hints in his assumptions, expressed at times implicitly and at other times explicitly. The book is rooted in a rejection of the argument that industrial structures and the division of labour determines workers' conceptions of themselves and other workers. Instead, Sabel posits a complex interplay among ideas, experience, and struggles which have profound influences on technology, industrial organization, and the division of labour.

The first chapter presents and rejects alternative theories of worker attitudes and behaviours, and launches into an over-extended and obscure introduction to the book. Sabel criticizes three theories of blue-collar workers: embourgeoisement or the view that the working-class revolt has been blunted either by workers' newfound middle-class material prosperity (Ferdinand Zweig) or by their unexpected mastery over modern technology (Robert Blauner); Serge Mallet's new working-class theory that the revolt will emerge from the ranks of highly specialized

technicians who become increasingly frustrated with bureaucratic limits imposed on their autonomy; and the instrumentalism of Goldthorpe and Lockwood who suggested that considerable societal instability could be created by trade unions demanding material concessions almost without limit. Sabel believes that these theories have been disproved by the wave of student-worker protests in the late 1960s and early 1970s, and the end of the post-war economic boom in the early 1970s. These theories suffer from three (mis)leading assumptions which form a cohesive thread through much of the book: technological determinism, or the view that the organization of work is determined by technological development; essentialism, or the assumption that the whole of a society determines its parts (if a society is industrial, then none of its parts is pre-industrial); and, reductionism, or the view that experience determines all thought. Sabel's book is an attempt to marshal cross-comparative research from a select number of western industrial societies to expose the untenability of these assumptions.

In chapter two Sabel contends that consumer markets shape the division of labour between and within plants, and their use of technology, both of which influence labour markets. Using Michael Prior's model, he divides the economy into a primary or core sector consisting of large, Fordist, assembly-line plants producing for the stable market where demand for commodities remains constant, and a secondary or peripheral sector of small plants producing for the unstable market where demand for products fluctuates. The primary sector rests on specialized technology not adaptable to quick changes in product design. Its essence lies in long production runs of standardized products for mass markets and the employment of as much unskilled labour as possible. Yet ironically such Fordist plants develop their own peculiar

demand for skilled labour, such as maintenance crews to tend to the increasingly complex machinery. These firms also ferret out of the ranks of the unskilled, workers who develop "intermediate-level" or "plant-specific" skills (such as process workers) whose claim to a special status is their knowledge of the quirks of the plant's technology learned through years of on-the-job experience.

The secondary plants in the unstable sector rely on universal machines easily adaptable to quick changes in product designs and on a higher proportion of unskilled, migrant labour and women. Yet, as Sabel points out in the West German Bavarian example, exceptions to this model exist so that there are no automatic connections among markets, technology, organizational structures, division of labour, and labour markets. As if to remind us of some of the book's opening themes, Sabel insists that this division of labour between primary and secondary industries is not locked into a technological necessity, but is openly influenced by cultural tastes and political struggles for property and power.

The third chapter is devoted to an exploration of the subjective consciousness of workers located in different labour markets. Sabel sees this consciousness in terms of "world views" and "careers at work." A world view is "the set of hopes and fears, together with the map of the social world that it establishes." (11) Careers at work, the workers' world view, is "a series of remunerative tasks that successively challenge and require the development of whatever powers one takes as the measure of human worth." (80) Sabel utilizes "careers at work" to analyze the consciousness of craftworkers, workers with intermediate-level skills, peasant workers, would-be craftworkers, and ghetto workers. *Craftworkers* value technical experience, knowledge, and fellowship with their companions in contrast to middle-class graduates of engineering schools

who value careers through recognized ranks which confer increasingly greater status and prestige. *Workers with intermediate-level skills* develop a particular type of consciousness due to their place in the labour market (they cannot switch firms because of their plant-specific skills). They develop an isolationist consciousness regarding other workers because of their location in an "articulated co-operative division of labour," and a sense of autonomy from supervisors who dare not fire them because of their "technical sensibilities," or knowledge of the peculiarities of the plant's machinery. Yet their employment situation is tenuous because market pressures may revolutionize the plant's technology, thereby making their skills obsolete.

Sabel also discusses three types of unskilled workers — peasant workers, would-be-craftworkers, and ghetto workers. *Peasant workers* are migrants from agricultural areas who labour at low wages and under poor working conditions. Disregarding the consequences of their actions on industrial production, they often take time off from industrial work during harvest time. They live in an industrial world with one foot always in the village from which they migrated. Peasant workers are usually quite isolated from other industrial workers and their trade unions. Their migration paths are quite diverse: from Sicily and southern Italy to northern Italy; from the deep South in the United States to the auto factories of Michigan; and from southern Europe to France and West Germany. *Would-be-craftworkers* are unskilled peasant workers who shun their agricultural origins and seek promotion into the ranks of those with intermediate-level skills. When the labour market for skilled workers is tight, would-be-craftworkers usually seek individual promotion; when the market is loose, they more often engage in collective trade union action. Finally, *ghetto workers* are the unskilled

who, after repeated failures, have lost their self-confidence and have thus given up hope of holding a steady job in the industrial system, not to speak of advancement through the skill hierarchy. Sabel believes these five types of workers make individual choices based on their backgrounds and labour markets which largely shape their destinies in the division of labour.

The fourth chapter, entitled "Interests, Conflicts and Classes," brings to a head the climax of the book. It is an attempt to examine the transformative effect on the division of labour produced by the conflicts of workers located in different labour markets. For Sabel, worker conflicts can have three transformative effects: a change in the balance of power between contestants; a redefinition of the contestants' original claims necessitated by the alliances into which they enter; and the redefinition of claims, ideas, and interests in the heat of battle itself.

Using this framework, Sabel examines the struggles of peasant workers, would-be-craftworkers, craftworkers, and workers with intermediate-level skills. The material on peasant workers is exclusively Italian, focusing on the Turin General Strike of 1962, the *autunno caldo* of 1969, and the *delegati* and *consiglio di fabbrica* won as a result of the struggles in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Despite the initial hostility directed by northern skilled workers against largely unskilled southern peasant migrants who at most aspired only to intermediate skill levels, these two groups of workers broke down the barriers between them for one basic reason: they had to unite to defend their interests against the strong alliance of Christian Democrats, industrialists, and landowners who had outmanoeuvred an increasingly weak parliamentary opposition and because the weak labour movement had splintered into three trade union federations. A measure of the success of this solidarity was the reorganization of the industrial structure in which all workers

(regardless of union status) elected *delegati* to a *consiglio di fabbrica*, and the skill hierarchy which was flattened somewhat, favouring the unskilled over the skilled. Using the British printers' chapels as a case study, Sabel argues that craftworkers are simultaneously revolutionaries (because they oppose a capitalism based on Fordist principles which erodes their craft skills) and labour aristocrats (because they defend their skill privileges against both management and the less skilled). Sabel also illustrates the struggles of the intermediate-level skilled by reference to oil refinery process workers in Great Britain and France, special workers in chemical plants in northeastern England, nuclear power station operators in France, welders and metal polishers in the United States, and truck drivers at Bulledor in France. He concludes that this cross-comparative examination invalidates Mallet's new working-class theory: workers with intermediate-level or plant-specific skills do not necessarily adopt a radical consciousness because of their position in the production process; such workers may adopt a narrow self-interested defence of their place in the division of labour. Sabel suggests, on the basis of his examination of worker struggles in this chapter, that the Marxist view (as he interprets it) has been falsified: career at work rather than worker position in the division of labour determines their political views.

The last chapter brings us back to industrial structures, the division of labour, and labour markets, and appears to lose sight of careers at work and subjective consciousness. It is a speculative piece, with some case studies, concerning the possible decline of Fordism and the rise of neo-Fordism (Fordist plants producing more diversified commodities without losing sight of fundamental mass assembly line principles) and a high-technology cottage industry in the secondary sector (central and northeastern Italy provide the empirical referents). The

decline of Fordism is interpreted as self-destruction: Fordism in the core industrialized west stimulates the demand for more diversified commodities and unwittingly induces the imitative competition from newly-industrializing Third World countries (Singapore, South Korea, Taiwan, etc.). Both responses force large plants in the industrialized west to decentralize into universal machinery run by skilled labour. At the end of the book, we are ironically left dangling from these new structural imperatives without a whimper from subjectivity!

The strength of Charles Sabel's *Work and Politics* lies in his pruning of cross-comparative data in order to interpret the complex interplay among struggle, consciousness, experience, industrial organization, technology, labour markets, and the division of labour. Yet herein lies also the book's weakness: it is an unsystematic sampling of case studies by country and often loses the main thread of the argument. Excessive attention is paid to the plight of peasant migrants from southern Italy in the northern Italian factories. No similar close examination is offered of migrant workers in France, West Germany, Great Britain, or the United States, nor for that matter of craftworkers, would-be-craftworkers, workers with intermediate-level skills, and ghetto workers from any of the countries.

This rational imbalance is matched by a theoretical imbalance: in his enthusiasm to prove the "structuralists" wrong, Sabel misinterprets the subtlety of some of their arguments, and in the process swings the pendulum in chapter four too far in the other direction of complete voluntarism to the neglect of the complex interplay between structures and subjective actions. Sabel places his bets on differences among leaders in imagination, daring, boldness, and political instincts, and then states: "try to trace these differences back to underlying differences in social structure, and you end

by confusing the idea of an explanation with the assertion that everything has antecedents." (189) I suspect that, behind such extreme voluntarism, Sabel is grinding an axe against what he perceives to be Marxism. He selects the most unrepresentative example of Marxism and then generalizes this to all of Marxism. For example, he states: "If a class is defined in the Marxist sense as a group of persons who share a position in the division of labour, and who for that reason share political views, then . . . blue-collar workers do not form a class." (187) Sabel attributes the gist of this statement to Erik Olin Wright (*Class, Crisis and the State*), who ironically has been accused by many Marxists of being overly deterministic, structuralist, and static in his view of class. By hiding behind the cloak of such distortions, Charles Sabel fails to arrive at a more adequate comprehension of the dialectical interplay between the division of labour and subjective consciousness. Another reading of the cross-comparative literature on industrial technology, factory workers, industrial organization, and labour movements could be conducted to arrive at a point closer to such a comprehension than the one provided by Sabel.

Carl J. Cuneo
McMaster University

J.M. Bumsted, *The People's Clearance, 1770-1815* (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press 1982); Stephen P. Dunn, *The Fall & Rise of the Asiatic Mode of Production* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 1982).

THESE TWO apparently disparate books — one on the "tacksman" emigration from Scotland at the end of the eighteenth century and the other on the Soviet-Marxist debate on the existence or otherwise of the Asiatic mode of production — share a perhaps unexpected amount of

common ground. Both books show clearly how badly we need to understand those pre-capitalist societies which do not possess unambiguous feudal characteristics. Both also purport to examine history in a "revisionist" light: one from an explicit theoretical position (Dunn), the other from an empirical position (Bumsted). Reading these two entirely different approaches in sequence, one is left with a strong sense of the urgent need to test theory against fact, on the one hand, and to understand documentary evidence in the context of theoretical construction on the other.

Bumsted's book is described on the dust-jacket as "a revisionist account of Highland Scottish emigration to what is now Canada," revisionist in the sense that it argues that "the earlier phase of Highland emigration was not the tale of an oppressed, impoverished peasantry driven off the estates to make way for sheep," but an exodus of people of higher social status and some wealth (tacksman) who left, paying their own way, because they wanted "to be left alone to continue their old pastoral way of life." (221) This "revision" of the conventional wisdom (claims the dust-jacket) is "supported with careful documentation." Indeed, in many respects it is, and the author is to be commended for his diligent accumulation of material, for his careful, detailed account of the abortive "Canadian regiment" solution of 1803, and for his explication of the politics and pressures behind the Passenger Act of the same year. It is also encouraging to see an historian examine this early tacksman migration as a phenomenon distinct from the later (post-1815) exodus which is so often taken as the whole story of the Highland diaspora. Nonetheless, and despite its considerable merits, it must be said that what has been achieved here is, above all, a fine exposition of the capitalist case for the defence rather than a revisionist history of the early Highland emigrations.

This is a history which by title, and

hence presumably by intent, purports to present the perspective of the "people." Who were these people? We are told they involved a "prosperous and dynamic element of the middling [sic] ranks of the people," (13) but that their motivations have to be read from actions rather than words since they "largely lacked the skills of writing and the ability of fluent self-expression." (xiv) I fail to find adequate evidence for this claim. The Glenaladale Papers (PAPEI, 2664), for example, are not only a highly literate account of the motivations of the tacksman emigrants but make references to a literate tacksman class in general. Add to this the poetry and comments cited in John Prebble's *The Highland Clearances* (Penguin, 1963, 189 for example) and it seems to be that the contemporary Highlander of this early emigration was far from "silent." However, the author tells us that those who could and did write contemporary explanations of the phenomenon were either "outsiders," or "superiors on the estates," and mostly "hostile" to the emigration. And so this book seeks to speak for the early emigrant, to explain his exodus as one "based upon pride and choice" so that he would "maintain his traditional way of life." (xiv)

But what was this way of life? Dr. Bumsted seems just a wee bit confused here. Could it be maintained *without* a chief and *with* land ownership, he asks — and considers this a "nice question" — yet he does understand that it did involve maintaining "family, clan ties, language, religion" along with something which he describes rather vaguely as a "semi-pastoral approach to the land." (70) Here is the nub of the problem. The emigration cannot be understood without understanding what the emigrants left behind, what they retained, what the framework of their traditional society had been. It requires an in-depth understanding of the clan system. And so, despite the author's efforts, the Highland emigrant remains voiceless, faceless, con-

textless — and the empty, ruined houses of the cover picture speak metaphorically to just this point. When the emigrant finally “speaks,” (220, in the epilogue) he is said to be mythologizing, to be reading the hardships and brutality of the later clearances back into his own migration. Because he had money, argues the author, he must have had the “dignity of choice,” (xiv) been motivated by prospects of “betterment,” and hence not “dispossessed,” “exploited,” or “forced.” He chose to take his extended family to the New World. The injustice done him was merely one of political or economic misunderstanding: it was only a failure to see that Highland development schemes (roads, canals, fishing villages) would not provide him with adequate long-term employment; that population pressure would become problematic as crofts were subdivided; that the Highland elite were “misguided” in their paranoia about depopulation. Even the infamous Sutherland clearances, according to Dr. Bumsted, were really not so much “heartless” as a “paternal effort to modernise in everyone’s best interest. . . .” (209) The people were unreasonably reluctant to move from “infertile” straths to the new villages so munificently provided on the coast. But this statement is not substantiated with careful research and argument: just a footnote, citing the literature for the prosecution and the defence. Dr. Bumsted should visit one of those villages, 150 feet above sea-level, where the ruined cottages of people cleared from Strath Kildonan have iron rings set into the walls to which children were tied so that they would not fall, or get blown, into the sea. But it is not easy to get there, although it is National Trust property in the public domain: I’m sure I’m not the first historian to have been ushered unceremoniously off the site in recent years by a ghillie who did not like to see the landlord’s grouse-moor disturbed. Under such humanitarian conditions of uprooting, to have the means of removal

to a new land and a fresh start cannot be described as “choice,” but as blessing; it says not so much about free will as it does about the financial ability to survive. The tenants did not *choose* to be squeezed out: they “chose” not to stay, having been disappropriated, and in this respect they were more fortunate than those who did not have even such a meagre choice as this, being destitute.

But, says Dr. Bumsted, they could have gone to the cities, to the army, to build the roads, to New Lanark . . . what was wrong with that? And, answering his own question, explains quite correctly that they wished to preserve their “traditional way of life.” This is the tragedy of this book — it is, at the end of the day, such a near miss. The history of the tacksman emigration, indeed of the Highland migrations writ large, does need to be revised, to be demythologized; the tacksmen, and the pre-1815 migrations do need to be distinguished from the later evictions which James Hunter has so graphically documented for those who did not emigrate because they could not, lacking both the means of production and the means of escape.

What is needed still is an understanding of the society upon which the “improvement mania” descended. We need to know what the Highlands were like before capitalism; we need to know what the “traditional way of life” was, in the kind of detail that Alan Macpherson (*Scottish Studies*, 10, 1966; 11, 1967; 12, 1968) provides and more, if we are to comprehend the “emigration mania” that so distressed the proprietors and the British Parliament. Dr. Bumsted is puzzled himself, although he gets close from time to time, and one can sense the dissatisfaction of a good historian with his partially-solved jigsaw puzzle, in his wondering about what the roles of chief and landowning were in that “traditional way of life.”

The point is that Highland society was not capitalist at the grass roots at the end

of the eighteenth century. Nor was it any longer purely communalistic, as the existence of that complex phenomenon, the "wadset," demonstrates. But, as Hunter points out, the local people were not *au fait* with the antagonistic nature of capitalism: they had no defence against it, no comprehension of it. The clan system had operated on the premise that the chief (not necessarily the same thing as a laird or proprietor) was *primus inter pares*. He was the holder of the communal lands of the clan, the living symbol of joint "possession" by all clan members, and so he could not sell land since it was not his to sell. This attitude is well-documented. Indeed, even in Prince Edward Island, the obligation of chief to clan remained, as can be seen clearly in John MacDonald's complaint to his sister that things would go much easier with him if he were not "head of a damned tribe" (PAPEI, 2664, 16, 4) and in his culturally guilt-ridden reluctance to behave in the profitable capitalist mode. The author knows, and uses, this source (57-61), yet fails to get the message.

Dr. Bumsted has been working on the Highland Scots in Canada for some years now, and his knowledge of document and event is considerable. It is in the realm of construct, theory, and interpretation that he needs more work. He does not yet really understand the tribal, proto-communalistic society whose lifeblood streamed across the Atlantic in this first emigration. That these emigrants sought to "reestablish the old order in the New World" is true; that they were not poor is true; that they had a "choice" is barely true; that they were not driven out is untrue — for though they had the cash to get out, they did not have the capacity to stay under conditions they knew and loved. To understand the Highland pre-capitalist society will be to understand this emigration. Until then, the redressing of balance in Highland history, which Dr. Bumsted so clearly recognizes must take place, cannot be achieved.

Stephen Dunn's book on *The Fall and Rise of the Asiatic Mode of Production* illustrates very clearly just what a morass scholars can get into when trying to sort out pre-capitalist modes of production. As Bumsted's book was lacking in theoretical anthropological insight, so Dunn shows what horrendous problems can arise when scholars attempt to develop theory upon an inadequate data base. The Soviet debate on the Asiatic mode of production is the obverse of Bumsted's dilemma, compounded by politico-ideological restrictions. Dunn's repeated use of the word "exegesis," with its theological overtones, is brilliantly suggestive of the trap in which Soviet Marxist theorists found themselves in the 1920s and 1930s as the "Asiatic" position fell from political favour. (How could Marx have been wrong? By definition, he could not. Therefore, he required "interpretation," much as Teilhard de Chardin did for Genesis after Darwin, since the Bible, like Marx, cannot err).

The book itself, while fascinating, is not always readable. Categories and sub-categories get lost in complex sentences, and summary statements from time to time would be helpful. At one level, it is an exercise in Soviet historiographic disputation and evolution; and, as such, it is a specialist item, a demonstration of the problem of the concept from Marx and Engels through to the present Soviet-trained intellectuals. Its usefulness, however, goes beyond that, for it contains along the way the lesson of the need for substantive data, shows how ideology can constrain interpretation and inhibit truth, and teaches the dangers as well as the value of revisionism.

Whether or not the Asiatic mode of production is a genuine category has been, of course, problematic outside of Soviet thinking; inside it, the problem has been compounded by the dicta of "approved" thinking. Dunn wants to "sharpen and refine the tools of Marxist analysis," (xiii) to reject "fideism." He starts with a good

resume of basic Marxist thinking on the "concept of social orders" (4-6) and follows this with a thorough, chronological review of the various phases of Soviet-Marxist perceptions of the Asiatic mode of production to 1934, distinguishing between the arguments from (a) authority, (b) pure theory, and (c) politics — this last because Marxism is both a "cognitive tool and a political weapon." (34) By 1934 the "Asiatic position" had been condemned as non-essential and unclear from the historical evidence, and thus it could be rejected without fear of a consequent charge of stultification of Marxist methodology.

Between 1934 and 1964 there followed an interregnum during which the groundwork for the post-1964 Soviet resurgence of the "Asiatic" position was laid. There was a slow shift from exegesis to the perception of data-based investigation as sowing the seeds of an advance in knowledge. The Asiatic mode of production had been seen as static, and the problem of slaveholding as the weak link in Marxist historical theory: how was it possible to pass from slavery to feudalism? Slavery had to be seen as aberrant. By 1971 the debate had begun to clarify itself, and to acquire value beyond that which pertained to the specialist in Soviet-Marxist historiography. Marx, it was now held, had developed the concept of the Asiatic mode of production because he was working with inadequate and biased western data. As his thinking matured, he gradually came to abandon this category, but that did not have to mean that the concept could not be revived if data became available to substantiate its viability. Thus a quixotic situation had come into existence in which the politically orthodox rejection of the Asiatic mode of production, which had been historically revisionist, was being challenged by a politically revisionist revival of the concept, which was historically "fundamentalist" or conservative! That is, thinking had progressed to the

non-political position that the "Marxist theory of history as a whole and its component parts (real or purported, necessary or superfluous) stand or fall on their explanatory power with respect to actual historical facts." Dunn remarks that "the intellectual genie has been let out of the bottle. . . ." (87)

The result now, especially in the synthetic work of Kachanovskii, is an explanation that has considerable attraction. The social order of the east "was a gigantic and more or less deformed fragment of the primitive-communal social order within the framework of the slave-holding formation, just as the class of peasants of modern and contemporary times is a deformed fragment of feudalism within the framework of the capitalist order." For Dunn, this perspective is the "kernel of a new theory and suggests a way out of the existing dilemma" (120): it has the potential to provide a resolution of Soviet-Marxist or non-Soviet-Marxist disagreements on the existence or otherwise of the Asiatic mode of production as an evolutionary stage in the historical development of social orders.

But I think that it is much more than this. For all of us, Marxist or otherwise, who are interested in pre-capitalist societies, there is tremendous value here. This approach offers a conceptual framework within which not only Egyptian, Indian, or Chinese early societies, the classic "Asiatic" cases, can be re-examined. It also provides a place for aberrant, not-truly-feudal, no longer really primitive-communalistic, societies such as are represented by the Highland Scots of the fourteenth to early nineteenth centuries. It removes them from the realm of the idiosyncratic, and points the way to a structural analysis of what happened to them: in the case of the Highland Scots, what brought about the socio-economic disintegration which resulted in the tacksman, and later, emigrations.

There have been, to date, two commonly-held, but antithetical, explana-

tions of the Highland clearances. One is the conservative, now "revisionist" position held by Professor Bumsted — echoes of the Soviet *volte face* pointed up in Dunn's book. This reflects the view of the elite who saw "improvement" as essential and inevitable. Whether for personal gain, or from a "philosophical" position, or both, the Highlands had to be "developed." The other is the "view of the people" who were alienated, dispossessed, bewildered, and bereft. These are classic antagonistic positions. But historians have not commonly tried to apply a long-term structural analysis to the Highland clearances. Indeed, what "history" we have has been left all too often to the novelist, the playwright, and the musician. The result, of course, has been romance, mythology, and nostalgia, leading to a sense of something precious that has been lost, and to an emotional, romanticized nationalism. This is not good enough. It results in a polarized literature which fails to get to the root of the problem: the nature of the traditional society.

But the concluding pages of Dunn's monograph point the way to a solution. If we replace the unrefined concept of the Asiatic mode of production with a more flexible construct based on a range of pre-feudal but post-primitive-communalistic societies (which will exhibit a variety of differing characteristics resulting from differing national expressions), and if we then realize that these societies existed in close conjunction with more developed capitalist societies, we are getting closer to a more realistic appraisal of what the situation must have been like. Why did the Highland Scots, or the Irish for that matter, not rise in revolution? In such a situation, Dunn says, the pre-feudal society will not give rise to another stage of development. Its revolution — or resolution — will be purely destructive. In the "Asiatic" case, typically, destruction came through conquest by a contiguous, foreign, more developed society. Do not Wade's roads, wadsets, Culloden,

forfeited estates, the banning of the tartan, the "making of thecrofting community," and so many other features of the death of the clan system, become more theoretically comprehensible if we think of them in this way?

Perhaps. It will take careful, detailed, often micro-level research to substantiate or refute this hypothesis, but it will be a more fruitful avenue of academic exploration than much of what has passed for Highland history to date.

Rosemary E. Ommer

Memorial University of Newfoundland

Willie Orr, *Deer Forests, Landlords, and Crofters: The Western Highlands in Victorian and Edwardian Times* (Edinburgh: John Donald 1982).

BETWEEN THE Napoleonic Wars and World War I the physical face of Scotland and especially the Highland region was altered out of all recognition. The culprit in this profound renovation of the landscape was not so much the ubiquitous sheep of clearance fame, but *cervus elephus*, otherwise known as the red deer. In the hundred years ending in 1914, over 3,500,000 acres of Scotland was converted to deer forest, nearly 3,000,000 of those acres (or 30 per cent of the total land surface) in the five Highland counties of Argyll, Inverness, Ross and Cromarty, Sutherland, and Caithness. In the ongoing fascination with the clearances, this process of afforestation has received little attention from Scottish historians, and Willie Orr's book provides a welcome correction to the situation. The result is a thorough documentation of yet another process by which the small landholder in Scotland, especially in the Highlands, was systematically deprived of land upon which to make a living.

Deer Forests, Landlords, and Crofters unfortunately gives its reader only tantalizing tidbits about the author him-

self. Willie Orr worked for many years as a hill shepherd in the western Highlands, and apparently assumed an academic career only relatively late in life. The book appears to have begun as a dissertation at Strathclyde University, and certainly bears marks of the genre. Orr's sympathies for the small landholder are readily apparent, but he has succeeded in avoiding the worst features of his personal commitments. Unlike much historical writing about the exploitation of the Scottish crofter, this book is written in a low-key deadpan voice which neither whines nor screams. Orr prefers to cumulate his evidence and let the reader provide her or his own sense of outrage. He is, indeed, scrupulously fair to the large landholders, prepared to consider decisions and policy from their perspective and to allow that many were not monsters. He does not attempt to oversimplify the situation, documenting, for example, that most of the contemporary complaints about the agricultural devastations by wandering deer were exaggerated and that the forest holders did attempt to keep the wild animals confined to their habitat with fencing and other devices. While most large landholders were responsible landlords and even within their own assumptions generous ones, the cumulative effect of the actions was, of course, quite irresponsible and unresponsive to the needs of the local population. The author succeeds in making this point without beating it to death. A dispassionate presentation of the evidence without the trappings of ideological rhetoric does still have its place in historical work.

As one might expect, there was a clear relationship between clearing and foresting. As Orr nicely demonstrates, the earlier removal of a population for sheep walks was a necessary step towards the deer forest explosion. Much of the land converted to forests had begun as sheep walk, and was reallocated by the lairds as the economics of sheep altered at the close

of the nineteenth century under pressure from the competition of distant places like Australia and New Zealand. Sheep were introduced because they brought landlords greater revenue than smallholding, and deer replaced sheep because they represented a maximization of revenue. Orr points out that forests reduced employment levels to some extent, but the reductions compared to sheep-farming were not substantial. On the whole, both sheep and deer required a relatively small labour force, and the losses of jobs to the forests was minimal.

Perhaps the most fascinating question discussed in these pages relates to the reasons why deer forests were capable of producing a revenue to the landlord more attractive than other forms of land utilization. At first glance, it would not appear that the private maintenance of large forests for the sole purpose of providing occasional recreation in the form of "shooting" would be economically viable. Obviously conspicuous consumption accounts for a fair degree of the expenditure involved, but one wonders whether this provides a sufficient explanation. Orr's appendices indicate that a number of detailed lists of shooting tenants exist, but they have not been subjected to careful analysis. We need to know more about who was prepared to pay large sums of money for occasional recreational purposes. As the author observes, "so long as Highland proprietors — quite legitimately — chose to maximize their revenue, the expansion of the forests was inevitable." It is still not clear why the high rents which deer forests could provide existed.

Another implicit question concerns the conflict involving conservation, recreation, and local populations which Orr documents but does not attempt to analyze. It is tempting to dismiss the deer forests as the preserves of the wealthy and to postulate a simplistic confrontation between the rich outsiders and the relatively impoverished local population. Unfortunately, the problem is far more

complex. The establishment of recreational facilities available to all or conservation policies of value to all can have the same impact on a local population as the creation of facilities for the few. Deer stalking was not a democratic recreational activity, but wilderness camping has become one. The deer forests have become a major tourist asset to the Highlands, but whether the local populations can benefit from the new developments remains an open question.

In his conclusions Orr pleads for a policy of land use which integrates farming, forestry, stalking, deer farming, and recreation. As he notes, the basis of such a policy must be the emergence of a distinction between ownership and control of the land. It must also involve the establishment of a sense of the needs of local communities. Land control from afar in the interests of larger goods — be they private property or the “national interest” — can lead in curious directions.

J.M. Bumsted
University of Manitoba

Raymond H. Dominick III, *Wilhelm Liebknecht and the Founding of the German Social Democratic Party* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press 1982).

DESPITE THE SECOND PART of the title, this book is the first full-scale political biography of this influential leader of German social democracy which covers the whole scope of his career. The book focuses on the years between Liebknecht's return to Germany in 1861 from exile in London with Marx and the end of the exceptional laws against his party in 1890. No historical treatment of political socialism in this period would be able to avoid Liebknecht's role, but the author's aims are broader than simply writing another history of the party. Even before his death, Liebknecht's importance was

obscured by the special pleading of contemporaries like Kautsky, who stressed his own theoretical acumen at the expense of Liebknecht's. Later, in the historiographical battles arising out of the Cold War, east European historians made him into a proto-Marxist-Leninist, while lamenting his “deviations” from orthodoxy, and western historians tried to prove that he was either only superficially influenced by Marx or an example of how any sort of socialism is the first step on the slippery road to dictatorship.

Dominick attempts to show that neither of these approaches gets us very far in understanding either Liebknecht or the origins of socialism in Germany. He does this by placing Liebknecht in the concrete context of the authoritarian political and social system of nineteenth-century Germany. Hence his study raises questions about the relationship between political democracy and socialist theory, and between party organization and Marxist theory. In dealing with these questions, the author uses a wide variety of unpublished archival material and letters, published collections, Liebknecht's journalism, and parliamentary speeches.

Dominick argues that Liebknecht was an engaged Marxist, that like Marx, he was committed to democratic political values and a revolutionary socialist transformation of society, and that he did as much, if not more, than anyone to propagate Marx's ideas within German socialism. Differences between Marx and Liebknecht were not theoretical but tactical. While convincing, his case is weakened by the cursory attempt to analyze the nature of Liebknecht's debt to Marx, or to present his ideas about Marxism in a coherent fashion. We learn that Liebknecht was most influenced by *Capital* and the *Communist Manifesto*, that Marx's “philosophically more abstruse” theories like alienation and dialectics were a book with seven seals to Liebknecht, that he was mainly interested in Marxism as a theory of economic

exploitation (scarcely discussed) and revolutionary tactics. Although this is all true, it scarcely distinguishes Liebknecht from any of his contemporaries, including Kautsky. This becomes important in the final section of the book, where Dominick explains how Kautsky's version of Marxism, rather than Liebknecht's, was enshrined in the Erfurt Program, without explicating major differences between the two.

By focusing on Liebknecht's pragmatic Marxism, Dominick lays to rest certain simple-minded shibboleths about Liebknecht that had become the stock-in-trade of standard treatments of the origins of social democracy. His alliance with the middle-class, democratic Saxon People's Party in the 1860s and his virulent anti-Prussianism are often seen as a product of his supposed 1848 revolutionary romanticism and lack of concern with social issues when faced with the national question. But his strategy in the unification period was more complex than usually supposed. Like Marx and Engels, he expected Bismarck's reactionary policy would provoke a revolution (at least before 1866), and hence, as Marx had done in 1848, joined with the most advanced section of bourgeois democrats to try and drive them leftward. At the same time, he steadily increased the socialist content of the left-liberal newspaper he edited, hoping thereby to bring the most progressive sections of the People's Party into the International.

He recognized that the German working class was threatened not only by bourgeois democracy, but by the type of state socialism and caesarism which found an inroad into the German working class through the Lassallean tradition. Thus in the late 1860s, he walked a tightrope between the dangers of class collaboration and political accommodation with Bismarck's Bonapartism, and emerged with a new workers' party committed to democracy and socialism.

A second theme concerns styles of

leadership and the leadership role that Liebknecht played, often to the exasperation of Marx and Engels. This is really a question of the relationship between ideology and organization, and expressed itself in such questions as Marx's criticisms of the unity between the two socialist factions, the Lassalleans and Liebknecht's Eisenachers, in his *Critique of the Gotha Program*. That programme was partially authored by Liebknecht. In order to explain Liebknecht's role, Dominick resorts to categories of leadership derived from American social science. Liebknecht, in his view, was an "affective" leader concerned with the internal harmony of the group, whereas August Bebel is defined as an "instrumental" leader concerned with the group's external aims and willing to sacrifice a certain amount of intra-party peace for them. As purely descriptive terms, these categories are useful enough in explaining why the young socialist party in Germany did not fragment the way socialism did in other European countries. They point to the fact that when the party was small and persecuted, before it had developed a bureaucracy and an institutional method of dealing with conflict, Liebknecht could be an effective and important leader. They do not explain, however, why Liebknecht had such a penchant for compromising, and indeed, as Dominick's own flirting with psychological theories at the beginning of the book shows, are fundamentally rooted in an individualistic psychological theory. Dominick's own analysis of the historical situation and what Liebknecht thought he was doing indicate that they may be but decorative branches grafted onto an otherwise healthy tree.

This is shown by his analysis of Marx's and Liebknecht's differences on the Gotha Program. Marx's criticisms are often used as an example of Liebknecht's alleged deficiencies as a theoretician. However, to Dominick, the real issue was not so much correct theory as the relationship between theory and organization.

Liebknrecht argued that organization had to precede theory, while in this case Marx seemed to be arguing the reverse. Their disagreement was rooted in their different evaluations of the Lassallean faction's strength, and Marx's new-found awareness (arising out of the struggle with Bakunin in the International) that too much doctrinal diversity could not be encompassed within a single organization. Without impugning Marx's motives for opposing the unification, Dominick takes Liebknrecht's side. As Marx had earlier thought about British trade unions in the International, ideological clarification could occur after organizational unity. Liebknrecht agreed with most of the points Marx made in his critique, but for the sake of unity compromised on theory. This is important because later revisionists would use Liebknrecht as a precursor for their own position, when his procedure was the opposite of theirs, namely accepting a certain amount of doctrinal lassitude in the short run with the intention of working out a more sophisticated theoretical programme later. Liebknrecht was correct, Dominick argues, in thinking it would be unification on these terms or not at all.

History proved Liebknrecht right when fifteen years later the party adopted the Marxist Erfurt Program. The last two chapters of the book deal with the SPD and Liebknrecht in the 1890s. These are the most purely biographical and weakest sections of the book. His analysis of Liebknrecht's attempts to edit the party's central newspaper, *Vorwärts*, does, however, raise issues that go beyond Liebknrecht's career. In these chapters, Dominick does not seem to have as sure a grasp of the political and ideological issues facing Social Democracy as he does for the earlier period. This leads to some confusion in his analysis, for he reads the party's immobilization and bureaucratization after 1905 into the 1890s. He argues that the major difference between Kautsky's and Liebknrecht's drafts of the Erfurt Program lay not in

their commitment to Marxism, as both were firmly "Marxist," but in the rigid determinism of Kautsky's draft, which presaged a growing tactical paralysis and decline of revolutionary fervour in the party. This ignores the centrality of class struggle in Kautsky's thought in the 1890s and in the Erfurt Program. In that decade, the party had no need to act simply for the sake of changing, especially if that action meant making overtures to the liberal parties and integration into the morass of compromise with the authoritarian state. This was the essential issue behind the famous revisionist controversy at the end of the 1890s, and Dominick's failure to analyze which options Liebknrecht had in responding to the pressures to change the SPD's programme leaves one unclear about just what he thought Liebknrecht's policy in the 1890s should have been. In the end, one is left with the impression that Liebknrecht should have been more open to reformism than he was.

Although one can differ with Dominick on specific points, this is a well-written, lively, and thoughtful analysis of one of the great pioneers of international socialism in the late nineteenth century.

Glen R. McDougall
Simon Fraser University

Jean Lacouture, *Leon Blum*. (New York: Holmes & Meier 1982).

THERE HAVE BEEN a number of scholarly studies of Leon Blum in both French and English. This new biography by the talented French journalist Jean Lacouture, author of biographies of Charles de Gaulle and André Malraux, adds little except details of our knowledge of Blum. There are no revelations and no new interpretations. His account is a bit livelier, more searching, and more revealing of the man than Joel Colton's book, which concentrated on Blum's political career. But we

still do not have a study which brings this extraordinary and admirable figure to life — and perhaps never will since most of his papers were lost during the war.

Blum, the leader of the Popular Front in 1936, was the first socialist, and the first Jewish, prime minister of France. He became a full-time politician only late in life, when he was elected to parliament for the first time in 1919, at the age of 47. The following year he assumed leadership of the Socialist Party. Blum had had earlier careers, first as an intellectual, a literary critic, and secondly as a lawyer, a member of the Conseil d'État, the chief administrative court of France. He brought into his political career qualities he had developed in the first two. Blum had the commitment to truth, personal integrity, and humanistic ideals frequently attributed to intellectuals. And from his career in law he brought a respect for legality, though as the leader of the Socialist Party, competing for support with the Communists, he was forced to express a commitment to revolution, which he characteristically qualified by that curious phrase he liked to repeat: "revolution by any means, including legal." In fact, Blum was as committed to individual rights as his mentor Jean Jaures, who said that if a state which had become socialist moved against the rights of the individual, "against the liberty and dignity of the human being, it would lose its justification for being, for the state only retains its legitimacy to the extent that it secures individual rights."

Blum was one of the three great leaders of the Socialist Party in twentieth-century France. The first, Jean Jaures, was assassinated on the eve of World War I; Blum was condemned to life imprisonment by the Vichy government. Subsequently turned over to the Nazis and imprisoned at Buchenwald, he narrowly missed assassination. The third, of course, is François Mitterand, current president of France, who, opponents predicted, would not remain in office more

than two years. The lot of socialist reformers in France has not been an easy one.

The achievement of all three men was their ability to create successful political coalitions, coalitions first of all among competing socialist groups, and then coalitions between socialists and other left-wing parties. It has always been the formula for success in a crisis-ridden country whose successive regimes have created diverse loyalties; whose powerful sense of class, created by the laws of the ancient regime, was the model for Marx's own belief in class consciousness and class warfare; whose intellectual penchant for theorizing had enabled its writers in the period from 1789 to 1848 to develop most of the theories of social reform that would occupy the western world from that day to this. Compromise was a necessity of life if one were to reform a country with such rigid political loyalties, social distinctions, and intellectual commitments. The problem was how to maintain long-range goals and ideals while making the compromises necessary to achieve political power.

Leaders in such a situation are ordinarily attacked for betraying their ideals in the quest for political power. The traditional criticism of Blum, however, has been exactly the opposite. He is accused of having maintained his moral purity, his commitment to honesty and openness, his opposition to violence, and his respect for legality, at the cost of political effectiveness. He saved his soul by his moral dithering but lost the opportunity to transform France. The criticism was originally made by Colette Audry that Blum, in Sartre's phrase, refused to have "dirty hands." James Joll questioned "whether a man of intellectual honesty, moral principles and personal sensibility can, in fact, ever make a successful politician in the twentieth century." Joel Colton, in his otherwise laudatory biography of Blum, damningly concluded that "in the age of Hitler and lesser tyrants Blum's

integrity shone like a beacon, yet he lacked the ruthlessness to cope with ruthless men." Blum, Colton said,

possessed to an excess the soul searching and self-consciousness of the intellectual in politics. His diffidence and humility in the face of power, despite his unassailable courage and strength of conviction, were not the strongest equipment for statesmanship.

Thus Blum had his share of weaknesses and shortcomings as a political leader. His unbounded optimism, his passion for integrity, his faith in human beings, his desire for wide esteem, his eagerness to serve as conciliator, his sentimental attachment to the effectiveness of an enlightened public opinion, were not the best assets for leadership in any age; in his age, they were fatal flaws.

Lacouture, though less harsh, is in the same tradition: "Blum, so great in his generosity, talent, character, education, and his desire for the common good, was an anachronistic figure. He was not perhaps a man for the time of assassins."

One might well ask, "Who was?" Georges Mandel, one of the most ruthless of French politicians, who was never able to become prime minister, ended up in Buchenwald with Blum, and suffered the fate of assassination that Blum just missed.

The analysis of Blum as typifying the problems of the intellectual in politics is derived from the peculiar image intellectuals have of themselves. It implies that they are more morally sensitive than other people, more committed to ideals, less able to act from self-regarding motives, and less inclined to abuse power to achieve their ends. This is pure myth. It is first of all a slur on every other group in society. Intellectuals are not the unique guardians of virtue, and probably are no more, nor less, moral than members of other groups. Secondly, it is historically wrong. One wonders how the myth of the ineffectuality of intellectuals in politics has been able to survive the examples of Lenin, Trotsky, Mao Tse Tung, and a host of others, who rivalled anyone in ruthlessness. Thirdly, one wonders if the myth

does not serve to justify the abstention from politics of some intellectuals, who can dismiss it as a dirty game, unworthy of the commitment of moral-minded citizens, who would only sully themselves in the fray.

Blum's weakness, if such it was, is not attributable to the fact that he was an intellectual, but to the fact that he was truly committed to humanist ideals, to democratic procedures, to the improvement of the conditions of the workers, and to the well-being of society as a whole. Intellectuals have no monopoly on these ideals. Blum did not really believe in the virtue of revolutions nor of class warfare, nor of the domination of the state by a party, nor of the domination of society by the state. He believed in the potential rationality, creativity, and mobility of every person. The belief may have been utopian, but his achievements were not possible without it. Blum believed, like George Orwell, that "the aim of socialism is not to make the world perfect, but to make it better." The goal of perfection can justify any action; improvement requires a more subtle moral calculus.

An alternative reading of Blum's life might see him not as a pathetic intellectual who failed because he wandered into a treacherous realm, but as an idealist who showed how much could be accomplished by a commitment to ideals. He salvaged the Socialist Party as a democratic alternative after the majority had voted to join the Third International at the Congress of Tours in 1920. He quickly rebuilt the party, outdistancing the Communists by 1924, and preserving a democratic option for France in the 1930s, when many people were convinced that the only alternatives were fascism or communism. Then as prime minister of the Popular Front in 1936 he began the rearmament programme which, by all recent accounts, was beginning to pay off in 1940. He also laid the foundations of the modern welfare state with the social measures passed by the Popular Front government, including

the recognition of collective bargaining, and the right to paid vacations.

Blum showed what could be done despite overwhelming obstacles. As the first socialist, and Jewish, prime minister of France, he was subject to some of the most vicious attacks any politician has ever received in a democratic nation; even before assuming power, he was beaten up in the streets by fascist thugs. But despite divisions in his own party, divisions in the country, and the personal attacks, Blum maintained his course and his commitment to his ideals.

Of course, Blum made many mistakes. He has been criticized for the failure to devalue sooner in 1936, the failure to give public support to the Republican government in Spain, and the failure of his economic policy to revive the economy. But these are not mistakes primarily attributable to his moral sensitivity as an intellectual. Other leaders made mistakes at the time, but because Gamelin was defeated in 1940, we do not infer that generals are congenitally incapable of conducting war; because Sarraut did not react to the German reoccupation of the Rhineland in 1936, we do not conclude that professional politicians cannot govern; because Chamberlain was deceived by Hitler at Munich, we do not assume that businessmen are bound to fail as politicians.

Blum's life illustrates as much the achievements of an idealist as the failures of an intellectual. At this stage of our scholarship, we could use another interpretation of his life, one which examined more closely the man and his ideas, rather than the details of his political career. From this point of view, Blum is still a character in search of an author.

John Sherwood
Queen's University

Carmen Sirianni, *Workers Control and Socialist Democracy: The Soviet Experi-*

ence (London: Verso/New Left Books 1982).

DESPITE THE GROWING number of studies of the works councils' and shop stewards' movements in the period of upheaval surrounding World War I, until now no historian has attempted to write a comprehensive historical analysis of the one movement that went furthest in pursuit of the goal of workers' control over industry. The role of works councils in the Russian revolutions of 1917 has remained little known and little researched, except for a handful of specialized or inaccessible Russian-language studies. Students of the international workers movement will therefore welcome Carmen Sirianni's new work on *Workers Control and Socialist Democracy: The Soviet Experience*, for he has written a long overdue synthesis of what is known of the councils' movement in Russia between 1917 and 1921 as well as a searching analysis of the role of Leninist theory in defining the nature of the socialist transformation of economy and workplace.

Sirianni is a sociologist who has turned to history to investigate, on the basis of a concrete example, a problem of contemporary social and political relevance. Moreover, unlike the empirical emphasis of most historians, Sirianni's subject is chosen with a current theoretical problem in mind. What are the dynamics of the industrial struggle for workers' control? What are the possibilities for workers' control of production during and after a socialist revolution? Can works councils help to establish democratic institutions in industry after the elimination of capitalist control over the economy, and what role can they play in creating a socialist democracy? On a more theoretical level, what are the limits of Leninism in formulating concepts of socialist democracy and workers' control, and how can an historical analysis of the experiences of workers in Russia and other countries in the period around World War I contribute

to a re-evaluation and broadening of Marxist theory?

Sirianni tries to answer these questions by concentrating on three broad subjects. First, he writes a comprehensive analysis of works councils from the Russian revolutions of 1917 to the end of the civil war in 1920-21, paying close attention to the evolution of the councils in 1917 as a centre of dual power in industry; to the relationship of the councils to political parties, labour unions, and soviets; to the role of the councils in reorganizing the economy after the Bolshevik revolution; to the peasant question as it impinged on the realization of workers' control in industry; and to the decline of the councils' movement during the civil war. Sirianni devotes a second section of his study to Bolshevik theory as it related to works councils and workers' control, especially Lenin's understanding of the role of labour in the production process, his theories of the party and the state, and his attempt to introduce a concept of cultural revolution as a counterweight to bureaucratization in the construction of socialism. Finally, Sirianni tries to place the Russian experience in an international perspective by comparing it to movements for workers' control and to the relationship between factory committees and labour unions in other countries.

One of Sirianni's strengths is his ability to place the problem of works councils and workers' control firmly in the overall context of the Russian revolution. In this regard, his attention to the peasantry, in addition to parties, unions, and soviets, is particularly enlightening, for the creation of permanent democratic controls at the workplace was ultimately dependent in an overwhelmingly rural country like Russia on cooperative interaction with the peasants. Equally strong is Sirianni's recognition of the role of ideology in defining and limiting the options open to the Bolsheviks. With all due regard to the effects of war and civil war and to the political and ideological, as well as social and eco-

conomic backwardness of Russia, Bolshevik ideology preconditioned the Bolsheviks to minimize the councils and, after October 1917, to subordinate them to the unions, which were themselves subordinated to the party and the economic organs of the Bolshevik-dominated state. Lenin's highly conventional view of labour unions, his equating of industrial militancy with anarcho-syndicalism, his tendency to argue from the premises of a mechanical economic productivism, and his stress on technological innovation and an increase in the productive forces, all led the Bolsheviks to see the works councils as primarily a tactical weapon in the period of dual power, limited to the regulation and accounting of production. After the Bolshevik revolution, workers' control was systematically restricted on the questionable assumption that, in a workers' state, central planning and management automatically reflected proletarian interests and workplace control was superfluous, even anarchistically detrimental. Bolshevik ideology, like the Marxism of the Second International in general, predisposed the Bolsheviks to postpone the transformation of social relations in the workplace until after the full development of the productive forces, rather than to promote the councils as one possible organ of democratic workers' control during the socialist transformation itself. Sirianni's study benefits, finally, from his emphasis on the need to institutionalize and formalize democratic procedures. He criticizes the Bolshevik view of the proletarian dictatorship as absolute, essentially lawless, power and questions the traditional Marxist view that communist society will concern itself primarily with the administration of things rather than with the governing of people. Rather, Sirianni argues that, even after the victory of the socialist revolution, neither time nor resources will be so abundant that a process of allocation — and hence of political decision-making — will be rendered superfluous, and he underscores

the need to create stable institutions through which such decisions can be made democratically. He avoids equating socialist democracy with parliamentary institutions or the party system as they are known in western Europe and North America but instead analyzes the potential of the new political forms thrown up by the revolution, such as works councils, soviets, and socialist parties. He drives home the point that neither legal changes in ownership nor a single-minded multiplication of the means of production will automatically realize socialism as long as there is no complementary transformation of social relations and political control involving the mass of the working population.

Though generally comprehensive, Sirianni's research would have benefitted from reference to Anna Pankratova's pioneering study of 1923 on *Factory Councils in Russia*, written from a Bolshevik perspective. Sirianni also restricts his analysis of non-Russian councils theorists primarily to Anton Pannekoek and Antonio Gramsci, leaving unmentioned such important works as Karl Korsch's *Arbeitsrecht für Betriebsräte* as well as the three major working-class theorists of works councils, the labour union, and shop steward militants — Robert Dissman and Richard Mueller in Germany and Jack Murphy in Great Britain. Finally, the section on the councils' movement outside of Russia would have been strengthened by a closer examination of Germany, the country where, after Russia, the works councils were most highly developed. Indeed, despite the defeat of the revolution of 1918-19, works councils continued to play a central role in the German revolutionary movement up until June 1924; they re-emerged during the Great Depression as a base of communist union militancy in certain key industries like coal mining; and their legal institutionalization, though in greatly restricted form and subordinated to the

unions, has preserved for them a role in any resurgence of industrial militancy.

Sirianni's conclusions on the potential of works councils in creating a socialist democracy are mixed. On the one hand, the councils could have played a much greater role in tempering the Bolshevik dictatorship, consolidating some elements of democratic workers' control, and broadening the base of the Soviet regime, than the Bolsheviks allowed them. On the other hand, the experience of the councils in both Russia and other countries would seem to show that they function primarily as precursors or later as factory-level organs of industrial unions and lack an autonomous base from which to play an independent role in the building of socialism. Thus, Sirianni's study raises larger questions about the nature of socialist democracy. Could works councils in conjunction with (rather than as alternatives to) industrial unions realize their potential as organs of democratic economic control? Is the tendency of councils to flare up as the focal points of workers' control movements in periods of industrial militancy, only to retreat as mildly reformist organs when such militancy subsides, a sign of their unsuitability as organs of socialist democracy or, instead, evidence of the persistence of workers' demands for industrial democracy and of a continuing potential for the councils in realizing it? Is the bourgeois concept of multi-party democracy, based narrowly on legal equality, atomized individuals, and the separation of the economy from the state, transferable in any way to socialism, or will socialism require an entirely new concept of democracy derived from the unity of political and economic institutions, social equality within a collective, cooperative whole, and a balanced mixture of central planning with workplace control? Sirianni's sober assessment of the Russian works councils rejects them as a panacea for the problems of building a socialist democracy but leaves open the question of what

role they might eventually play in realizing this goal.

Larry Peterson

The Institute for Research in History,
New York

Richard Cornell, *Revolutionary Vanguard: The Early Years of the Communist Youth International, 1914-1924* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press 1982).

THE ENTIRE HISTORY of labour radicalism since World War I has been defined by the fact of the Bolshevik revolution. The World War I and post-World War I period inaugurated a new era in the western capitalist countries: imperialism as a world system, the horror of total war, the incorporation of the workers' movement into the system, modernist revolutions in scientific, intellectual, and artistic life. The inadequacy of traditional social democracy as a tool for independent working-class political action became clearly apparent. Mass revolts at the end of the war and new forms of worker organization provided inspiration for a broad range of revolutionary socialist trends: anarcho-sindicalism, council communism, the ideas of Luxemburg, Gramsci, Lukacs, Korsch, left-feminists such as Kollontai, and those of Lenin himself. Was it inevitable that the anti-reformist left movement be forced into the narrow channel of Bolshevism, with all dissenters being attacked and isolated as agents of the class enemy, many to eventually rejoin mainstream social democracy? Was the "Bolshevization" of the western European left an unfortunate result of Lenin's premature departure from the scene, or was it an inherent part of his approach to the world revolution? How might subsequent world history have been different if the Bolshevik Party had followed the path of conciliation with the other Russian workers' parties in a context of political democracy, if it had

sought to maximize unity with the divergent anti-reformist trends in the west, and if it had been prepared to fight fascism as a worthy goal in itself rather than as a gimmick to increase communist influence?

Richard Cornell provides us with some interesting material in partial answer to these questions. He tells the story of the Communist Youth International from its origins in 1907 within social democracy, to its full incorporation into the Comintern in 1924, as a little-known case example showing "Bolshevization" to be the consistent Russian policy from the time of the Zimmerwald movement during World War I. Relatively unconcerned with the particulars of the CYI and its member organizations, he is trying rather to show that the striving for independence of the young communists in the formative years of the "international communist movement" and the response from the apparatus controlled by Lenin, defined the nature of communism for decades to come. Not until Tito, Mao, and to a lesser extent Togliatti and later Eurocommunism, were independent currents to be successful.

The creation of the International Unions of Socialist Youth Organizations in 1907 began an ongoing dynamic between revolutionary youth yearning for "action" and an independent political role, and adult tutelage which forced it into the role of a recruiting reserve pursuing non-political tasks under party control. The youths' critique of the reformist Second International leadership on the issues of militarism and war, violence versus peaceful means, and the demand for organizational and political independence, brought them into congruence with the interests of the general left in the adult parties and the international.

At the end of the war, young socialists were rightly proud of their defence of internationalism in the light of "social-patriot" treachery. This pride soon became translated however, into a "youth

vanguardism" that saw itself as the defender of the ideological purity of the entire socialist movement. A planned IUSYO conference which would have embraced all anti-reformist trends in 1918 or 1919 came about in November 1919 in Berlin, when the Communist Youth International was formed. The "centre" of the socialist movement was excluded. In part, this was a consequence of the dominant "ultra-left" colouration of the youth movement at the time; but nevertheless the congress was also the scene of attacks by the Russian delegates on anarchism and other trends considered suspect by the Bolsheviks. Although autonomy was still strongly upheld, and the seat of the CYI remained in Berlin, at the same time centralism and discipline under the Comintern and Russian authority were seen as necessary and not in contradiction.

The young communists in the west held longer than others the belief that revolution was imminent, and it was this which justified in their eyes a semi-military discipline nationally and internationally in the communist movement, and Russian-style "democratic centralism." Defence of revolutionary purity was the entrenched mission of the CYI, and the Comintern was naturally seen as the final arbiter of this substance.

The CYI was therefore in a weak position when, in 1920 and 1921, a "Berlin vs. Moscow" split opened up over the role of youth. The CYI activists were blind to the issue of power relations between communist organizations, the need for national independence, democracy nationally and internationally, and a struggle against bureaucracy. Democracy was upheld to defend youth organizations against the parties, but not in relation to views that dissented from Comintern orthodoxy and those parties which upheld it.

In spite of this, youth leader Willi Munzenberg nevertheless cast a wide net in calling together the second CYI congress, which convened eventually in Jena,

Germany. He had had to face stiff Russian opposition to the location (western Europe rather than Moscow), and the myth of youth independence was finally laid to rest when the Comintern intervened to stop the congress, to be resumed after the Third Comintern Congress in Moscow in June 1921. Its obituary was signed by Munzenberg when he failed to protest this heavy-handed interference in the most basic of organizational matters. With the rejection of the leftist "revolutionary offensive" line at the Third Congress, the CYI became considerably less useful, and its independence actually harmful. The CYI congress rubber-stamped the Comintern decisions, the headquarters was moved to Moscow, and Munzenberg left the organization. Needless to say, the result was not what radical socialist youth had been fighting for since 1907.

The rest of the story, to me, is without a great deal of interest, telling the familiar story of Russian mastery of the Comintern under the slogan of "Bolshevization." Examples of Russian interference in Germany, Sweden, and most outrageously in Norway, are reviewed from the angle of the youth organizations. The actualizing of the decisions of the Fourth Comintern Congress (1922), which allowed for non-delegated election to the executive committee, decision-making powers of the ECCI over member parties, and the holding of party and youth congresses *after* Comintern congresses so no one could go to the latter with a mandate, revealed the hidden rewards of the CYI policy of centralization and ideological conformity.

We can use Cornell's rather dry narrative as a jumping-off point for a number of issues in radical strategy and communist history. It provides added raw material for the examination of the "two Marxisms" treated recently by Gouldner, Jacoby, and others. The figure of Munzenberg in particular is one caught between the two worlds occupied by Luxemburg and Lenin. *Revolutionary Vanguard* thus helps us think about the

role of democracy, not only as a means, but also as an end for the left. Can a movement that stifles dissent and non-conformity "before the revolution" offer real liberation afterward? The nightmare of the Stalin period is shown to be already in formation in the first years of the Bolshevik revolution.

Cornell's book also poses the question: are young radicals inherently irresponsible? Cornell argues, wrongly I believe, that the error of early communist youth (and also of the new left and its successors) was in refusing to face reality and work for practical results within the system. Nevertheless, he paints a disturbing picture of youthful self-righteousness which can ignore positive traditions and the need for democracy, in the pursuit of "purity." The practice of denouncing and splitting, upheld to this day as a hallowed Marxist-Leninist method of debate, can be seen to have been largely shaped by the role of youth as the vanguard of Bolshevization.

Finally, there is the place of leadership, exemplified by Willi Munzenberg. With his departure from the CYI in 1921, a false termination is imposed on communist experience. *Revolutionary Vanguard* would have been a more powerful book if it had gone on to examine his later life in the context of his role as marriage broker between "the two Marxisms" within the youth movements. This later life allowed him to carve out an independent and powerful role as the Comintern's "department of public relations" in the west from 1921 to the late 1930s. It was during this period that his earlier attempts to combine revolutionary organization with mass mobilization were actualized. What began as the "International Workers Aid" for the victims of famine in Russia became "a vast complex of famine relief committees and aid organizations, committees of solidarity with strikers, imprisoned socialists, and oppressed colonial peoples, of mobile canteens, children's homes, and holiday settlements, of publishing houses, news-

papers, magazines, film companies and film distribution societies, vocational associations, friendship societies, organizations against fascism and imperialism, organizations far transcending the boundaries of Germany and even of Europe." (Jorgen Schleimann, "The Life and Work of Willi Munzenberg," *Survey* 55, April 1965.)

Whatever Lenin had in mind when he set Munzenberg up in business in 1921, the "Munzenberg Concern" became a successful, independent means of mobilizing progressive sentiment, particularly in the struggle against fascism. Munzenberg's eventual break with the Comintern over its attempts to manipulate the Popular Fronts, over the purges in the Soviet Union, and finally over the Hitler-Stalin pact, allowed him to express politics which Cornell shows to be present from the time of World War I. In working for a new united German socialist party and preparing with others a programme for post-Hitler Germany, he rejected the Soviet Union as a model and demanded the liquidation of the KPD along with Hitler as both representing dictatorship. His death while fleeing the approaching German army in France in 1940 was almost certainly the work of someone acting for the Comintern.

Cornell adds the story of Munzenberg's activity within the youth movement to the existing literature on his time in Berlin and Paris as ambassador-at-large for communism. Given the lack of a biography in English of this fascinating figure, it seems a shame not to have taken the opportunity to follow one thread of opposition to "Bolshevization" through to the time of World War II.

Ken Hansen
Vancouver

Victor Rothman, *Britain and the Cold War, 1941-1947* (London: Jonathan Cape 1982).

VICTOR ROTHMAN'S BOOK provides an extremely useful addition to the vast literature on the Cold War. Until recently most of the studies on this subject have had a decidedly American perspective. This is especially true of the revisionist work of the "new left" historians who have critically reassessed the foreign and domestic policies of the Roosevelt and Truman administrations. Victor Rothman goes a long way towards correcting this situation through a detailed examination of British foreign policy between 1941 and 1947.

The German invasion of the Soviet Union fundamentally altered the policies of the British Foreign Office; now the Russians were wartime allies rather than Nazi collaborators. During the initial stages of the Anglo-Soviet alliance, Churchill, his Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden and the latter's officials were convinced that the U.S.S.R. could not withstand the German Blitzkrieg. Their first aim, therefore, was to sustain the Russian war effort until the United States could be brought into the war. The inability to launch a second front in 1942 placed a serious strain on Anglo-Soviet relations which the British sought to alleviate with various forms of military assistance, including highly sophisticated secret weapons and devices. No territorial concessions, such as a guarantee of Poland's boundaries, were asked for in return for this aid, and no Soviet commitment to the principles of national determination and human rights embodied in the Atlantic Charter were sought. But this was calculated generosity, for British statesmen had few illusions about the motives of Soviet leaders. Stalin's dramatic dissolution of the Comintern in 1943, for example, was regarded by the Foreign Office as "a propaganda measure designed to appeal to public opinion in the United States and to facilitate the British Communist Party's application for affiliation to the Labour Party." (104) Great Britain also feared that the Soviet Union might negotiate a separate peace treaty with Ger-

many. Later in the war the British and Russians argued over the degree of territorial dismemberment and deindustrialization which should be imposed on their vanquished adversary; the "lessons" of World War I convinced British officials that harsh and vindictive peace terms would be a tragic mistake and would lead inexorably to another world war. But difficult though their relationship with the Soviets was, British leaders believed, at least until 1946, that it must be preserved because of a fear of resurgent German militarism "within a foreseeable period after Hitler's defeat." (4)

In many ways the British Foreign Office still acted as if *Pax Britannica* was possible, though there was a strong sense of apprehension about the future. As Under-Secretary Sir Oliver Harvey wrote in July, 1945: "We have many cards in our hands if we choose to use them, our political maturity, our diplomatic experience, the confidence which the solidity of our democratic institutions inspires in the Western World and our incomparable War record. Unlike our two rivals we are not regarded either as gangsters or go-getters but we must do something about it or we shall find we have no partners to play with. Time is not necessarily on our side." (148) His final sentence was perhaps the most perceptive. The October 1943 meeting of Allied Foreign Ministers in Moscow was "the last important occasion when Britain spoke for the West, with the United States accepting a subordinate role." (108) By Yalta, Britain had definitely become a secondary partner — excluded from such important discussions as the conditions associated with Russia's entry into the war against Japan. Of even more significance, given Britain's substantial contribution to the Manhattan Project, was the unilateral decision by the United States to use the atomic bomb against Japan.

Britain was clearly in decline as a great power, but her ability to act as an important liaison between the U.S.S.R.

and the United States was real nonetheless. This was, however, no easy task. American leaders were often uncertain about their goals and inconsistent in their policies. As Rothman notes, in 1944 American Secretary of State Cordell Hull both denounced "greed for territory" as a war aim, while at the same time "declaring territorial issues utterly unimportant compared with the setting up of the United Nations." (111) There was also the grave danger that the United States would retreat once again from Europe, a spectre reinforced by the isolationist lobby in the American Congress and the refusal of either Roosevelt or Truman to make a military commitment beyond the maintenance of the American zone of occupation. The British were particularly anxious that they receive American support for their own involvement in eastern Europe; it was in this region that the first major dispute with the U.S.S.R. was to occur.

One of Britain's wartime commitments was the re-establishment of the London-based Polish government-in-exile. During the early stages of the Anglo-Soviet alliance there seemed to be a possibility that a hard-pressed Stalin would consider an independent Poland. By 1945, however, the death of Polish leader General Ladyslaw Sikorski, the indifference of Roosevelt to the Polish "problem" and above all, the gains of the Red Army convinced Churchill that there was now little chance of preventing the creation of a communist Poland. Churchill's "realism" was also influenced by the British attempts to maintain a presence in eastern Europe through secret negotiations with their ever more powerful Russian ally. Thus, in October 1944, during his celebrated second trip to Moscow, Churchill agreed with Stalin on the need for "British and Soviet spheres of influence in south-east Europe." (129) Four months later, at Yalta, Churchill accepted Stalin's insistence on the forcible repatriation of all prisoners of war who had been

Soviet citizens, a commitment which meant "the complete suppression of humanitarian values in British foreign policy." (140)

In relation to this and other key episodes Rothman provides many new insights into Britain's relationship with the Soviet Union and the United States during a most critical period. Although he views the history of the period from the standpoint of Foreign Office officials, his approach is generally quite successful. What emerges is a fascinating saga of a group of highly-skilled and determined diplomats seeking to guide their political masters through a tumultuous European and world situation in which many of the traditional assumptions of British foreign policy were now anachronistic. His access to hitherto restricted Foreign Office documents provides Rothman with an opportunity to answer some of the important questions which earlier studies of the Cold War had to skirt because of the thirty-year rule. In this regard *Britain and the Cold War* should be used alongside other such recent monographs which had utilized new archival sources, most notably Hugh De Santis, *Diplomacy of Silence: The American Foreign Service, The Soviet Union and the Cold War, 1933-1947*. Although Canada is rarely mentioned in *Britain and the Cold War*, the book provides the essential context in which this country's policies towards the Soviet Union and the United States in the same period must be understood. Of particular interest here is Rothman's account of the increasingly tough line which Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin took towards the U.S.S.R., as Britain moved towards an anti-Soviet alliance with the United States.

Omitted in the sweep of Rothman's book is a discussion of the British, American, and Canadian participation in the creation of the atomic bomb and the debate among them over control of atomic energy in the post-war years. The exclusion of the Soviet Union from the atomic

club, at least until 1949, is also ignored as a factor in the development of the Cold War. Nor do real and imagined reports of Soviet espionage activities receive attention. According to Rothman the major impact of the report of the 1946 Kellock-Taschereau Royal Commission on Espionage was that it provided the British Foreign Office with "some interesting thoughts on what Russia might attempt in western Germany." (253) This seems understated, particularly in light of the American communist "witch-hunts" which were to occur in the United States after 1946. This reader would also have appreciated some comment on the activities of Soviet "moles" in the British Foreign Service and security agencies. These criticisms notwithstanding, this book is a fascinating analysis of a most complex subject.

Donald Avery
University of Western Ontario

Geoff Hodgson, *Labour at the Crossroads* (Oxford: Martin Robertson 1981).

ONE OF THE MOST remarkable features of the current crisis of capitalism, by far the deepest since the 1930s, is the absence of a significant advance in popular support for the left in the west. Stagnation, if not an actual loss of support, has been the order of the day. This is true not only for the revolutionary left (to the point of dissolution in some cases) but also, and perhaps more unexpectedly, for social democratic parties, particularly in those countries where they have a long history.

If this discouraging reality has led some people historically linked with the struggle for socialism, such as Eric Hobsbawm in Britain (see his article in *Marxism Today*, October 1983) or Jim Laxer in Canada, to advance reformist strategies, others have turned to the difficult task of articulating the means

whereby the struggle for socialism can be advanced. It is this task that Geoff Hodgson has undertaken in *Labour at the Crossroads*, a study of the British Labour Party's prospects in light of its defeat by Margaret Thatcher's Tories in 1979.

Hodgson is one of the many British socialists who believe that the most promising — if not the only — route to an effective vehicle for socialist transformation lies through reforming the Labour Party. His book, in essence, is a sustained defence of this belief, notwithstanding the party's 1979 electoral defeat, combining a breadth of analysis and attention to empirical evidence which make it the most significant statement of this position since Ken Coates' article in the 1973 *Socialist Register*.

Hodgson's defence involves two separate but not unrelated arguments. One concerns the nature of the party's weaknesses and the prospects for overcoming them. He begins by arguing that the Labour Party by 1918 was an avowedly socialist working-class party whose ensuing reformism was caused by structural (rather than congenital) defects — particularly the substantial powers accorded its parliamentary caucus — traceable to the *de facto* division of labour between the party itself and its trade union base. "Labour Party policy has been corrupted less through the adoption of reformist and other inadequate ideologies than through the operation of this institutional power." (35)

Hodgson then challenges Ralph Miliband's argument that the 1945-51 Attlee government was the "climax of labourism" followed by steady decline ideologically, electorally, and in terms of working-class involvement, with its implication that transforming the party is a pointless if not impossible task. This, he argues, is too simplistic and fails to consider the counteracting processes of renewal arising from the party's link to the working-class movement, backing his argument with a wealth of empirical evi-

dence. Above all Hodgson points to the re-emergence of a labour left in the late 1960s, led by Tony Benn and Stuart Holland, and traces the growth of its weight in the party and particularly its success in radicalizing the party's economic growth.

Finally Hodgson assesses the 1974-79 Labour government and its legacy. Its defeat, he argues, while serious should not be viewed as an epochal one, signalling a right-wing populist revolt against the welfare state, citing opinion polls showing that Labour's support in 1978 was as high as in any year of a Labour government since 1966. "Labour lost because it first abandoned and then chose to confront its base among the working class." (122)

Indeed, Hodgson suggests that there are grounds for cautious optimism concerning Labour's electoral future. Labour's reforms facilitating unionization early in its term, together with its later break with post-war consensus economic policies left Britain more polarized and "class-divided than at any time since the war." (137) If Labour is to regain office in the 80s, however, he argues, it must find a way of solving Britain's economic crisis while maintaining the support of its working-class base.

This leads to Hodgson's second argument for working to transform the Labour Party — the economic programme of the Labour left. These are the policies developed by Benn, Holland, and others and adopted by the Labour Party in the early 70s which are now known (since the 74-79 Labour government rejected them) as the Alternative Economic Strategy (AES). The AES calls for orthodox Keynesian reflation plus a sharp extension of state economic involvement (selective nationalizations and some form of control on investment, trade, and prices) and industrial democracy.

Hodgson first defends the AES as a means for reviving the British economy based on a detailed analysis of the British crisis. He argues that recovery depends

upon increasing Britain's historically low level of productivity and that the AES can accomplish this insofar as it entails a progressive reform of the principal cause of this low productivity — the social relations of production. Secondly, Hodgson argues that the AES also provides a means of moving towards socialism. While incomplete, it substantively entails socialist measures of democratic control of the economy, and strategically combines extra-parliamentary mobilization with parliamentary measures, thus being consistent with the "dual strategy" he holds appropriate in advanced capitalist societies. Hodgson concludes his book with an urgent appeal for support in the struggle to complete the task of reform underway. "The threats are real and with us now. But so, too, are the instruments of change waiting to be seized." (227)

Are they really? However thorough Hodgson has been in constructing his defence, the arguments are not convincing. To begin with, while Hodgson may well be correct to deny that the 1979 defeat was the beginning of the end for the Labour Party, he seems to have underestimated its seriousness. Labour's loss of support in 1978-79 may have appeared to be a sudden one, but only because its support from the "middle classes" was increasing from 1974-78. Meanwhile Conservative support among trade union members — the base for Hodgson's future scenario — was increasing from 23 to 36 per cent. (121) This rightward shift was fully revealed in the 1983 election when, with the newly formed Social Democratic Party in the race, Labour's support plummeted to below 30 per cent, virtually ruling out the prospect of a Labour government in the 80s.

Hodgson is on firmer ground as regards the prospects for the Labour left whose continued advance in the early 80s led Miliband himself to admit that the possibility of transforming the party was at least "more open than I had believed."

(*Socialist Register* 1983, 117) But the real issue isn't the "possibility" of transforming the party, which can have no *a priori* answer; it is the Labour left and its strategy. Hodgson's reference to "the instruments of change waiting to be seized" quoted above is most revealing. It is a strategy of "capture" predicated on the assumption that gaining control of the party is tantamount to capturing its base of support — an assumption that Hodgson's depiction of Labour as an "avowedly socialist" party, corrupted less by its ideology than its structure, is designed to make credible.

This is questionable to say the least. The 1983 election saw right-wing Labour Party leaders publicly repudiate certain party policies — a reflection of the left's advance since 1979 much more than actual changes in policy per se — signalling that the right's commitment to reformism was rather greater than its commitment to the party. This commitment, moreover, is one which is shared by much of the union leadership. Hodgson notes that it was with reformist objectives in mind that the unions created the Labour Party as their parliamentary wing in the first place, and he is too honest a scholar to suggest that objectives of many present union leaders are substantially different.

Consequently, it is virtually inconceivable to transform the party without alienating a substantial element of its support (and dividing the unions along ideological lines at least for the foreseeable future). While this might prove to be more of a shortcut to a mass socialist party than beginning anew, it is patently not the shortcut envisioned by the majority of the Labour left and they demonstrated this by lining up behind the Kinnock-Hattersley "dream ticket" at the 1983 Labour Party Conference.

Finally, there is the question of Hodgson's defence of the AES. The efforts of the British left to address the whole issue of what economic policies a government bent on a socialist project

might develop is surely to be applauded. But to suggest that the economic wounds British and foreign capital would inflict in retaliation against such a government can be salvaged by turning on the workers' control tap — that many if not most workers wouldn't pay a considerable price for economic and political power — is to pander to reformism rather than to address its limits. In this respect it seems more pressing to articulate a long-term socialist vision rather than short-term policies, and a political strategy to unify and mobilize the working class rather than the economic programme that could be implemented in the event that this occurs. Hodgson does recognize these issues in his final chapter and it is unfortunate that they weren't developed more. In sum, however remote the possibility of a Labour government in the 1980s, the possibility that it will be bent on a socialist project is virtually non-existent.

Donald Swartz
Carleton University

Peter Richardson, *Chinese Mine Labour in the Transvaal* (London: Macmillan 1982).

FACED WITH A labour crisis, and anxious to recover from the losses of the South African war, the Witwatersrand gold mining industry implemented its so-called Transvaal experiment. Between May 1904 and November 1906, 63,695 indentured Chinese labourers embarked for the Rand mines. Employed on three-year contracts, the overwhelming majority of these men came from the northern provinces of China. Only a tiny minority — in all, 1,689 of the total number — came from the traditional recruiting grounds for emigrant labour in southeast China.

Before this scheme could be implemented, however, the mining industry had to allay the fears of business, labour, and farmers. The industry made provisions to ensure that the Chinese would not pose an economic threat. Thus

the imported labour would be used exclusively for "the exploitation of minerals" within the Witwatersrand district, and then repatriated. While in southern Africa, the miners would be legally excluded from the skilled trades, and prohibited from engaging in any form of market gardening.

Peter Richardson sets the introduction of Chinese labour in South Africa within the larger context of the international political economy. He ties the circulation of Chinese labour to the development of metallurgical mining and the global expansion of capitalism during the nineteenth century. *Chinese Mine Labour in the Transvaal* is an economic history of the Transvaal experiment. It is a detailed account of the workings of the mining industry's labour policy from its inception to its withdrawal. Unlike Watt Stewart's earlier study of Chinese labour in Peru, Richardson's work is less impressionistic. The latter considers the Chinese labour question from the industry's perspective. Thus, Richardson speaks of labour as a commodity rather than as people, and explains the South African experiment in terms of supply and demand, working capital, costs, and risks. Richardson is at his best discussing the origins and nature of the crisis which threatened the gold mining industry, and how the industry in turn dealt with that threat.

Social historians with a special interest in Chinese emigrants will, on the one hand, be disappointed with Richardson's book because it reveals little about the miners' own experience. His passing references to labour unrest, Chinese crimes, floggings, "the crisis of social control," and widespread desertion will titillate their interest but not satisfy their curiosity. On the other hand, they will appreciate the thoroughness of his research in bringing into focus the relationship between industry and the state in mobilizing labour on an international scale, the mechanisms of coolie recruitment, and the structural factors which

governed the Chinese labour market. His analysis of the different fortunes of recruiting in the north and south is a careful consideration of local politics, the peasant economy, the transportation system, and historical circumstance. Indeed, in one propitious stroke the Russo-Japanese war eliminated emigration to Manchuria, the single most important source of competition for the South Africans in the north. Although the Transvaal experiment and attendant emigration processes were heavily regulated, the coolie system was inherently exploitative, and subject to abuses. Reconstructing the organization of the coolie trade, the author shows how the miners were exploited even before setting foot in South Africa. In short, Richardson has addressed a complex historical problem, and not merely rehearsed the superficial push-pull factors in presenting a reductionist analysis of coolie emigration.

As it happened, the Transvaal experiment was short-lived. The victory of the Liberals in Britain, and the *Her Volk* party in the Transvaal spelled its termination. By then, however, the crisis had passed, and the mining industry replaced the departing Chinese with African contract labour. Although the trial ended just as the Chinese labour force was reaching its maximum efficiency, Richardson argues that "the employment of indentured labour, far from being a phenomenon associated with decaying or transitional forms of capitalist enterprise, actually became the means of continuing and accelerating the process of accumulation in an advanced capitalist industry in a colonial setting." (189) While his assertion may hold true for the Transvaal, it must be tested for application elsewhere.

The shortcoming of this narrowly-focused study is that it relegates the social and political aspects of the Chinese labour issue to the background. Consequently, we are left with an uneven treatment of the Chinese question. Although the author

does briefly discuss Chinese labour in the context of British domestic politics, he presupposes that his readers are conversant with the issue in South Africa and British imperial history. Hence, he tends to leave things unsaid. For instance, it is unclear why the imperial authorities relented to Milner's lobbying and negotiated the agreement with the Chinese government when Chinese labour was so unpopular. Nor are we told much about popular opinion at the local level in the Transvaal. Richardson tends to underplay opposition to the scheme within the industry. He gives us the impression that it was only a matter of time before economic imperatives would prevail, and force the opposition to support the Chinese measure. He neglects to mention Colonel F.H.P. Creswell's "white labour policy," and perhaps underestimates its support.

The book also lacks an adequate conclusion, and Richardson does not draw his analysis together, putting it in perspective. The importation of Chinese labour appears as an isolated episode, its historical significance obscure. Richardson fails to relate the Transvaal experiment to the evolving colour bar in South Africa. He should have emphasized that the legal restrictions, which barred the Chinese from a range of work on the basis of race, were subsequently applied to Africans. He could have stressed that indentured labour served to reinforce racial segregation and widened the wage disparity between skilled and unskilled labour. Finally, as a footnote, it should be noted that Canada excluded Chinese immigration in 1923, not earlier as Richardson states. These criticisms notwithstanding, this book makes an important contribution to our understanding of Chinese indentured labour.

T. Jin Tan
Ontario Institute for
Studies in Education

Mikiso Hane, *Peasants, Rebels and Outcasts: The Underside of Japan* (New York: Pantheon Books 1982).

THIS IS A WELCOME book. As the author Mikiso Hane rightly notes in his preface about western scholarship on Japan, "The literature on political, economic, social, intellectual, and cultural developments in modern Japan is copious, but relatively little has been written about the actual experience of ordinary people." (xi)

The greatest strength of Hane's study is its translated selections from writings and oral recollections of ordinary people who participated in or observed "the underside of modern Japan" from the middle of the nineteenth century until the present. These interesting first-hand accounts are important to the English-language student of modern Japanese history because they are not found elsewhere. Indeed, the subjects of this book — peasants, factory workers, coal miners, outcasts, prostitutes — are almost invisible in most English-language textbooks and monographs about modern Japan. This invisibility exists in spite of the fact that in Japan many scholars, journalists, and writers have been and continue to be extremely interested in the experience of the human beings who paid the price of the seemingly "miraculous" modernization of Japan. *Peasants, Rebels and Outcasts* introduces general readers to the work of some of these Japanese scholars, journalists, and writers and for this, too, one is grateful.

Nevertheless, in its eagerness to tell a story which has previously been neglected and with its regrettable lack of an analytical framework, this book is filled with overemphasis which both distorts and oversimplifies. The description of the lives of peasants during the Tokugawa period (1600-1868) as minutely regulated by the samurai class (7) is only half of the picture. Internal autonomy in many farming villages which were ignored by their lords as long as they paid their taxes was

also a fact of Tokugawa peasant life. The stress placed upon the moral textbooks in post-1890 public elementary schools as indoctrinators of mindless national chauvinism (58-59) produces a similarly unbalanced portrait because it omits consideration of the often very different messages in the Japanese language readers. Yet Japanese school children spent many hours each week studying their language readers while morals lessons were held only once a week.

In the same vein, Hane's insistence upon the male head of the family as the "decisive voice" in family affairs (68-9, 79) underplays the tradition that those in senior positions of authority and power at least consult and receive passive consent from their inferiors, especially juniors and subordinates within the family. Indeed the book is marred by one-sided, stereotypical sketches of Japanese family life. Sometimes Hane's own evidence intrudes upon these sketches: for instance, a quotation on page 81 suggests that the real power within the family could sometimes be not the oppressive mother-in-law or husband but the young wife, pictured elsewhere as a totally helpless victim.

Distortions and oversimplification also arise from incomplete information. Mention is made of left-wing doctrinal issues and leadership struggles which contributed to the defeat of tenant union struggles (111) and of organized outcast activism. (162) Yet no details of these are given and the reader is left with little more than the old cliché about left-wing factionalism as a "cause" for "failures" in left-wing organizing. The claim that the poor in the countryside were worse off than the poor in the cities because the latter enjoyed "cultural and technological conveniences of modern civilization" (38) is weakened by a failure to spell out just what these conveniences were. The claim may be reasonable, but since Hane elsewhere mentions (190) the government medical survey of 1913 which found that

the incidence of fatal death and disease was higher among (often urban) textile factory workers than it was among the population at large (including the rural population), concrete support for his claim must be put forward.

There are also too many unsubstantiated conclusions in the volume. Too often conclusions emerge from assumptions rather than analysis. For example, there is the conclusion that work in the early twentieth-century textile factories was easier than farm work during the same time period. (80) It appears to rely rather heavily upon the recollections of elderly, former factory workers who, as the author correctly points out, not only survived the factory system but have reached an age from which they can afford to look back nostalgically upon the youth they spent within the factory. Hane says that, "The girls in the silk plants evidently dreaded more than anything else the thought of being sent back to the farm" (180) and quotes a silk reeler's song on this theme. But he makes no mention of the many, many textile workers' songs which expressed hatred of their factory work and of their factory bosses — although many such songs are collected in the source which contains the song he cites.

It is implied that family size and perhaps population increased during the Meiji period (1868-1911) because abortion and infanticide were made crimes. (209) Yet I can find in the book no statistics or other data comparing family size or analyzing population increases over time. Such omissions often cloud the significance of the information we are given. We are told the absolute number of deaths in coal mines during selected years but are not given deaths in terms of percentages of total miners killed. We learn that there were women as well as men working in the mines but are left in ignorance regarding the percentage of the coal mining force which was female.

The lack of context of so much of the

discussion is particularly irritating because it undermines the very good points the author sometimes makes. He quite properly reminds us that illiteracy among rural girls of school age remained a serious problem well into the twentieth century. His observation that farm girls' school attendance was low up to the turn of the century is true in comparison to the following: 1) their later rates of attendance; 2) 100 per cent attendance; 3) the attendance of farm boys during the same period. However in any reasonable international comparative context these "low" rates do not seem low at all. In support of his refutation of claims that illiteracy was almost gone from rural Japan by the early years of the twentieth century he calls upon statistics which give 1897 country-wide elementary school attendance for girls as 50.9 per cent of the female school-aged population and for boys as 80.7 per cent of the male school-aged population. (272) Yet those same statistics report that in 1903 the percentage of girls attending school was 89.6 and that of boys was 96.6. (272) What happened between 1897 and 1903? Hane never tells us.

There are flaws in this book, and one wishes the author had employed more analytical skill. Still, as a corrective to those numerous studies of the tip of the pyramid of modernizing Japan which concern themselves only with leaders and elites, *Peasants, Rebels and Outcasts* is worth its weight in gold.

E. Patricia Tsurumi
University of Victoria

Eric Fry, ed., *Rebels and Radicals* (Winchester, MA: Allen & Unwin 1983).

THESE DOZEN ESSAYS span the history of Australian protest from the earliest days of settlement up to World War I. It is a mixed bag covering a wide variety of experience and writing talents.

The collection starts with the history

over more than a century of the dispossession of the aboriginal settlers. This was carried out with varying degrees of brutality and by practices ranging from direct extermination to more subtle forms of "hegemony." Both methods were tried out in Tasmania. Lieutenant-Colonel Arthur attempted to drive the aboriginal remnants into the sea in the 1830s, but later found a charismatic parson to win them to Christianity and a slower form of extinction on an island in the Bass Straits. Among the aboriginal rebels two are recorded here: the first, Musquito, was hanged after leading attacks on white settlements; and the second, named Major, a leader of black guerrillas in western Australia, was shot by the police in the Kimberleys in 1908.

A second group of protesters is taken from the British and Irish convicts, of which over 160,000 were settled in different parts of Australia between 1789 and the mid-1860s. In their case, the selection of rebels has been more difficult to determine. It is one thing to draw up a list of protesters from among the many thousands sentenced to transportation by the Middlesex and Dublin assizes, but quite another to select suitable candidates for the title once they had arrived in the colony. But within the convict community itself there was little doubt: they counted their heroes not among machine-breakers or political radicals but among those who most boldly defied their jailers or experienced the most daring escapes out of the bush. Such a man was Ralph Entinistle, sentenced for larceny at Lancaster in 1827, who, after several years as an assigned government servant, became a rebel and a fugitive after being unjustly flogged. He was caught, tried, and hanged outside Bathurst Jail a few months later. There was also Frank McNamara, a native of Wicklow who, after delighting his fellow convicts in Sidney with his repeated defiance of authority, became a bush ranger and left a legendary record as a "poet in revolt."

With the exception of western Australia, the early 1850s brought convict settlement, and therefore military government, to an end. In consequence, the remaining eight chapters concern the activities of men and women engaged in a different struggle — the struggle for responsible self-government, a fuller democracy, socialism, feminism, and the rights of women. Every reader will have the right to assess the value of these chapters. For myself I was particularly moved by the extraordinary career of the Irishman, Dan Denichy, who almost single-handedly waged a sustained and determined battle for a more democratic

constitution; and who, several years after his death, was acclaimed as "one of the truest democrats that ever lived." Other notable portraits are those painted by Don Baker of John Dunmore Lange and Eric Fry of Monty Miller, "Australian worker," tireless marcher, and champion of socialist principles. His death in 1920 concludes the volume.

These dozen portraits deserve study because against the background of Australia's more familiar history, "they reveal the other side of the story."

George Rudé
Concordia University