Labour/Le Travailleur

Labour and Politics in Canada and Australia: Towards a Comparative Approach to Developments to 1960

Terry Irving and Allen Seager

Volume 38, 1996

URI: https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/llt38art10

See table of contents

Publisher(s)

Canadian Committee on Labour History

ISSN

0700-3862 (print)
1911-4842 (digital)

Explore this journal

Cite this article

Irving, T. & Seager, A. (1996). Labour and Politics in Canada and Australia: Towards a Comparative Approach to Developments to 1960. *Labour/Le Travailleur*, *38*, 239–277.

Article abstract

This chapter seeks to move the discussion of labour and politics beyond the contest of political ideologies in the movement and the constraints of the liberal democratic state. To explain the different political histories of the Australian and Canadian movements we use a model with three dimensions: the changing balance between labour and politics; the different social forces that labour seeks to represent; and the different conceptions of politics that labour holds. After a discussion of the literature on labour and politics in the two countries, the paper applies this model to distinguish two periods, a formative period up to the early 1920s, in which labour entered politics, and the period from the 1920s to the 1950s when parties or governments took politics into the labour movement. The model enables us to characterize the politics of the Australian Labor Party as a form of class-based labourism, with significant moments of working-class socialism. We characterize the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation/New Democratic Party as a form of populist socialism. The paper concludes with some insights gained from using a common model in a comparative exercise.

Labour and Politics in Canada and Australia: Towards a Comparative Approach to Developments to 1960

Terry Irving and Allen Seager

IF THE CONSTITUTIONAL bedrock of Canadian and Australian politics is quite similar, the institutional landscape has always been quite different. The most significant point is that the Antipodean labour parties were among the first and most successful in the world. Australian federalism, unlike the earlier Canadian experiment, which depended solely on the political genius of the colonial bourgeoisie, evolved in a context of extraordinary class contention which propelled workers' representatives into positions of significant political authority before the turn of the century. In 1910 the first Australian Labor Party (ALP) majority governments were elected. By the 1920s a rich and indigenous debate about the meaning of political power informed the workers' movement in Australia,[1] while Canadians were still engaged in primordial pursuit of "a political party for labour."[2] Such a party (commonly known as the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation — New Democratic Party or CCF-NDP) was eventually built, but has never governed outside the provinces. Canadian Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau once likened labour's representatives in the House of Commons to "seagulls, squawking and

[1]For a key document of Antipodean labour history see Vere Gordon Childe, *How Labour Governs — A Study of Workers' Representation in Australia* (1923; Melbourne 1964).
[2]Kenneth McNaught, "J.S. Woodsworth and a Political Party for Labour, 1896-1921," in Donald Swainson, ed., *Historical Essays on the Prairie Provinces* (Toronto 1970), 230-53. Problems of how — and where — "labour governs" in Canada have been most recently addressed in Norman Penner, *From Protest to Power: Social Democracy in Canada, 1900 to the Present* (Toronto 1992).

Terry Irving and Allen Seager, "Labour and Politics in Canada and Australia: Towards a Comparative Approach to Developments to 1960," *Labour/Le Travail*, 38 (Fall 1996)/*Labour History*, 71 (November 1996), 239-77.

squealing above the ship of state, [but] pretending to steer it."[3] No one, even allowing for partisanship, would have ever described Australia's Prime Ministers Hawke or Keating in exactly those terms.

Inflections of these divergent pasts can still be heard today. Mike Moore, former leader of the New Zealand Labour Party, articulated well the common sentiment of Antipodean labour leaders when he said in 1993: "I do not want a narrow Labour Party. I want a Labour Party in New Zealand that looks like New Zealand, that reacts in any given situation as ordinary New Zealanders."[4] During the same year, Bob White, president of the Canadian Labour Congress, expressed a considerably more modest political ambition with a significantly different logic: "Ultimately most people realize that a lot of decisions are made in the legislatures and parliaments of Canada and [that] we should have a voice in there."[5] Despite these institutional differences, however, there are certain common programmatic themes in the history of labour and politics in the two countries. Liberal assumptions and strategies were of key importance in shaping labour's political interventions and institutions. On the other hand, distinctly anti-bourgeois ways of talking about and practicing democracy were common in the formative years and not unknown thereafter. The periodization of labour and politics is similar in the two countries. Indeed, we conclude in the 1960s because we wish to acknowledge a major watershed in the broader history of the political left in both countries: between oppositional currents rooted in the primacy of class, and the more diffuse objectives of the new social movements. If language is important, and we do agree that it is, it is clear that more recent political challenges to hegemony have not embraced a *lingua franca*, and that the political language of class indeed belongs to history in Canada or Australia.

Most of the writing in the two countries about "labour and politics" has concentrated on the parties and ideologies of the labour movement — labour politics. While this paper will have this focus, it will also do more. At the outset it is essential to make the distinction, which is customary in the labour movement, between "labour" and "politics," the former referring to trade unions and the latter

[3]Quoted in Bryan D. Palmer, *Working-Class Experience: the Rise and Reconstruction of Canadian Labour, 1800-1980* (Toronto 1983), 292. For a more sympathetic view, similarly inclusive of recent themes, see Alan Whitehorn, *Canadian Socialism: Essays on the CCF-NDP* (Toronto 1992).

[4]*Sydney Morning Herald*, 2 December 1993.

[5]This was of course uttered in the context of a severe questioning of by-then traditional political strategies within the house of labour in the wake of the near obliteration of the CLC-endorsed NDP in the October 1993 federal election, as well as bitter disputes between various unions and the Rae NDP government in Ontario. See "Union members refuse to give support to NDP," *Globe and Mail*, 17 November 1993. For discord within Mr. White's own union see Jay Casey, "Why CAW Local 222 [Canadian Auto Workers, Oshawa: membership 23 000] dumped the NDP," *Canadian Dimension*, May/June 1993, 11-5.

to governments or to parties that want to govern. It is a distinction well known to political science and industrial relations.[6] It allows us to see labour and politics as having a dynamic inter-relationship. There will be moments when one side is proactive and the other reactive: when labour enters politics, and on the other hand when governments or parties colonize the labour movement. This paper acknowledges that "causation can move in both directions" in the relationship between labour and politics.[7] In very broad terms, the periodization of labour and politics in the two countries reflects the changing balance within this relationship.

In the study of labour politics the main dynamic is often seen as a contest between the rival world-views of liberalism and socialism. This has illuminated the big picture but often at the expense of the details. Starting with the idea of a relationship between "labour" and "politics," however, we are reminded of the importance of power in a structural sense. There are questions about what social forces labour represents as it enters politics, and how power is organized in society, or in other words the kind of political game that labour is seeking to enter. However it is possible to focus not just on the big picture of "liberalism versus socialism" but on currents in the labour movement that have worked with a liberal pluralist model of social power but have occupied different political spaces because they sought to express different social forces, for example organized workers, the working class, or the people. There is a basis now for distinguishing the lib-lab politics that sought to express the interests of certain unionists from the labourist politics that sought to speak for the working class within a liberal political system. It is also possible to distinguish both from the labour populism that gripped sections of Australian labour from time to time.

In a similar way, this paper can take a model of social power more associated with socialism, a model emphasizing structural contradictions between classes, and discover the basis of political differences in terms of whether socialists thought they were representing organized labour, the working class, or the people. In both Canada and Australia syndicalist socialism, absolutely opposed to parliamentarism, was strong in the 1910s, based on labour organized along industrial lines. By contrast, there were moments when the ALP pursued socialist policies in government, on behalf of the working class. In Canada the populist socialism of the CCF-NDP has always been a point of tension with organized labour, and more so with advocates on the Left of working-class politics.

This paper approaches the task of comparison with a specific model of the interactions of labour and politics (see the table appended to this chapter). The model incorporates the notion of the changing balance of labour and politics and a common typology of forms of labour politics. The paper that follows has two parts.

[6]Ross M. Martin, *TUC: the growth of a pressure group, 1868-1976* (Oxford 1980); Ross M. Martin, *Trade Unions in Australia*, second edition (Ringwood 1980).

[7]The idea comes from Charles C. Lemert, ed., *Intellectuals and Politics — Social Theory in a Changing World* (Newbury Park 1991), ix.

First there is a discussion of the literature on labour and politics. A particular point is made of the way the literature focuses either on ideology or social forces as the basis for labour politics. Second there is a sketch of the periodization of labour politics, concentrating first on "labour-in-politics," in particular the class alliances of the formative years up to the first labour or labour-influenced governments in the 1910s and early 1920s, and the gradual shift to "politics-in-labour," that is the political struggle inside the working class from the 1920s through to the 1950s.

1. *The literature on labour and politics*

The historical literature on the politics of the labour movement, in the broadest sense, is co-extensive with that of labour history as a whole. The creation of a labour movement involves a rearrangement of power relations not only between labour and capital but within the working class itself. This paper concentrates on a selection of studies in which there is an underlying conception of the relationship between labour and politics. In each case, this theme, whether explicit or implicit, is an organizing principle of the work.

One way of cutting the labour and politics cake is to extract those works that concentrate on the study of ideology. The work of Louis Hartz and his followers calls for immediate attention in this respect, not just because it is typical of the philosophical idealism so often found in studies of labour and politics, but because it also provides a framework for the comparative analysis of Canada and Australia. In the Hartzian "fragment theory," the ideological development of "new societies" (those settled by invaders from Europe) is cut short by the process of fragmentation from the mother country. Each new society is only a fragment of the full ideological spectrum of Europe, and without the dynamic provided by that spectrum the new society is frozen "at its point of origin." Thus, according to Hartz, French Canada is a feudal fragment of Europe, English Canada a liberal fragment, and Australia a radical fragment.[8] Immediately, a point of similarity between Canadian and Australian labour politics is apparent: neither, according to the Hartzians, could develop a fully-blown socialist ideology or (since ideas are the stuff of politics for philosophical idealists) a socialist politics. On the other hand, the fragment thesis also predicts dissimilar histories for labour politics in the two countries, with labour in English-speaking Canada succumbing to bourgeois liberalism (exemplified according to Kenneth McRae by the formation of the NDP in 1961), whereas labour in Australia could never advance beyond the radical but atheoretical politics of

[8]Louis Hartz, ed., *The Founding of New Societies* (New York 1964). See the chapters by Kenneth McRae on Canada, and Richard Rosecrantz on Australia. Hartz had earlier formulated a version of the fragment thesis for the United States see, *The Liberal Tradition in America* (New York 1955).

trade unionism (an idea which appealed to "new left" writers, who called it "labourism").[9]

It would be wrong to exaggerate the influence of the fragment thesis among labour historians in the two countries. It was, rather, a familiar and parallel mind-set that lubricated their own preoccupation with "exceptionalism": many radical historians in Canada and Australia have seen the development of socialist class-consciousness in the fashion of the European working class as the desired outcome of labour politics, an outcome which their working classes had yet to attain. On the other hand, the historical record undermined the empirical validity of the fragment thesis. In Canada, Gad Horowitz, while working within the Hartzian framework, nonetheless insisted on the ideological diversity of English Canada and hence the legitimacy of Canadian socialism.[10] In Australia, Allan Martin dented the radical tradition by showing the leading role of urban liberals in the middle of the 19th century (when the radical fragment supposedly congealed) and the initiatives of the social liberals in Labor's "golden age" of state and nation-building before World War I.[11]

The discovery of liberalism in the labour movement did nothing to weaken the preoccupation with ideology as the main way of organizing the discussion of labour and politics, even on the Left.[12] Robin Gollan's *Radical and Working Class Politics* was influential in this regard. Gollan argued that "the Labor party had become firmly established as a party with a liberal rather than a socialist theory" by 1910. There were many young left-wing historians who built on this conclusion, often without acknowledgment to Gollan.[13] Also there were many right-wing "revision-

[9]Kenneth McRae, "The Structure of Canadian History," cited in G. Horowitz, *Canadian Labour in Politics* (Toronto 1968), 9; for labourism see discussion below.

[10]Horowitz, *Canadian Labour*, 9, 24.

[11]Allan Martin, "Australia and the Hartz 'Fragment' thesis," *Australian Economic History Review*, 13 (1973), 131-47. For other discussions of Hartz in relation to Australia see, Brian Head, "Political Ideas and Institutions," in James Walter, ed., *Australian Studies — A Survey* (Melbourne 1989); and T. Rowse, "Political Culture: a Concept and Its Ideologues," in G. Duncan, ed., *Critical Essays in Australian Politics* (Melbourne 1978).

[12]This is so despite the attempt by some political scientists to define parties and the party system as forms of behaviour; see "Introduction" by A.W. Martin and R.S. Parker in P. Loveday, A.W. Martin and R.S. Parker, eds., *The Emergence of the Australian Party System* (Sydney 1977). Explaining political science's fascination with ideas as a way of discussing Australian party politics, while the rest of academia deplores the pragmatic nature of Australian culture, would repay investigation.

[13]R.A. Gollan, *Radical and Working Class Politics: A Study of Eastern Australia, 1850-1910* (Melbourne 1960); the 'New Left' historians of the 1970s would criticize Gollan for his inadequate theorization of class, but they were content to accept his account of the liberal Labor party (although scornful of its supposed lack of revolutionary faith). See R.W. Connell, *Ruling Class, Ruling Culture — Studies of Conflict, Power and Hegemony in Australian Life* (Cambridge 1977), Ch. 1, and H. McQueen, *A New Britannia — an Argument*

ists" who, ignoring Gollan's conclusion, argued that their interest in bourgeois ideas was a "counter-revolution" that somehow invalidated the labour history project.[14]

Narrower in their range were the studies of particular ideologies. For example, Gollan's book on the influence of communism (as both ideology and organized politics), Graham Maddox's chapter on the translation of 19th-century radical-democratic ideas into labour socialism, Peter Love's book on Labor populism and Verity Burgmann's book on the early socialists.[15] If such work has taken ideas in the past seriously, it is in part because its authors, writing from a Left perspective, have understood the power of ideas in the present. A similar understanding, though from a conservative perspective, insisted on the irrelevance or undeveloped nature of ideas in the past in order to celebrate Labor's supposedly non-ideological legitimacy in the present: a matter of denying ideology in labour history in an ideological way. A number of Australian works, nominally belonging to the institutional tradition of labour history, have in fact been organized around the idea that labour's ideas are not ideas at all but some kind of natural emanation from a benign society. The standard-bearer for this group of writers was Bede Nairn in his *Civilising Capitalism*. This was an account of the role of the New South Wales Trades and Labour Council in the formation of the ALP. Nairn assumed that colonial society was pragmatic and that there were "accepted colonial standards." This allowed him to argue that the trade unions and the ALP, in their common indifference to ideas, were the natural outgrowth of colonial society. In one form or another these propositions turned up in several later institutional histories. Thus Dennis Murphy's introduction to the collection *Labor in Politics* proclaimed the pragmatism of "the lower orders" who were "not educated for the higher adventures in socialism." Instead, the Labor parties naturally inherited 19th century "radical liberalism," turning it into a kind of "workingman's reformism." The official centenary history of the ALP in New South Wales, by Graham Freudenberg, opened with the statement, "More than any other political party in the world, the Australian Labor Party reflects and represents the character of the nation which produced it ... [it is] the authentic expression of Australianism."[16]

Concerning the Social Origins of Australian Radicalism and Nationalism (Ringwood, Victoria 1970), 15.

[14]P. Coleman, ed., *Australian Civilisation — A Symposium* (Melbourne 1962), see Coleman's introduction.

[15]R.A. Gollan, *Revolutionaries and Reformists — Communists and the Australian Labour Movement, 1920-1955* (Canberra 1975); P. Love, *Labour and the Money Power — Australian Labour Populism, 1890-1950* (Melbourne 1984); Verity Burgmann, *'In Our Time' — Socialism and the Rise of Labor, 1885-1905* (Sydney 1985).

[16]B. Nairn, *Civilising Capitalism — The Labor Movement in New South Wales, 1870-1900* (Canberra 1973); D.J. Murphy, ed., *Labor in Politics. The State Labor Parties in Australia, 1880-1920* (Brisbane 1975); G. Freudenberg, *Cause for Power — the Official History of the New South Wales Branch of the Australian Labor Party* (Sydney 1991), 3.

This myth of the perfect identification of party with society or nation goes hand in hand not only with crude analyses of labour ideas but with blindness to the complexity of labour's social base. In this connection, another category of writing on labour and politics can be defined by its focus on politics as an expression of social forces. As Bob Connell has pointed out, the 1910s and the 1940s, the "great upswings in class conflict in twentieth-century Australia," each produced outstanding critics, researchers, and analysts of class relations: Vere Gordon Childe in the earlier period and Brian Fitzpatrick in the latter.[17]

Childe's *How Labour Governs* was the culmination of a series of articles in which he considered the relationship between the working class and its organizations. He rejected both the dominant Fabian statism as well as the Leninist conception of a working class unified and led by a class-conscious party. His chief commitment, intellectually and practically, was to democracy. He produced a class analysis of considerable subtlety, allowing not only for "class representation" but for the formative role of the party in the class. Moreover, he drew on a pluralist analysis of society that nonetheless saw the state as a major site of transformative politics.[18]

Fitzpatrick's *A Short History of the Australian Labour Movement* was less sociologically sophisticated but more firmly grounded in political economy. Fitzpatrick too was a democrat, playing a major role in various struggles for civil liberties. It was his instinct for the importance of social struggles that anchored his explanations of labour politics. Thus, he wrote, the formation of the Labor party was not due to doctrine but to the "sharpened ... collective understanding of the working class."[19]

Another product of the great upswing of class conflict in the 1940s was Ian Turner. As he did not enter academic life until the 1960s, his most important book, *Industrial Labour and Politics* was not published until 1965. Covering the same period as Childe's book (the first two decades of the 20th century), Turner argues that between 1910 and 1921 the initiative in the working class passed from the politicians to the industrial unionists, and that this was associated with the growing industrialization of the working class. Although Turner claims that at the base of his explanation is "the response of workers generally to their social and economic situation," the story he tells is of left-wing organization and ideas.[20] Turner thus

[17]Connell, *Ruling Class, Ruling Culture*, 8.

[18]T.H. Irving, "New Light on How Labour Governs: Re-Discovered Political Writings by V. Gordon Childe," *Politics*, 23 (1988), 76; T.H. Irving, "On the Work of Labour Governments: Vere Gordon Childe's Plans for Volume Two of How Labour Governs," in P. Gathercole, T.H. Irving, and G. Melleuish, eds., *Childe and Australia — Archaeology, Politics and Ideas* (Brisbane 1995).

[19]B. Fitzpatrick, *A Short History of the Australian Labour Movement* (1940; Melbourne 1968).

[20]I. Turner, *Industrial Labour and Politics — The Labour Movement in Eastern Australia, 1900-1921* (Canberra 1965), xvii-xx.

managed to miss the community and workplace dimensions of class, and also Childe's more inter-active account of labour and politics.[21]

Extending Connell's argument the most recent period of class struggle in the late 1960s and 1970s similarly produced an interest in class relations among labour historians. Humphrey McQueen's *A New Britannia* focuses on the making of "a peculiarly Australian petit-bourgeoisie" whose interests the ALP is supposed to express. There has been much argument about this claim, and not enough notice of the more useful aspects of his approach to class analysis. While it is true, as he disarmingly states, that his attention to political practices and ideas makes his book the last of the "Old Left" histories, his interest in the interaction of politics and class points to something new. Like Childe, McQueen understands the way politics and ideas play a part in class formation.[22]

At one point in his book McQueen quoted Gramsci: "the history of party ... must be the history of a social group."[23] The internal dynamics of class formation were, however, hypothesized rather than established by systematic and theoretically-based analysis in those pre-feminist, pre-deconstructionist days. Nonetheless, there were some valuable pointers to the history of social forces in labour politics. Stuart Macintyre suggested in 1977 that labourism should be understood as the product of the trade-unionist working class, while socialism was the ideology of the clerical salariat and petit-bourgeoisie.[24] It was not, however, until Desley Deacon's work on the role of the "educated new middle class" in constructing the social welfare state at the end of the 19th century, that the role of the clerical salariat within ALP politics was given any real empirical foundation.[25] Running at a tangent to this interest in the socialism of the clerks, with its Fabian or technocratic assumptions, was the work of Ray Markey. He leaned more to the approach of the Second International radicals who defined socialism as a product of class-conscious workers. Markey distinguished the social-democratic (in the European sense) trade unionists in the urban areas from the populism of the bush unionists and the utopianism of the city intellectuals.[26] This was a position closer to

[21]See Connell, *Ruling Class, Ruling Culture*, 12-3.

[22]H. McQueen, *A New Britannia*; for influential critiques see S. Macintyre, "The Making of the Australian Working Class — an Historiographical Survey," *Historical Studies*, 18 (1978), 233-53; and Connell, *Ruling Class, Ruling Culture*, 19.

[23]McQueen, *A New Britannia*, 221.

[24]Macintyre, "The Making of the Australian Working Class."

[25]Desley Deacon, *Managing Gender — the State, the New Middle Class and Women Workers, 1830-1930* (Melbourne 1989), and "Seeing the State," in Terry Irving, ed., *Challenges to Labour History* (Kensington 1994), 136-49.

[26]R. Markey, *The Making of the Labor party in New South Wales 1880-1900* (Sydney 1988); and note the view outlined by R.W. Connell and T.H. Irving in *Class Structure in Australian History*, 2nd edition (Melbourne 1992), 198-200, about the significance of working-class intellectuals for translating experience into politics.

Burgmann's earlier analysis of the working-class character of socialism and its key role in the formation of the ALP.[27]

As in other countries, the effect in Australia of feminist interest in cultural theory and post-structuralism was mainly to swing labour history even further away from "labour and politics" questions. The gender order was studied at work and in the home, but rarely in labour's intersection with the state, until Desley Deacon's seminal work.[28] At the same time, studies of language in the labour movement were pointing to a new way to bring politics back into labour history. At first feminist historians handled the idea of labour as a men's movement rather crudely, often relying on selective readings of texts. Lately the work of Marilyn Lake, Judith Allen, and Joy Damousi has become more sophisticated, focusing on gender as process and the role of subjectivity in the creation of political identity.[29] Also showing the influence of "the turn to language" was the renewed study of labour ideas in the 1990s. Frank Bongiorno brought Patrick Joyce's interest in non-class understandings of oppression among male workers to his analysis of the populist origins of Victorian labour; Terry Irving constructed the genealogy of "labourism" through an historiographical critique of the New Left; and Paul Smyth, Tim Battin, and John Laurent reaffirmed the role of socialist ideas in the 1940s through a critique of populism and labourism.[30]

Canadian enthusiasm for the study of labour and politics has always been blunted by an understanding of visibly non-class fractures in national politics. In so far as there exists any Canadian myth of identification of the party with the nation, this surely belongs to the Liberals, whose relationship with labour spurred an interesting (if inconclusive) debate around the issue of "liberal corporatism"

[27]Verity Burgmann, *In Our Time: Socialism and the Rise of Labor, 1885-1905* (Sydney 1985). Resolving these differences about the social appeal and discursive power of radical ideology in labour politics is a central question for current scholarship in Australia.

[28]Deacon, *Managing Gender*.

[29]Compare Marilyn Lake, "Socialism and Manhood: the Case of William Lane," *Labour History*, 50 (1986). Note the controversy between Bruce Scates and Lake in issues 59 and 60 of *Labour History*. Marilyn Lake "The Constitution of Political Subjectivity and the Writing of Labour History," in T. Irving, ed, *Challenges to Labour History*, 75-87; see also Judith Allen, *Rose Scott: Vision and Revision in Feminism* (Melbourne 1994) and Joy Damousi, *Women Come Rally — Socialism, Communism and Gender in Australia, 1890-1955* (Melbourne 1994).

[30]F. Bongiorno, "Class, Populism and Labour Politics in Victoria, 1890-1914," *Labour History*, 66 (1994); Terry Irving, "Labourism: a Political Genealogy," *Labour History*, 66 (1994); Tim Battin, "Keynesianism, Socialism and Labourism, and the Role of Ideas in Labor Ideology," *Labour History*, 66 (1994); Paul Smyth, Australian Social Policy: the Keynesian Chapter (Sydney 1994); John Laurent, "'That Old Treasure House of Constructive Suggestion': Australian Labour Ideology and War Organisation of Industry'," *Labour History*, 68 (1995).

during the 1970s.[31] Regionalism was another key motif, as if to underscore the commonsensical view of Ramsay McDonald in 1906, when he reminded the British diaspora that Canada "could not be treated as a whole."[32] Without coincidence, no monograph has been explicitly devoted to labour and politics in Canada since Horowitz in 1968, and given the tendency to recast Canadian history as "English Canadian" history there is no likelihood of Horowitz being revisited in any near future. Canadian works continue to draw selectively on international political theory. The identification of socialism with the clerical salariat and petit-bourgeoisie, for example, had been recently explored in a short article on the class character of early Canadian socialism by Mark Leier.[33] No student of later Canadian socialism, however, would have any difficulty with this theme. English-Canadian urban socialists of the 1930s proudly boasted of their "salariat" status — so much so that it practically obscured the proletarian elements in their midst.[34]

Ideology remained a paramount concern of the seminal works of the 1970s, including Ross McCormack's, *Reformers, Rebels and Revolutionaries: the Western Canadian Radical Movement, 1897-1919*. In fact, McCormack's model of competing tendencies of proletarian socialism, syndicalism, and reformism or "labourism" could have been profitably extended to encompass the dominion as a whole. Ironically, McCormack's regional framework was undermined by the procedure of making labour's ideologies synonymous with radicalism in the West, thus neglecting the weightier impact of an actual —not merely speculative — "petit-bourgeois" movement rooted amongst the grain growers and other small property-holders on the frontier. *Democracy in Alberta*, by C.B. MacPherson, had earlier replicated the same error in reverse, completely overlooking working-class agency in the construction of a regional radicalism.[35] Relatedly, an echo of the

[31]Reginald Whitaker, "The Liberal Corporatist Ideas of Mackenzie King," *Labour/Le Travail*, 2 (1977), 136-167, and for an extended reply, Paul Craven, *'An Impartial Umpire': Industrial Relations and the Canadian State, 1901-1911* (Toronto 1980) also Allen Seager, "A new labour era?': Canadian National Railways and the railway worker, 1919-1929," *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association*, new series, 3, (1992), 171-95 for a case study of the "corporatist" dialectic within the federal public sector.

[32]Quoted in R.C. Brown and Ramsay Cook, *Canada 1896 to 1921: a Nation Transformed* (Toronto 1974), 111.

[33]Mark Leier, "Workers and Intellectuals: the Theory of the New Class and Early Canadian Socialism," *Journal of History and Politics*, 10 (1992), 87-108.

[34]See for example Michael Horn, *The League of Social Reconstruction, 1930-1942: Intellectual origins of the Democratic Left in Canada* (Toronto 1980).

[35]R. McCormack, *Reformers, Rebels and Revolutionaries: the Western Canadian Radical Movement, 1897-1919* (Toronto 1977); and C.B. MacPherson, *Democracy in Alberta: Social Credit and the Party System* (Toronto 1953). Despite empirical flaws, MacPherson's eclectically Marxist approach to the "regional" problem has inspired a number of important studies within the discipline of political science, most notably in recent years David Laycock, *Populism and Democratic Thought in the Canadian Prairies 1910-1945* (Toronto, 1990).

fragment thesis guided McCormack's analysis, with its emphasis on eventual adaptation to the "nation's orderly and moderate political culture," this seemingly impervious to change by any class or region.

Be that as it may, the ongoing search for a "political party for labour" in Canada during the ALP heyday reflected the regional imperative in nearly all respects, since it was an eclectic mixture of populist, progressive, and socialist leadership west of Ontario that first established an enduring parliamentary beach-head "for labour" in the 1920s. The experience of the broader-based party that was formed in the 1930s, originally known as the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation, precursor of the NDP, understandably structures much Canadian debate.[36] At the time of writing the NDP of Canada certainly looked oblivion-bound, although as late as 1992 a forward-marchist account of CCF-NDP history could be written under the title *From Protest to Power — Social Democracy in Canada, 1900 to the Present Day*. Norman Penner's companion volume *Canadian Communism* (1988) is similarly written from an ideologically-centred point of view.[37]

Penner rightly raises the question of what was particularly communist about the mass organizations of the Canadian CP, but no one has explicitly asked what was social-democratic about the CCF-NDP.[38] Some but not all studies of the party-movement use the phrase; others use terms such as "socialist" or "left-populist." The history of labour's involvement in the CCF-NDP coalition remains anything but well documented, and the question posed is indeed a double-edged sword. For example, Bob White's comment, quoted in our introduction, recalls most vividly the pluralist ghost of Samuel Gompers.[39] The more important question remains unanswered. To what extent did interest-group politics or working-class

[36]Ivan Avakumovik's *Socialism in Canada: A Study of the CCF-NDP in Federal and Provincial Politics* (Toronto 1978) is a good example of the weaving of the entire history of "socialism" into the party narrative, although Avakumovic is by no means a blind partisan. His opening paragraph draws an interesting if historically inaccurate parallel: "At a time when the pro-socialist Australian Labour Party was assuming office in Canberra [1904] Canadian socialists had little success to report...".

[37]Penner, *Protest to Power* and his *Canadian Communism: the Stalin Years and Beyond* (Toronto 1988). Both works are spin-offs from Penner's original dissertation, published under the title *The Canadian Left: A Critical Analysis* (Scarborough 1977). Penner's own years as a communist activist, culminated in his prominent role as a dissident-reformist leader during the 1956-7 crisis, an account of which is found in *Canadian Communism*, 241-8.

[38]This problem is, however, implicitly addressed in Palmer, *Working Class Experience*, as well as Whitehorn, *Canadian Socialism*.

[39]For White, see note 5 above. For a study of the juxtaposition of Gomperism and party politics in comparatively recent years see David Kwavnick, *Organised Labour and Pressure Politics: the Canadian Congress of Labour, 1956-1968* (Kingston 1972). For an excellent case study of the evolution of the "national question" see Ralph Peter Gunzel, "The Confédération des Syndicats Nationaux, the Idea of Independence and the Sovereigntist Movement, 1960-80," *Labour/Le Travail*, 31 (1993), 145-74.

consciousness structure trade union intervention in the CCF-NDP after the initial endorsement of "labour's political arm" by the Canadian Congress of Labour (CCL), which was one of the three major central peak bodies at that time, in 1943?

Reading the history of the CCF-NDP backwards remains a strong temptation, either from the optimistic outlook of Norman Penner, or the pessimistic standpoint of Daniel Drache, whose 1984 survey of the fragmentation of the Canadian working class is clearly haunted by the failure of all attempts to negotiate an effective political alliance between Québécois and English Canadian labour in the CCF-NDP era. The original sins of "colonialism" and Anglo-Saxon chauvinism typically loom large in Drache's account, which neglects the paradoxical point that there was considerably more political solidarity between secular labour leadership in French and English Canada during the age of high imperialism than later.[40] Thus, just as Australian labourism would be subjected to nearly endless New Left vivisections of its "petty bourgeois radicalism, populism, racism, chauvinism, and idolatry of state power,"[41] so its Canadian counterpart was quickly dismissed by Canadian neo-marxists.[42] As E.P. Thompson once remarked, however, such work was always far less interested in comparative politics than in resurrecting "blue-prints of the Ark."[43]

Thompsonian historians made a major contribution towards rethinking labour and politics in Canada, though generally eschewing any sort of institutional framework or directly relevant theoretical model. Nineteenth-century labour politics, for example, were essentially discovered by Kealey and Palmer, who explored the fascinating encounter between mass agitation for labour reform and the actual party system, not a reified political culture, in the 1880s.[44] A similar impression of class without politics was also drawn by some practitioners of Canadian interdisciplinary studies, attentive to religious and literary evidence of a contemporary social theme.[45] Reproduction of long-forgotten documents such as the Royal Commission on Relations Between Labour and Capital (1886-9) potentially shed

[40]Daniel Drache, "The Formation and Fragmentation of the Canadian Working Class, 1880-1920," *Studies in Political Economy*, 15 (1984), 43-89. See also Bryan Palmer's cogent ripost to Drache in "Listening to History instead of Historians: Reflections on Working-Class History," *Studies in Political Economy*, 20 (1986), 47-83.

[41]Winton Higgins, quoted in Irving, "Labourism: A Political Genealogy," 5.

[42]Gary Teeple, "Liberals in a Hurry: Socialism and the CCF-NDP," in Teeple, ed., *Capitalism and the National Question in Canada* (Toronto 1972), 230-50, quotations from 332.

[43]See "The Peculiarities of the English," in E.P. Thompson, *The Poverty of Theory and Other Essays* (New York 1978), 245-301, quotation from 287.

[44]Gregory S. Kealey and Bryan D. Palmer, "The Bonds of Unity: The Knights of Labor in Ontario," in Palmer, ed., *The Character of Class Struggle: Essays in Canadian Working Class History, 1850-1985* (Toronto 1986), 36-67, especially 52-6.

[45]Robin Mathews, *Canadian Identity: Major Forces Shaping the Life of a People* (Ottawa 1988), chapters on "The Left Vision of Canada" and "Religion in Canada."

much light on the never-ending Canadian debate about the basic utility of political action. Rival Knights of Labor unionists, for example, agreed with American Federation of Labor (AFL) leadership that a reduction of the work-day was not to be achieved by legislation but by a "general refusal to work more than eight hours" — a reformist/syndicalist position that cannot be understood without reference to the many cultures in conflict in North America at that time.[46]

Craig Heron's 1984 paper, "Labourism and the Canadian Working Class," is perhaps the most relevant Thompsonian text for Canadian political studies, albeit rather predictably identifying early-20th-century labourism with the interest of miners and skilled workers and various legacies of liberalism. What labourists held in common, Heron argued, was their assertion of "radical democracy in the face of political corruption and, perhaps more importantly, elitist theories of the state." "[T]hey seemed on the whole [suspicious] of state intervention into social life, and preferred self-help and self-improvement through individual and co-operative activity on a voluntary basis — from temperance, to technical education, to trade unionism."[47] This complex of ideas seems to set the Canadian labourist program somewhat apart from the pre-Keynesian statism of contemporary ALP leadership, this undoubtedly explained less by essentialist national values than by differential access to political power in the state.

Voluntarism in a stricter sense was the defining characteristic of Canadian labourism, largely because of the adamantly anti-partisan stance of the AFL unions in Canada during the Samuel Gompers era (1880s-1920s). Though not theorized as a study in politics, Robert Babcock's *Gompers in Canada* adopted a usefully "continentalist" approach which put the debates between moderates and radicals within the Canadian labour-political movement into some perspective. They were all cut from the same cloth, as far as Gompers was concerned; above all, AFL-controlled union funds were not to be used for partisan purposes.[48] Thus, the notion of "independent labour" politics in Canada traditionally had two meanings: independence *vis-à-vis* the old-line parties, and independence *vis-à-vis* the trade unions and their regional centres of power, a structural not ideological theme that Heron among others insufficiently explores. Tim Buck, the foremost public spokesman for Canadian communism, well described the buoyant Independent Labour Party (ILP) movement of the World War I era as exactly that — an exquisite example of the difference between movements and parties which, some theory to the contrary,

[46]See G.S. Kealey, ed., *Canada Investigates Industrialism: The Royal Commission on the Relations of Labour and Capital, 1889* (Toronto 1973), 65. Much of this is also documented, albeit in a theoretically-understated way, in Martin Robin, *Radical Politics and Canadian Labour, 1880-1930* (Kingston 1968).

[47]C. Heron, "Labourism and the Canadian Working Class," *Labour/Le Travail*, 12 (1983), 45-75, quotations from, 61-2, 75.

[48]Robert Babcock, *Gompers in Canada: A Study in American Continentalism Before the First World War* (Toronto 1974).

transcends conventional ideological boundaries.[49] It encompassed, in Buck's words, "a Cape Breton Labour Party, a Halifax Labour Party and so on. All the way across the country to Vancouver Island there were Independent Labour Parties, all quite independent."[50]

Writing from a feminist perspective, Patricia Roome's case study of labourism in Calgary, where a fractious local organization calling itself the Dominion Labour Party (a surviving remnant of the still-born, anti-conscriptionist Trades and Labour Congress party of the same name) advanced the interests of the workingman, "the working girl," and other groups according to their own lights in the 1920s. Roome provides the model of the kind of research that is still needed to flesh out the history of the Canadian ILPs. James Naylor's regional study of the once electorally promising Ontario ILP movement is most helpful, despite the author's strained hypothesis that "a labourist consensus" was somehow in the making during 1914-25. In Ontario, as elsewhere, there was certainly no consensus on such issues as conscription, the Bolshevik revolution, and so on. A strong case could be made, however, for ubiquitous class-based strivings towards what Naylor calls (borrowing from the title of a popular labour periodical of the day) "a new democracy," or as Gordon Childe expressed the same point in the Antipodean context, a "novel theory of democracy."[51] Canadian Stephen Leacock, easily among the Empire's most insightful bourgeois political economists, well expressed contemporary fears of open-ended agendas. "The state as we know it," he argued in 1919, "threatens to dissolve into labour unions, conventions, boards of conciliation and confer-

[49]The party/movement dichotomy is closely associated with the work of Canadian political scientist Walter D. Young, who interpreted the CCF in a manner consistent with Robert Michels' model of the evolution of social democratic oligarchy. For a critique of some of the conceptual and empirical problems of the model see Whitehorn, *Canadian Socialism*, Ch. 2.

[50]William Beeching and Phyllis Clarke, *Yours in the Struggle: Reminiscences of Tim Buck* (Toronto 1977), 66, passim. Buck adds that the "neutral" role of "the majority of full-time [trade union] officers," some of whom were card-carrying socialists, was the negative linchpin of the ILP movement. Other biographies which illuminate the complexity of Canadian labourism in this period include David Akers, "Rebel or Revolutionary? Jack Kavanagh and the Early Years of the Communist Movement in Vancouver, 1920-1925," *Labour/Le Travail*, 30 (1992), 9-44, and Peter Campbell, "Making Socialists: Bill Pritchard, the Socialist Party of Canada and the Third International," *Labour/Le Travail*, 30 (1992), 45-64.

[51]Patricia Roome, "Amelia Turner and Calgary Labour Women, 1919-1935," in Linda Kealey and Joan Sangster, eds., *Beyond the Vote: Canadian Women and Politics* (Toronto 1989), 89-117; see also Alvin Finkel, "The Rise and Fall of the Labour Party in Alberta, 1917-1942," *Labour/Le Travail*, 16 (1958), 61-96. James Naylor, *The New Democracy: Challenging the Industrial Order in Ontario, 1914-1925* (Toronto 1991). For Childe, see note 1.

ences."[52] But it has taken a long time for scholarship to assimilate the insights of contemporaries, whose political world, of course, was not our own.

2. *Canadian labourism, 1880-1920*

As has already been suggested, the history of Canadian labourism before the 1920s is one marked by shifting alliances, local particularisms, and ideological diversity. Independent labour parties did evolve, but like the British ILP (the minority tendency within the labour representation movement in the Old Country after 1900) they remained institutionally separate from the trade unions. Attempts to forge a common political voice or program for the trade unions dated back to the Canadian Labour Union of the 1870s, a considerably stronger push being exerted by radical artisans and intellectuals within the Knights of Labor in the 1880s. These foundered first on the various rocks and shoals of Canadian politics, as such, and second on the steadily growing iceberg of Gomper's non-partisanship within the AFL after 1886. In a typical disjuncture, AFL hegemony over the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada (TLC) was established with the expulsion of the so-called dual unions in 1902, about the same time as a rising tide of British immigration and unprecedented economic growth was beginning to put the notion of the ILP on the political map of industrial Canada.

Meanwhile, the lib-lab strategy, which might have (as to some extent in Britain and Australia) formed the basis of a party within a party, was undercut by countervailing tendencies towards a Tory-labour alliance, a mirror of core disputes over the National Policy which dominated the heights of Canadian politics between the 1880s and the 1920s. While friends of enterprise within the Conservative Party championed the productive interests of "the manufacturing classes," and the Liberals' commercial policy made endless zigzags, labour was unable to insert the Australianist notion of "new protection" (the linking of commercial concessions with improved wages) into the underlying national development debate.

There were similar problems with the famous attempt to Canadianize the principle of arbitration through compulsory conciliation in the Liberals' 1907 Industrial Disputes Investigation Act (IDIA). MacKenzie King modestly noted that the IDIA was not "the work of one person but inspired by experience in Australia and New Zealand and in other countries."[53] TLC leadership was typically pulled in all directions by the IDIA, which was opposed as class legislation by the socialist-leaning left, and as unwarranted state intervention by the voluntarist-leaning right. Despite the alleged repudiation of the IDIA by the Congress in 1911, leadership always waffled on the point until a better alternative, compulsory collective bargaining on the American New Deal model, appeared in the 1930s. In comparison

[52]Douglas Owram, *The Government Generation: Canadian Intellectuals and the State, 1900-1945* (Toronto 1986), 81.

[53]Speech in Cincinnati, 1913, quoted in R. MacGregor Dawson, *William Lyon Mackenzie King: a Political Biography, 1874-1923* (Toronto 1958), 137.

to Australia, all of the elements of this compound boiled down to a significant paradox. The relatively high level of industrial development in Canada, a product of complex (and competitive) proximities to the markets and capital of the United States, tended to marginalize independent politics.

Within the labour community, however, both leaders and led were permanently drawn into the political fray by the Great Upheaval of the 1880s. Examples of the local movements spawned multiply from coast to coast but a good illustration is presented by the "quite independent" labour parties in two neighbouring English-Canadian heartland cities, Toronto and Hamilton. Ward-based organization established the trade unions' long-enduring parallel power in municipal affairs in Toronto (Canada's second largest city) around 1886, whilst Hamilton's Labor Political Association polled as much as 48.8 per cent of the vote in a national election in 1887. The Hamilton ILP later became the pace-setter in provincial politics as a result of the post-1906 success of Alan Studholme, a parliamentarian of Knights of Labor vintage.[54] The two cities sometimes looked like peas in a pod but there were clearly differences as well. Hamilton's more thoroughly proletarian movement never lost much sleep over their support for conservative commercial policy but the Toronto intelligentsia tormented workers endlessly with philosophical debates over liberalism and free trade.

In the absence of TLC discipline, old line partisans were not likely to be driven from the wards. On the other hand, new line partisans had no basis for machine-like party politics in areas of strength. The Vancouver Island coalfield presents a particularly interesting example of the apparent ease with which a determined group of left-wingers could merge the politics of working-class mobilization with the politics of labour representation in Canadian circumstances. Here, Socialist Party politicians played the role of miners' delegates in the provincial assembly after 1903 but were significantly unable to unseat the area's Lib-Lab federal MP, Ralph Smith (ex-President of the TLC) in 1908. TLC endorsements in such situations typically acknowledged no party, and individual socialists, such as the able Albertan "impossibilist," C.M. O'Brien, could win official approval on the basis of their legislative records.[55]

An older Marxist literature was willing to consider the possibility that "a kind of native Canadian socialism" (as opposed to the "socialism in Canada" of the early Socialist Party of Canada and similar Marxist groups) arose from Canadian labourism's institutional dilemmas.[56] If so, the evidence is most likely to be found

[54]See Gregory S. Kealey and Bryan D. Palmer, *Dreaming of what Might be: The Knights of Labor in Ontario, 1880-1900* (Cambridge 1982), 213, 241, and passim.

[55]See Allen Seager, "Socialists and Workers: the Western Canadian Coal Miners, 1900-1921," *Labour/Le Travail*, 16 (1985), 23-59.

[56]See Charles Lipton, *The Trade Union Movement of Canada, 1827-1959* (Montréal 1968), 46. Lipton's Stalinist-rooted "two-nations/One Canada" model regrettably prevented him from developing this argument in any systematic way but he is nonetheless uniquely

amidst the upheavals of the 1910s, including such moments as the One Big Union, launched in March 1919 in a prematurely anti-political revolt against diverse antagonists in the West.[57] Party-building, however, played a larger role in the politics of working-class mobilization during and immediately after World War I. Typical was the Toronto convention of a hopefully constituted "new Independent Labour of Ontario" in March 1918. Of nearly 400 delegates, 200 came in fact from the trade unions, revealing a rising tide of pressure for political action in the heat of the conscription crisis. Unlike Australia, the English-Canadian pro-conscriptionists (and/or pro-acquiescence groups within official labour) won the debate through parliamentary closure and an extraordinary Wartime Elections Act designed to insure ratification outside of Québec.

Public disagreements on the conscription issue among labour candidates indicated the need for something like a common pledge of policy. At the Greater Toronto Labor Party Convention a few months after the December 1917 federal election, seekers after "labourist consensus" included about 100 delegates from actually existing independent labour parties in various Ontario communities, but an almost equal number represented more unlikely political groupings. Gesturing sincerely towards "the new democracy," as well as astutely boring-from-within, were delegates from the Social Democratic Party of Canada (since 1911 the party of the Second International in Canada), the Socialist Labor Party, and the Socialist Party of North America (like the Socialist Party of Canada, among the last survivors of the First International in the world labour movement).[58] Icing the ILP cake were various non-partisans, including members of the United Farmers, the Russian Socialist Revolutionary Group, the Jewish Socialist Labor Bund, two self-styled Fabians, and one member of the Reconstruction Group of the Theosophical Society. "Women Democrats" formed yet another distinct presence within Ontario's ILP, linking organizers from the shop-floor of women's war work with better known personalities from the middle class Left like Laura Hughes and Flora MacDonald Denison.[59]

---

sensitive, among the older Marxists, to the dialectics of Canadian-American and Canada-Québec relationships.

[57]See among other sources David Jay Bercuson, *Fools and Wise Men —the Rise and Fall of the One Big Union in Canada* (Toronto 1978); Allen Seager, "Nineteen-Nineteen — Year of Revolt," *Journal of the West*, 23 (1984), 40-7; Gerald Friesen, "Studies in the Development of Western Canadian Regional Consciousness, 1870-1925," PhD thesis, University of Toronto, 1974, Ch. 4, 186-234.

[58]"Boring from within" was the term current in socialist circles to describe the tactic of a committed and organized minority working within a mass party to convert it to socialism.

[59]See Naylor, *The New Democracy*, 106-7, 145-6, and passim; also Linda Kealey, "'No Special Protection — No Special Sympathy': Women's Activism in the Canadian Labour Revolt of 1919," in D. Hopkin and G.S. Kealey, eds., *Class, Community and the Labour Movement: Wales and Canada, 1900-1930* (St John's 1989), 134-59.

The Ontario ILP, however, was never actually organized on the ground, suffering the paradoxical fate of being over-run by electoral success. In the February 1919 provincial elections the constituency labour parties returned eleven members to the legislature, and bargained two trade unionists into the cabinet of a "non-partisan" (that is neither Liberal nor Tory) government dominated by the minority United Farmers of Ontario (UFO). Despite a number of reform initiatives, the inexperienced UFO government was soon overwhelmed by a less than popular leadership which was steadily undermined from within by a combination of rural-urban cleavages and byzantine factionalism. Erased from Ontario's electoral map in 1923, the UFO never recovered as a political force while ILP stalwarts enjoyed a half-life in the 1920s, becoming permanently submerged within the CCF coalition in the 1930s. The vast majority of Ontario labour voters remained out of reach during the inter-war period, while the bulk of the province's trade union leadership comfortably hewed to the line that political action had been tried and failed.

A different tale was told in other provinces, notably in the West, where left-wing anti-politicalism almost inevitably yielded to renewed electoral activity in a series of post-war contests between "the people" and "the interests." A somewhat more successful Farmer-Labour coalition flourished for a time in Alberta (a province that lacked a strong local bourgeoisie). In Manitoba the newly elected United Farmers' sharper turn to the right made room for a broadly-based labour-led opposition in the provincial metropolis. Manitoba's ILP, benefiting from the turn to electoralism after the Winnipeg General Strike in 1919, formed the backbone of the self-styled Labour Group in the federal Parliament, whose appearance in 1921-2 marked the birth of an authentically reformist independent labour tendency in Canadian federal politics. From the beginning, however, it was divided over how broad the movement should be, Winnipeg MPs J.S.Woodsworth and A.A. Heaps representing different strategic solutions to the problem of labour's class alliances. Reverend Woodsworth, a formidable intellectual of impeccably Canadian middle-class roots, was determined to find a "distinctly Canadian type of socialism" whose vehicle would be a "people's party" with indistinct class loyalties. Heaps, a working-class immigrant from London's East End, hewed to the narrow Labour Party line. The onset of the Depression and a revival of both militant agrarianism and middle-class radicalism in various parts of the country during the 1930s decided this question in favour of the broader coalitionists. Hence Canadian labourism would perish and the CCF-NDP was born.[60]

Whether a "distinctly Canadian" or "native Canadian" socialism could ever have evolved out of the large-L Labour party movement is of course conjectural. There were many impediments, chief among them the problem of Québec, social

[60]Penner's *From Protest to Power* offers a succinct summary of these debates; relevant biographical literature includes most recently Allen Mills, *Fool for Christ: The Political Thought of J.S. Woodsworth* (Toronto 1991).

democracy's political graveyard at the federal level at every election from 1935 to the present. Without demonstrable support there, wavering supporters of social democracy in English Canada could never be mobilized, and without demonstrable command of the English Canadian working class, the CCF-NDP was not likely to impress the majority of tactical voters in francophone (or anglophone) Québec. Oceans of ink have been spilt over this question but the underlying dynamics of Canada's two political worlds are really not that complicated. Missing, from labour or social democracy's point of view, was a hinge to connect the two. Significantly, a rudimentary sort of hinge did exist during the period before 1920, in the form of the labourist movement in multi-ethnic Montréal, whose contemporary status as the unchallenged commercial-industrial metropolis of Canada surely made that city a potential linchpin for the labourist project. The loose fish that swam out of Montréal into Ottawa, including MPs Alphonse-Télésphore Lepine (*Chevaliers du travail*) and Alphonse Verville (the *Parti Ouvrière*) represented the centre from 1888 to 1921.

French-Canadian labourism, like all others, sprang from liberal roots, including an anti-clerical dimension whose importance in the politics of working-class mobilization in Québec can scarcely be understated. Irish-Catholic labourites or secular trade unionists in Australia, for example, never faced similar censure by the Church in the period before 1921 (or 1955) — unless they co-operated with the Communists. As Québec Liberalism traded most of its ideological clothing for the emoluments of office in the period after 1896 a clearer class-based politics appeared; as pioneering propagandist-organizer of Montréal's *Parti Ouvrier*, J.A. Rodier, would rightly ask: "Where are their [the Liberals'] reforms?" On the other hand, Montréal labour's increasingly strong AFL connection ensured that the secular trade unionists would be divided as to politics, here as elsewhere.[61] Meanwhile, the clerical party itself shifted its position from simple condemnation to an approach more in keeping with contemporary European themes by creating the federation of Canadian Catholic syndicats (CTCC) in 1921. Despite its reformism, the institutional separatism of the labourite version of "the Catholic program" strengthened the hand of the established political parties, both in the cities and outlying regions.

The so-called Dominion Labour Party, launched by activists within the TLC to fight the 1917 federal election, came closest to the mark of serving as a transmission belt for labourite ideas within Québec as well as between Canada's two political worlds. The rhetoric of English-Canadian élites, however, ground remorselessly

[61]Jacques Rouillard, "L'action politique ouvrière au début du 20e siècle," in Fernand Harvey, ed., *Le mouvement ouvrière au Québec* (Montréal 1980), 186-213 (Rodier quoted at 188, author's translation). Albeit purely descriptive, see also various sections under "political action" in the official history of key groups within the Québec labour movement, *The History of the Labour Movement in Quebec*, translated by Arnold Bennett (Montréal 1987), 58-60, 65-6 and passim.

against working-class unity before the votes were even counted. "If this is the birth of a real labor party in Canada," said the *Ottawa Journal*, "the occasion is unfortunate." The *Lethbridge Herald* (Alberta) expressed more visceral sentiments in a bowdlerized language of labour: "Quebec was asking the western working men for support ... [but] Quebec was the home of the 'scab'. This province has scabbed on our soldiers, the trades union movement, and the nations of the world." The Dominion Labour Party (Québec Section) answered such calumnies at its founding convention in November 1917, 208 delegates representing 104 different unions, clubs, co-operatives, and socialist groups throughout the province jointly declaring that "the class struggle is the basis of the organisation of the workers in the political and industrial field in order to restore natural resources and the means of production to the working class."[62]

A class-struggle program, however, was no more likely to rally an electoral drive in Québec than in British Columbia, where "impossibilist" socialists and "direct actionists" dominated the 1917 campaign. Anti-conscriptionist Liberals stole virtually every working-class vote in Québec, allowing incumbent MP Verville to stand unopposed as a Liberal-Labour candidate as a gesture of conciliation to the workers' movement.

In sum, the independent labour party movement, in its broadest Canadian development, was both a product and a casualty of war. The momentum continued for a time; commenting on a by-election loss to Labour in the Ontario-Québec border riding of Temiskaming (Ontario) in April 1920 Prime Minister Meighen described the voters as being "on the borderland between rebellion and lunacy."[63] By the time of the general election in late 1921, elements of reaction had already set in. In place of the "new democracy," there was the emergence of the two competing tendencies which would dominate the left in Canada for another generation: social democracy and communism.

3. *Formation of the Australian Labor Party as a class party*

In comparative terms it is clear that what made the Labor parties of Australia unique was their viability and early influence on the state. The ALP, which traces its history back to the colonial Labor parties of the 1890s, formed the first majority Labor governments in the world in 1910. As far as viability is concerned, however, too much can be made of this if we concentrate on the national level. As Dennis Murphy pointed out in 1975, in Victoria, Western Australia, and Tasmania it was the need for Senate votes in the new Commonwealth parliament after 1901 that ensured that

[62]*The History of the Quebec Labour Movement*, 102; see also Robin, *Radical Politics*, Ch. 9; *Ottawa Journal*, "Labour and the War," reprinted from the *Lethbridge Herald*, 4 December 1917; "scab" Québec from "Labour Meeting at Coalhurst Strong for Union Government," *Lethbridge Herald*, 10 December 1917.

[63]Quoted in Robin, *Radical Politics*, 228. The winning "Farm-Labour" candidate was John Angus McDonald, a Scots-Catholic carpenter with strong ties to OBU hard-rock miners.

an organized Labor party would replace the loose amalgam of unionists and radicals that had dominated labour politics in the colonial period.[64] As for early success, it should be remembered that unionists had been resolving in their colonial and inter-colonial peak bodies to seek parliamentary representation since the 1870s.

Indeed, at least in the key colonies of New South Wales and Victoria, the influence of labour in politics begins with the class accommodation between the liberal bourgeoisie and the radical workingmen that underpinned the introduction of parliamentary democracy in the 1850s. It is worth insisting that this was an accommodation, not the co-option of a passive citizenry. During the 1850s and 1860s parliamentary and electoral politics were never free from the actual or potential pressure of popular mobilizations to extend democracy and unlock the lands. Thus the central role of the state in Australian history should not be allowed to produce a reading of citizenship which excludes the struggle to define popular sovereignty. The ALP did not inherit an "invisible state" of despotic, disciplinary power and legal authority but a tradition of contesting state power, of negotiating, countering and accommodating, of using citizenship to exploit the divisions between pastoral and mercantile capital.[65] ALP success, then, was more than just the latest expression of an underlying liberalism; it had deep roots in a tradition of self-activity among working people.

The ALP was a party of a new type. The new element that it brought to politics was its class character. This was widely recognized at the time by ALP opponents, and it was asserted by ALP leaders. But over the years this clarity of understanding has been lost, some commentators stirring up the mud of diverse subjective identities among party members, other commentators pointing to the confining and class-dissolving channels of trade unionist practice and parliamentary democracy through which the party had to flow. The analysis of labour and politics can ignore neither political subjectivity nor structural settings, but if the ALP is a class party the evidence has to be found in the state, where ultimately class power is constituted. And there is evidence. It can be found in the reason why "the pledge" (by Labor members of parliament to support party policy), although not a ALP invention, caused so much consternation to the ruling class. It can be found in the reason why control of the politicians by the extra-parliamentary organization was insisted on only by the ALP. Or as J.C. Watson in 1894 put it, "The [party] insists that members of the labour party shall be elected primarily as labour representatives, and secondly as representatives of [a] particular district."[66] The conservative

[64]D.J. Murphy, "Introduction — the Labor Parties in Australia," in *Labor in Politics — the State Labor Parties in Australia, 1880-1920* (Brisbane 1975), 9.

[65]This is based on the series of researches into mid-nineteenth century class and politics beginning with Irving's 1968 PhD thesis. For a fuller recent statement of the argument see T.H. Irving, "Les origines du socialisme parlementaire en Australie, 1850-1920," *Le Mouvement Social*, 167 (1994), 81-98. For the opposite view see A. Davidson, *The Invisible State: the Formation of the Australian State, 1788-1901* (Cambridge 1991).

[66]*Sydney Morning Herald*, 23 April 1894.

Sydney Morning Herald was clear that the solidarity created by a pledge at that time, that is when labour's interest was defined as replacing private enterprise by public co-operation on behalf of the working class, was "opposed to the principles of sound Parliamentary government."[67] This was politics based on a "novel theory of democracy," as Gordon Childe called it, a theory of democracy as social or class power.[68]

The formation of Labor as a working-class party did not happen at the same speed and in the same way in every colony.[69] In Victoria, Labor spent the 1890s as the radical wing of the Liberals and did not become a separate party until 1902. In fact, in every colony except New South Wales there were moments when groups of liberal politicians exercised some attraction for the Labor parties. The transition from "lib-lab" politics was partly a matter of Labor learning that if it wanted to become an independent party it had to oppose the Liberals, but it was also the result of the party learning that the more it spoke of itself as a class party with a broad program and the more it organized in working-class electorates the more it was able to elicit a class-wide response.[70] In fact, the party was not just a reflection of the working class but an active agent in the class's formation.[71] It is interesting to see the idea also developing in Childe, who wrote as a participant in the movement in the 1910s. Childe at first held to the Second International's class-representational model, in which the party merely registered and acted for the working class, reflecting in a passive way the class's strengths and weaknesses. But by the end of the decade he was clear that it was the party which was, for better or worse, determining the character of the working class and its politics.[72]

In 1910 the ALP formed majority governments in the Commonwealth and New South Wales parliaments. In 1915 this feat was repeated in Queensland. Now the party's claims to be a workers' party were put to the test. Even before World War I, disillusionment with the party among the workers was evident, especially in New South Wales. The switch to public ownership was slow and patchy, and workers in the state enterprises could not exercise any substantial democratic control over their work. Workers were frustrated that ALP governments could not stop real wages from falling and they were bitter when Labor governments opposed workers on strike. There was a series of major strikes, climaxing in the 1917 General Strike in New South Wales, which indicated that workers were ready to pursue their interests through militant non-parliamentary action again. The perception spread in the

[67] *Sydney Morning Herald*, 13 November 1893.

[68] Childe, *How Labour Governs*, Ch. 1; T.H. Irving, "On the Work of Labour Governments: Childe's Plans for Volume Two of *How Labour Governs*," in P. Gathercole, T.H. Irving and G. Melleuish, eds., *Childe and Australia*.

[69] The story can be followed in Murphy, *Labor in Politics*.

[70] Loveday, *The Emergence of the Australian Party System*, 458.

[71] John Rickard, *Class and Politics: New South Wales, Victoria and the Early Commonwealth, 1890-1910* (Canberra 1976).

[72] Irving, "New Light," 76.

movement that ALP politicians were self-seeking and cowardly, unwilling to upset their middle-class supporters in the electorate. In New South Wales the ALP refused to abolish the un-elected, ruling-class dominated Legislative Council which blocked important legislation passed by the ALP-controlled Legislative Assembly. In the Commonwealth sphere, the ALP governments of A. Fisher and W.H. Hughes had less impact on the day-to-day lives of working people, but this changed when the stalemate between the Allies and the Central powers raised the issue of conscription. Although workers in the main were patriotic they valued their freedom, identified it with their organized advance, and saw it threatened by the introduction of "coloured labour" if they were conscripted into the war machine. At last, the growing resentment at the failures of the ALP politicians found a focus, and the supporters of conscription, Prime Minister Hughes included, were expelled from the party in 1916.

Thus, although precipitated by the conscription issue, the dramatic 1916 split in the party embodied a more deep-seated revolt against "politicalism," as Childe called it, the strategy of pursuing power in the parliamentary arena alone. It was not, however, a revolt against politics, nor of "labour-in-politics." The struggle against politicalism was in its most important aspect a struggle by unionists to control the ALP in the interests of parliamentary socialism. Nor should this revolt be understood as coterminous with syndicalist ideas. Certainly syndicalism was present in the Industrial Workers of the World and the De Leonite Socialist Labor Party, and it had a significant regional following in the mining districts of New South Wales and Western Australia. But its strength was without an organized foundation, and the attempt to rectify this through the One Big Union in the years that followed the split could not reverse the decline of syndicalism. The formation of the Communist Party in 1920 was also indicative of the centrality of the idea that political methods were essential for the labour movement.[73] Before Stalinism caught up with the party at the end of the 1920s, and despite its small size and doctrinal inconsistencies, it had worked out for itself a pragmatic attitude to the state and regional labour councils and the ALP. Such an approach might have saved the party from sectarianism in the long run and allowed it to make a positive contribution to socialism in the mainstream of the movement. This was not to be; but the point to note here is that neither syndicalism nor communism seriously challenged the ALP as the main site for a politics of labour.

There had been socialists in the Labor party since the 1890s. The struggles and organizing experiences of workers at that time had provided an opening for socialist ideas.[74] The party's pledge, its program, and much of the rhetoric of its leaders

[73]Stuart Macintyre, "Dealing with Moscow: the Comintern and the Early History of the Communist Party of Australia," *Labour History*, 67 (1994), 130.

[74]Burgmann, *In Our Time*; Terry Irving, "Socialism, Working Class Mobilisation and the Origins of the Labor Party," in B. O'Meagher, ed., *The Socialist Objective — Labor and Socialism* (Sydney 1983), 32-43.

drew on socialist ideas about public ownership, co-operation, and equality. Many far-sighted socialists such as Bob Ross and Childe believed that parliamentary socialism, using the ALP, was a viable strategy. Not the only strategy, and one that needed to be harnessed to a newer unionism dedicated to industrial democracy if legislative advances were to be translated into real workers' power, but a possible and viable strategy nonetheless.

This view of socialism and the ALP explains the adoption by the party of its 1921 socialization objective. This was not the work of middle-class intellectuals (as Clause 4 was in Britain), nor, as an objective for the ALP, could it have been the work of syndicalists. It was the work of trade union leaders who believed, despite the arguments of the syndicalists and the communists, that the Labor party could be a vehicle for socialism. It is sometimes said that the argument that socialism was the ideology of the working-class mobilization does not explain why "things went so horribly wrong for the socialists within the Labor parties."[75] We have to be careful however not to turn this valid insight into an *a priori* argument that the ALP was intrinsically an impediment to the realization of socialism. In historical terms we have to be careful that this insight does not blind us to the possibility that the ALP was a party for socialists and socialism. Historians who criticize "labourism" have to explain why so many practical, trade-union based socialists found the ALP more attractive than the supposed revolutionary alternative offered by either syndicalism or communism.

One reason was that the story of the ALP in office was not entirely one of sell-out and corruption. When Childe left New South Wales in 1918 he discovered a mood of "revolutionary optimism" in Queensland. He noted the contrast between the constant subversion of strikes by the Labor governments of J.S. McGowen and W.A. Holman in New South Wales, and the way the T.J. Ryan ALP government in Queensland was distinctly, if reluctantly, on the side of strikers. Later he was to attribute this difference to the "opportunistic" New South Wales party's policy of bargaining with ruling class parties (in the three-party system before a single conservative opposition to ALP emerged), a policy which encouraged corruption and internal strife, while in contrast the Queensland party "as a result of its more uncompromising policy ... gave birth at length to a real Labour Government."[76] Throughout the labour movement the same distinction was being drawn: between ALP politicians that betrayed the trust of the workers and those who were "genuine."

Even more crucial than the handling of strikes was the question of public ownership. In New South Wales the ALP carried on its state enterprises for the

[75]Burgmann, *In Our Time*, 18. Burgmann is referring to earlier studies by Irving, but her own book is proof of the correctness of this interpretation: socialism was "a movement of ordinary working-class people," an ideology that "encouraged the working class to develop a distinctively new party." See 193-5.

[76]Childe, "A Fabian Judged by History," *The Plebs*, 16 (1924), 12-3; for Childe on New South Wales and Queensland, see Irving, "On the Work."

benefit of capital: the state enterprises had to contribute to general revenue so that taxation on private enterprises could be reduced. Workers and consumers got nothing out of state enterprises in New South Wales. In Queensland, however, a wide range of state enterprises had reduced prices on food and services. At the same time the government was trying to increase taxation on the income and holdings of big capitalists and to force employers to bear the full cost of unemployment insurance. This was therefore in its main thrust an anti-capitalist government.[77] It was under the illusion, however, that Labor's "state within the state" (to use Childe's description of the Queensland situation) could overcome the anti-socialist resistance expressed in the economic power of capital. This illusion was revealed when Queensland Premier E.G. Theodore was forced to succumb to the capital blockade organized by the Queensland pastoral capitalists through their London financiers in 1924.[78]

Even before the debacle of 1924, intellectual and industrial socialists were arguing the need for unity between workers organized according to the principles of the newer unionism and a real Labor government. Indeed the 1921 objective rested on just such a strategy, as set out in the oft-forgotten seven "methods."[79] So, although the labour and politics relationship in the later stages of the period of worker mobilization was driven by industrial dissatisfaction, its main thrust was not anti-Labor party. It was anti-political only to the extent of eliminating corruption and careerism from the party, and of making it into an instrument for curbing the power of the market and for assisting the industrial movement to achieve industrial democracy. It was a form of parliamentary socialism, and it went down to defeat in the counter-offensive by business in the 1920s and 1930s.

4. *Canada: Social Democracy and Communism, 1920s-1950s*

If the fractured chronology of key gatherings during the era of World War I — in Québec in November 1917, in Ontario in March 1918, and in Western Canada in March 1919 — underlined the absence of a labourist consensus, behind the scenes the situation was even more complex. Most notably, radical industrialism or syndicalism was gradually being supplanted by a new blend of politics and militancy represented by the fledgling communist movement. First organized in an unofficial way in 1919, Canada's "soldiers of the international" would ride a

[77]Childe, "Political Action and the Newer Unionism," *Labor News*, 15 February 1919, 6; Carmel Black, "The Origins of Unemployment Insurance in Queensland, 1919-1922," *Labour History*, 60 (1991), 34-50.

[78]T. Cochrane, *Blockade: the Queensland Loans Affair, 1920-1924* (Brisbane 1989).

[79]The "methods" for achieving the "socialisation of industry" combined constitutionalism, industrial unionism, industrial democracy, and a "Supreme Economic Council." See J. Reeves and G. Evans, "The Evolution of the Socialist Objective, 1890-1980," in G. Evans and J. Reeves, eds., *Labor Essays 1980* (Melbourne 1980).

roller-coaster throughout the 1920s, including spectacular public interventions and melancholy internecine disputes.[80]

The Communist Party of Canada (CPC) was, at least initially, a substantively artisanal group, its British-born leaders being supported by a second-tier leadership within American-style language federations. Pro-Communist Russians, Ukrainians, Finns, and Eastern European Jews were sufficiently well organized to orchestrate the virtual handover of the Social Democratic Party of Canada to the CPC although such non-ethnic minority organizations as the One Big Union or the Socialist Party of Canada were never won over to communism en bloc. When the executive committee of the Comintern finally accepted the main Canadian application on 18 December 1921, Moscow emphasized the "duty *not* to adopt a position of narrow sectarianism which would throw [the] advanced socialist workers [within the OBU and the SPC] back into the arms of the opportunists." Regardless of the Comintern line, that remained to be seen.[81]

Foremost among the leaders of the party was Tim Buck, a former machinist who rose from industrial director to general secretary in the 1920s. Mediating, and in some authors' views moderating, the transition from a Leninist to a Stalinist Comintern line, Buck would be the personal embodiment of Canadian communism until the late 1950s.[82] Central to the Buck mythology was his and six or seven others' stint in prison between 1932 and 1934, which became to some extent a symbol of all that was rotten in the state of Canada during the worst Depression years. Linking the issues of civil liberties, unemployment relief, and collective bargaining in open-shop manufacturing and resource industries, the CPC recovered from the schisms of the late 1920s to a period of significant strength in 1935.

Communist tactics in the North American trade union movement went full circle from calls for building a "Left Wing" within the AFL in 1922 to the demise of the CPC's own quasi-nationalist union central, the Workers' Unity League (WUL), in 1936. The latter episode, viewed as evidence of a "sad march to the right" by WUL stalwarts like Nova Scotia's J.B. McLachlan, likewise represented the rather premature peak of Canadian popular-frontism, excluding the projection overseas of the broader left's limited effort during the Spanish Civil War.[83] Following defeat of proposals for a "reconsideration of CCF policy" towards the CPC led by trade

[80]The original study of the CP in the 1920s remains the best available survey: William Rodney, *Soldiers of the International: A History of the Communist Party of Canada, 1919-1929* (Toronto 1968).

[81]National Archives of Canada, Communist Party of Canada Papers, vol. II, f 1, documents pertaining to the constituent convention of 28-9 May 1921, Jules Droz and O.W. Kuusinen to Canadian CP, 28 December 1921.

[82]See John Manley's introduction to Gregory S. Kealey and Reg Whitaker, eds., *RCMP Security Bulletins: The Depression Years, Part II, 1935* (St. John's 1995).

[83]See David Frank and John Manley, "The Sad March to the Right: J.B. McLachlan's Resignation from the Communist Party of Canada, 1936," *Labour/Le Travail*, 30 (1992), 115-34.

union-oriented social-democratic leader, David Lewis in 1936, the two parties were at definite loggerheads.[84] The primary site for this antagonism would be the newly formed American-based Congress of Industrial Organisations (CIO, after 1940 the CCL) unions, whose political action program was, in principle, much more activist than anything since the Knights of Labor's. The rivalry had significant electoral consequences as well, although, in the Popular Front period, communist strength was clearly concentrated in the local government arena. Fifteen CPC candidates polled about 30,000 votes in the 1935 general election; Tim Buck personally polled almost 40,000 votes in a single, city-wide municipal contest in Toronto two years later.

As in Australia (though interestingly enough, not in front-line Britain) a determined effort was made to stamp out the CPC in 1940-1. Despite the ongoing political ban the CPC re-emerged in 1942 in the form of "Tim Buck Total War Committees" and then regrouped in what was to be the largest and most successful mass organization of Canadian communism, the Labour Progressive Party (LPP) of 1943-57. Claiming, and to a much more limited extent practising, a policy of openness towards non-communists, the LPP line of 1944 or thereabouts was similar to that of the short-lived Communist Political Association in the wartime United States, setting revolution aside for any foreseeable future in favour of what was an attempt to supplant the CCF as labour's representative in the high-level debates over post-war reconstruction.

There being no takers for the LPP leadership's wilder coalitionist schemes, the party would make its debut in the national elections of 1945. Candidates in areas of strength polled 112,000 votes to the CCF's 823,000, probably costing the CCF about 10 seats, mainly in industrial Ontario, where the CCF had a major breakthrough in 1942-3,[85] and winning one for the LPP at the expense of the Liberals in immigrant Montréal.[86] However the CCF in Saskatchewan (where the CCF government of 1944 enjoyed wide support from labour) brought down the sitting Unity member, the pro-communist MP Dorise Neilson. Interesting to note, another Saskatchewan MP, Gladys Strum, was the only woman among the 28 members of the CCF caucus of 1945, the first sizeable group of social democrats to be sent to Ottawa. But the 1945 election also marked the high-water mark for both Canadian communism and CCF social democracy. By 1953, for example, CCF support slumped to 636,000, while the LPP's vote total slipped below 60,000.

In the late 1950s social democracy found a way of adapting to the new environment by shedding old emblematic clothing through the foundation of the

[84]Whitehorn, *Canadian Socialism*, 25.

[85]Ivan Avakumovic, *The Communist Party in Canada: A History* (Toronto 1975), 163.

[86]The winning LPP candidate in Montréal-Cartier, Fred Rose, was actually a sitting MP, first returned at a 1943 by-election. During the Gouzenko Affair of 1946, vengeful Liberals made an "example" of Rose, who was stripped of his seat, jailed, and later effectively deported for alleged complicity with Soviet spies.

New Party movement, which was underwritten by the Canadian Labour Congress. Canadian communism proceeded on exactly the opposite track. An attempted reformist coup in the wake of the twentieth CPSU Congress ended in a purge of "counter-revolutionary" tendencies and, indeed the liquidation of the LPP as such in 1956-7. The new Communist Party of the 1960s would be anything but new.

Evaluations of Canadian communism's political significance must include its role in concreting many broader left positions regarding relations to Washington, Downing Street, and many similar matters. However, Leslie Morris's popular front tract, *The Story of Tim Buck's Party* emphasized the key message:

> The Communist Party is the product of the Canadian labour movement, a summary and achievement of all the million experiences which have marked the Canadian working class and its movements ... and which is [part of a movement] destined to lead the world to a higher form of civilization — to Socialism. The trade union movement of Canada ... can find its true place and realise its full significance only if it takes up the cudgels of labor political action ... in the daily struggle for bread in the factories, workshops, mills and mines.[87]

Interpreted as a dialectical dance around the core issue of class and politics, rather than a simple ideological rivalry, the parallel of Canadian communism and social democracy in the period after 1920 helps to explain the emergence and persistence of significant left-wing elements within the CCF itself. Typically labelled "reds" or "Trotskyites" in the 1930s many if not most of the left-wingers were in fact old-line Marxists who had rejected the CP and chosen an entryist strategy *vis-à-vis* the CCF.[88]

During this period such groups as Catholic action, which expanded beyond Québec in the 1930s, are not comprehensible outside the framework of the core battles in and around the CCF and the CP. Moses Coady, for example, organizer of the Antigonish movement in the Maritimes, articulated a healthy respect for the "energetic minority" on the left, as did the second generation leaderships of the Catholic syndicates.[89] The swirling debates around the 1949 Asbestos miners strike

[87]Leslie Morris, *The Story of Tim Buck's Party, 1922-1939* (np nd), 1-2.

[88]James Naylor, "Politics and Class: the Character of 1930s Socialism in Canada," paper read at the Canadian Historical Association Annual Meeting, Ottawa, 1993, 10 and passim; Walter D. Young, *The Anatomy of a Party: The National CCF 1932-1951* (Toronto 1969), passim.

[89]M.M. Coady, *Master of Their Own Destiny: The Story of the Antigonish Movement of Adult Education through Economic Co-operation* (New York and London 1939), 137, passim. Also Alfred Charpentier, *Ma conversion au syndicalisme catholique* (Montréal 1946). Jacques Rouillard, *Les syndicats nationaux au Québec, de 1900-1930* (Québec 1979), is the essential text on the proletarianization of the Catholic syndicates; see also Irving Abella, *Nationalism, Communism and Canadian Labour: the CIO, the Communist Party and the Canadian Congress of Labour, 1935-1956* (Toronto 1973), for a national overview.

(an illegal and extremely violent strike allegedly fomented by "communists" within the Catholic union movement) provide another illustration.[90]

The Catholic movement in Canada was typically multi-sided. It included a predominantly Anglo-Celtic wing, dedicated to boring from within, in a similar fashion to the Catholic Social Studies Movement in Australia. There was also the separate project of attempting to build authentically Catholic unions in French Canada, consistent with the Church's unique responsibilities regarding the provision of education, health and social welfare services in pre-1960s Québec. A detailed comparison of Catholic interventions in Canadian and Australian working class politics would be a rich study.

5. Australia: Comms, Langites and Groupers: "politics into labour," 1920-1960

Electorally, the Labor party in the states did quite well in this new period. In Queensland, after the setback to its socialist agenda, an increasingly conservative ALP remained in office until 1957, except for the years 1929-32. At the other extreme, the ALP was not able to form a majority government in Victoria, the heartland of liberalism and the centre of business power, until 1952. In South Australia and Western Australia, the ALP was more often in opposition than in office. In New South Wales and Tasmania the ALP was in power from 1941 to 1965 in the former and from 1934 until 1969 in the latter. At the federal level, the ALP was less successful. There were Labor governments in the Great Depression (1929-31) and then during the War and Reconstruction years (1941-49), but out of these experiences a myth was born. The ALP consoled itself during long years in opposition that, chosen by the electorate in these moments of national crisis, it was the true party of the nation. After the electoral defeat of 1949 there was no Commonwealth ALP government until 1972, when the end of the long post-war boom was in sight.

The policies of ALP governments, both state and Commonwealth, continued to mediate between the nation and the working class, sometimes mainly integrative, at other times mildly redistributive. In this period, however, the ALP had to deal with a more complex environment as a result of the impact of industrialization on the nation and the working class. Labor's policy discourse in this situation not only had to be more diverse, it had to be more political. The party had to offer leadership to construct a labourist nation and a nationalist working class. Increasingly, too, as a result of its own war-time centralization of policy-making, it had to operate in a more fractious federal system.

Four tendencies may be distinguished in Labor's policy discourse. First, the populist strand, which successfully migrated from the countryside to the industrial cities and towns. Labor leaders who berated "the money power" were continuing

[90]Fraser Isbister, "Asbestos, 1949," in Irving Abella, ed., *On Strike: Six Key Labour Struggles in Canada 1919-1949* (Toronto 1975), 163-96; "the date, rather than the place" borrows the original insight of Trudeau, cited by Isbister, 163.

a tradition that had begun in the 1890s, when the populist vision was artlessly agrarian, but in the 1930s and 1940s monetary radicalism had to satisfy industrial workers and intellectuals with a more sophisticated vision of radical reform. This proved impossible to do. Although J.T. Lang rose to power in New South Wales by sweet-talking the remnants of the industrialists, his demonizing of the banks in the Depression was not able to head off the revival of socialism in the party. Lang's kind of demagogic populism, exemplified by his refusal to make interest payments to foreign bondholders, was exposed in all its futility when he meekly accepted dismissal by the Governor of New South Wales in 1932. Meanwhile, J.B. Chifley, Lang's factional rival, was developing the national banking policy that he would introduce as Prime Minister in the late 1940s. While building on the hatred of the banks, Chifley and his bureaucratic advisers envisaged a government-regulated banking system as part of a wider program of redistribution, informed by socialist critiques of capitalism. When this was blocked, Chifley raised the class stakes by proposing to nationalize the private banks. He came up against a banker-led mobilization of the ruling class, a massive anti-labour propaganda campaign, and a sluggish labour movement unconvinced that the banks were the right target. The banks fought the issue in the courts and won. Six months later the ALP lost the 1949 federal election, and Labor populism of the pre-industrial variety was dead.[91]

The second tendency, Labor developmentalism, continued the state capitalist experiments of the 1910s into the era of industrialization. Its vision of a benign capitalism was closest to what later commentators would celebrate or attack as "labourism." It used state power to encourage manufacturing investment, guarantee jobs, and "strengthen the nation." In projects such as the Snowy Mountains Hydro-Electricity scheme it laid down the infrastructure for future growth. Through sponsored mass immigration from Europe after the war it provided the labour for an expanding economy. The trade-off with business, however, was that the unions would be excluded from the process of macro-economic decision making. This only reinforced the tendency for industrial workers to use their unions as vehicles for political consciousness, and this in turn was an added reason for the Labor party to look for ways to intervene in the working class, to regain the political initiative.[92]

Thirdly there was the Labor embrace of Keynesianism in the 1940s, which sought to continue the party's commitment to social reform and redistribution. This was the policy strand closest to the vision of the Queensland state socialists of the 1910s. The public enterprise program, which saw the creation of public air and shipping lines and government involvement in mining and manufacturing, was now located in a more realistic strategy and a theory of the role of government in a mixed economy. But it was also clear where the impetus for this progressive vision of post-war reconstruction came from. The 1945 Federal Conference of the Party, in

[91]Love, *Labour and the Money Power*, Ch. 6; B. Nairn, *'The Big Fella': Jack Lang and the Australian Labor Party, 1891-1949* (Melbourne 1986).
[92]Connell and Irving, *Class Structure*, 182.

a resolution that got to the nub of what "labour-in-politics" meant, told the government to implement the "planning and regulation of all factors of economic life in order to achieve full employment at award rates, and to guarantee economic security."[93]

Finally, there was Labor welfarism, sometimes called social democracy to make a link with the welfare state policies of the post-war socialist governments in Western Europe.[94] Welfare for the ALP, however, was closer to the traditions of social liberalism than to the state-centred universalism of European social democracy. According to Castles, Australia's system should be called "the wage-earners' welfare state," because the organized strength of workers in the labour market was the basic lever for redistribution. Full employment was the main policy objective, with social security acting as a safety net. The ALP's model of citizenship was consequently based on a different model of class politics than the contemporaneous programs in Europe. There were inconsistencies, however, in the Australian model. Although benefits were means-tested, the taxation system ensured that those who received also paid. It was, therefore, a welfare state that Labor's conservative opponents could take over and develop along liberal lines with minimum class contention after 1949.

This history of electoral politics and public policy cannot be properly understood outside the context of changes to the political identity constructed by the labour movement. The effect of "politicalism" (parliamentarism) by 1920 was to consolidate a specific political identity for the organized working class, an uneasy mixture of institutionalized class mobilization, via the unions and the party, and passive, individualized support for parliamentary socialism.[95] For workers, this identity rested on the ambiguous experience of having to stand aloof from the party to re-direct their collective power into control of the labour market, because of the failures of Labor politicians, at the same time as they relied on the party as individual voters to defend the system of regulation that legitimated unions and promised them a better future.

The existence of this political identity had ramifications for the labour and politics relationship. Although the project of taking "labour into politics" had not been discredited, it seemed to have reached a natural limit. The flow of energy from the working class to the party had become a sluggish delta of factions and power bases. On the other hand, in a period of ruling class reaction the significance of party politics was only enhanced. There was no plausibility in a syndicalist industrialism when the working class was on the defensive. Consequently, not only

[93]Quoted in G. Maddox, *The Hawke Government and the Labor Tradition* (Melbourne 1989), 141.

[94]For example in Carol Johnson, *The Labor Legacy: Curtin, Chifley, Whitlam, Hawke* (Sydney 1989).

[95]T.H. Irving, "The Roots of Parliamentary Socialism in Australia, 1850-1920," *Labour History*, 67 (1994), 97-109.

the parliamentarist electoral and policy efforts described above but all the class solutions of the 40 years between 1920 and 1960 were concerned with taking politics back into the working class. Not just the Communist party, but the Labor party on two occasions, under Lang in the 1930s and the Groupers in the 1940s and 1950s, was involved in this change.

The first indication of a change in the labour and politics relationship was found in the Communist party. Formed in 1920, it flourished in the 1940s and disbanded in 1990. As these dates suggest, its history in important respects was fashioned by industrialization; it presented itself as a factory-based party of industrial workers engaged in the crucial fight against the new leaders of the ruling class, industrial capitalists. The Communist party was also quite clear that it wanted to reverse the direction of the relationship between labour and politics. As Leninists, the communists were to be leaders of the working class. The party's general secretary, L.L. Sharkey, said in 1942, that the party had to take Marxism-Leninism

> to the masses who, unaided, are unable to raise themselves to a level of a theoretical understanding, are unable to advance beyond the immediate practical tasks of wages, conditions, strikes .... Our goal is to raise the consciousness of the Unionists to the level of a Socialist understanding.[96]

For the Communists it was clearly a case of taking "politics into labour."

The Communist party in the first decade of its existence was so small that it had to confine itself to permeation of the Labor party, and the effectiveness of this limited strategy was considerably weakened after the ALP decided to exclude Communists in 1924. For a decade the party became little more than a ginger group. Throughout the 1920s, as Frank Farrell has pointed out, most of the revolutionary trade unionists were outside the Communist party.[97] So it is not surprising to find that the changing balance of labour and politics, that communism most clearly expressed, was also felt elsewhere. Indeed, several parts of the labour movement, its advance checked, were reassessing strategies and organization. In 1927, partly as a continuation of the One Big Union movement, the Australian Council of Trade Unions (ACTU) was set up. It adopted the socialist objective of the ALP and endorsed the shift to industrial unionism. In the early 1930s the ALP was swept by a movement to set up "socialisation units" and the New South Wales branch was ever so briefly (24 hours in fact) committed to a Three Year Plan to achieve socialism.

These elements of ideology, strategy, and organization are as important for an understanding of working-class politics in the 1920s and 1930s as the byzantine factional intrigues that dominate most accounts. Of course it would be stupid to deny that Lang, the New South Wales ALP leader from 1923 and 1939, was an

[96]L. Sharkey, *The Trade Unions* (Sydney 1942).

[97]F. Farrell, "Explaining Communist History," *Labour History*, 32 (1977), 1-10; R. Gollan, *Revolutionaries and Reformists*, 1-13.

autocratic, populist demagogue, or that despite his anti-communism he formed an alliance with militant trade union leaders, the so-called Trades Hall Reds, to gain control of the ALP in that state. Yet, when Lang obtained almost dictatorial power in the party in 1926-7, including the right to choose his own Cabinet, this was the exact antithesis of the situation desired by the "industrialists" a decade earlier — notwithstanding their claim to the contrary. Willis, the guild socialist miners' leader said: "It's been an eight or nine year fight but we have won." If so, it was a hollow victory. Lang soon emerged as "The Big Fella," the "People's Champion," who formed his own machine to appeal over the heads of the union leaders to the working class.[98] His "Inner Group" was a faction. Lang's base was not in any specific part of the working class; he did not play any representative role in working-class politics. Langism after 1927 was a political construction. The slogan used to resist the slow growth of Communist party influence in the 1930s, "Lang is Greater than Lenin," indicated that the Inner Group was trying to play the same game as the communists. The state executive of the ALP under Inner Group control ran the party along democratic centralist lines, using the so-called "Red Rules" of 1927. Lang paid special attention to controlling the *Labor Daily* and Radio 2KY, and his propagandists elaborated a program (the "Lang Plan") and a myth of Lang's decisiveness and fearless opposition to the money power. During the 1930s the Inner Group ran teams in union elections against the communists and the official Labor party. Lang's opponents in the Labor party were forced to use the same tactics, setting up rival political bodies to contest union elections and to agitate in the party branches. Eventually in 1939, with the support of the Federal party, Lang was deposed as New South Wales leader.[99] In sum, Langism was a political tendency, with its own quasi-party organization, which sought to impose its form of politics on the working class.

Meanwhile the Communist Party of Australia (CPA) was rescued by the depression and the failure of the ALP to remain united in the face of the devastating impact of the depression on the working class. Communist agitation through the Unemployed Workers' Movement and the Militant Minority Movement widened its influence. The attacks on the ALP which were justified by the "Third Period" strategy of the Communist International began to attract ALP socialists and trade union militants, disillusioned by Langism, into the CPA. When the international communist line switched in the mid-1930s to building a popular front against fascism, the party's influence grew among intellectuals as well. By the end of the 1930s the CPA had won control of some of the key unions: the miners, the ironworkers, the waterside workers, and the seamen. In 1940 the New South Wales branch of the ALP was expelled because it was too sympathetic to the Communists. Even the banning of the Communist party by the conservative federal government

[98]J. Hagan and K. Turner, *A History of the Labor Party in New South Wales, 1891-1991* (Melbourne 1991), 94.
[99]Hagan and Turner, *A History of the Labor Party*, 91.

in 1940 had no effect on the steady recruitment of members and its success in union elections.

By 1944 the CPA was at the peak of its influence. It had 25,000 members, it was a major force in the ACTU, its leaders were secretly consulted by the federal ALP government, it was developing electoral support at the local level in working-class areas, and it was a growing cultural force. Within a few years, however, despite a wave of working-class militancy for shorter hours and higher wages, it was in decline. The question that is relevant to this discussion is not about the reasons for its rise and fall but about the connection between its Leninist approach to the labour and politics relationship and the character and extent of working-class mobilization. Or to put it another way: did the CPA have a negative impact on the working class, did it split the working class, or did it encourage new sections of the working class to enter the struggle and did it succeed in developing, if even for only a short time, a higher level of socialist consciousness in the working class? The kind of research into the work of the party in the trade unions and local communities has not been as extensive as it needs to be, but a sketch of one possible answer follows.[100]

Let us take the positive side of this question first. It would seem from its successes in local government and in union elections that the CPA was emerging as an alternative mass party of the working class. While the ALP was caught in its populist obsession with the banks and the bush proletariat, the CPA correctly saw the transition to industrial capitalism as an opportunity to address the working class in a more relevant way in the 1930s and 1940s. It was this coincidence of political economy and Communist doctrine that enabled the communists to campaign around real grievances with conviction and success. The Communists drew on the tradition of militancy and working-class consciousness, extending the revolt against "politicalism" without themselves succumbing — at least in the main — to corruption and sell-out. This enabled them to play a major part during the 1940s and early 1950s in the revival of socialism in popular attitudes, culture, and strategic thinking. Yet there is a negative side too. The CPA's conception of the Left was, in Len Fox's terms, a narrow one, and while there was also a strand of activity that recognized a "broad left," reading the accounts of communist activists leaves little doubt that, in the end, communist sectarianism was the stronger impulse.[101]

There has been little scholarly interest in accounting for the triumph of sectarianism in the CPA. Most Communists themselves are inclined to put it down to their faith in the Soviet Union, and former party leader Jack Blake has suggested that there is a strand of anti-intellectualism in the Australian working class that

[100]There are of course some indicative studies, for example Martin Mowbray, "The Red Shire of Kearsley, 1944-47: Communists in Local Government," *Labour History*, 51 (1986), 83-94; and Stuart Macintyre and Andrew Wells are preparing a major new study of the CPA.
[101]Len Fox, *Broad Left, Narrow Left* (Sydney 1982); also Nancy Wills, *Shades of Red* (Brisbane 1980).

must bear some of the blame.[102] These explanations, however, have a touch of the synchronic about them, relying on the identification of essential traits of the party and the working class. The important question is whether sectarianism became a form of working-class identity, in part constructed by the Communist party's Leninism, but equally by other political interventions on behalf of populism (as in the Lang machine) and Catholicism (as in the Industrial Groups). If it existed, this identity in turn would have played its part in reinforcing the narrow approach to class politics in the competing parties.

This is the necessary context for understanding the phenomenon of the Industrial Groups, and the internecine conflict that accompanied them. As we have seen, in the 1940s the CPA was shaping up to become an alternative mass party of the working class. In this situation some ALP, trade union, and parliamentary leaders approached the churches for support, arguing in fact that the ALP had lost its leadership of the working class. Only the Catholic church had any major presence in the working class, and only the Catholic church had, in the person of B.A. Santamaria, a dedicated political organizer who had the wit and talents to harness the Christian tradition of social action to anti-communism. With tacit support from elements in the Church hierarchy Santamaria had developed the clandestine Catholic Social Studies Movement to combat communism in the trade unions. He was thus in a position to offer the right-wing of the ALP the possibility of mobilizing specifically Catholic working-class support for a campaign to resist the advance of the CPA. In 1945 the alliance between the Movement (as the Catholics were called) and the ALP anti-communists was cemented when the state branches of the ALP began to form Industrial Groups, that is groups of Labor members dedicated to fighting the Communists in the unions.[103]

The shadow of the Movement over the Groups, and their focus on getting the numbers to control ALP branches and unions, may direct our attention away from the fact that the Groups were not without a wider awareness of working-class politics. On Industrial Group tickets in New South Wales, for example, there was printed the socialist objective of the ALP, and old Groupers today remember themselves as legitimate battlers in the class war. There were anti-communist left-wingers as well as Movement operatives in the Groups in the early days. In a sense it might be said that the secret connection with the Movement was important not just for its organizing potential but for its version of working-class politics. The ALP was once again emulating the logic of Communist activity in the working class, and contributing to a kind of working-class identity that was sectarian in a double sense — both political and religious.

[102]Fox, *Broad Left*; Wills, *Shades*; Jack Blake, *Revolution from Within: a Contemporary Theory of Social Change* (Sydney 1971).

[103]Gollan, *Revolutionaries and Reformists*, 169-77; B.A. Santamaria, interview with Geraldine Doogue, ABC television, 1993; D.W. Rawson, "The ALP Industrial Groups," in J.E. Isaacs and G.W. Ford, eds., *Australian Labour Relations Readings* (Melbourne 1974), 205-22.

Thus we must look at labour and politics from two points of view. We must distinguished the various kinds of labour politics that emerge when the working class organizes to enter the public sphere. We have also to identify the change that comes over working-class politics when the stress in the mutual constitution of class and party shifts from the class to the party, from labour to politics. This latter change is not often identified in this way. It is a change in situation, not in particular forms of organization or ideas. Thus the socialist militants of the 1910s were similar in many respects to the communist militants of the 1940s but their impact on the working class was quite different. The fluid and open class identity of the classic period of working-class formation is well known. We need complementary studies of the construction of a sectarian political identity, which resulted from the various strategies of political intervention in the working class followed by the Communists and their opponents in the ALP in the period from 1920 to 1960.

6. *Comparative insights*

The most obvious virtue of comparative study is that it forces us to be specific. Thus, before comparison began we knew that the ALP and the CCF-NDP were instances of the historical tendency for labour movements to exploit parliamentary openings in liberal-democratic regimes. Having made the comparison, however, we can identify, and begin to explain, the different political trajectories followed by the two movements, labourist in Australia and populist/socialist in Canada. In fact the process of comparative analysis has forced us to develop a set of concepts to handle the range of phenomena covered by labour and politics. Not only have we moved from the general to the specific but from the empirical to the theoretical. Labourism, populism, socialism: in our paper these are not merely empirical descriptions of policies or ideas, with particular Canadian or Australian inflections, but three cases among a range of theorized forms of labour and politics.

There are several important issues arising from this comparative analysis. First there is a question about what we mean by politics, or more exactly the sphere of politics. In Australia, where unions have been closely integrated with the state because of compulsory industrial arbitration, there is a tendency to write as if unions have only thought of politics as activity within the organizations of the state, either in the form of direct dealings with governments or through their connection with the ALP.[104] This is a typically labourist view of labour politics. In this respect the comparison with Canada, where there has never been a mass labour party, is instructive in two ways. Firstly, the fact that the relationship of the trade unions to governments and party competition is relatively fluid and contentious in Canada points up the need to unpack the relationship in Australia, to open up this particular piece of labourist luggage to scrutiny. Secondly, and more importantly, the relative weakness of labourism (in contrast to other forms of labour politics) in Canada

[104]See for example the discussion in Martin, *Trade Unions in Australia*, 114-8.

reminds us that the discussion need not be confined to a pluralist discourse in which governments stand at the apex of a neutral state. This allows the history of alternative left conceptions of politics in the working class to come into focus.

In relation to this second point, there is a more general insight about the significance of party competition within the working class. The absence of a mass labour party in Canada meant, for example, that parties with members active in unions in the 1940s included the Conservative Party, the Liberal Party, the CCF, the Labour-Progressive Party, and fleeting local labour parties. In Australia, where the union-based Labor Party dominates the political landscape, we tend to pass over those periods when Labor, Communist, and Democratic Labor parties fought for control of the union movement, and the importance of union support for the viability of minor (or, in Canada, unofficial) parties of labour.

Shifting the focus to unions, we can also draw from this comparison an important insight about the union as a vehicle for politics in the local community. We are familiar with the idea of community sources of union strength, both in the period of labour movement formation and in contemporary invocations of social movement unionism. In Canada we also see unionists for whom the union was a more effective political instrument than any party. Canadians, however, do not see the novelty of this; Australians, for their part, rarely look at their unions in this way. Analytically speaking, what we have here is the union as an agent not only of political action but of political socialization. This insight only comes into focus because we can contrast a country without a history of a mass labour party and state arrangements to institutionalize industrial relations with a country that does.

Our distinction between a working-class labourist party and a populist/socialist party helps to clarify the exactly reversed situations in Canada and Australia in the 1940s and early 1950s on the question of outside interference in the party. In Australia, the Catholic Movement threatened to make the ALP into a non-labourist labour party; in Canada, the New Party movement was widely seen as threatening to make the non-labourist CCF into a labour party. In Australia, it was the Catholic Actionists who were more doctrinaire than the average ALP activist; in Canada, it was the union activists who were moderate, while the CCF activists feared that their doctrinaire socialism would be diluted by the influx of unionists into the party. The contrast here underlines the need to be very careful about characterizing the political effects of union affiliation to parties of the Left.

Finally, our comparison reminds us that sections of both the leadership and the rank and file of trade unions may be actively opposed to the idea of union involvement in party politics. The Canadian case makes this plain enough, despite the complicating factor of "outside interference" from non-political unionism in the United States. Between the 1920s and the 1950s, the TLC distinguished itself from its major rivals in English Canada, mainly the All-Canadian Congress of Labour/CCL less by adherence to imagined craft principles than by a steady refusal of institutional support for the Labour Group of the CCF in parliament. The TLC

unionists were liberal individualists; regarding group action of any sort as illegitimate, they were only remotely part of a labour political culture.[105] Yet they were steadfast unionists and, relatedly, sometimes effective political lobbyists. In Australia, where a labour political culture has a strong institutional presence, it is all too easy to dismiss this liberal or pluralist conception of union politics. At the very least, this would seem to pose a problem for theorists of an essentialist labourism within the movement.

There is more to be learned from a comparative study of labour and politics in Canada and Australia, two countries with a common constitutional and, in a very broad sense, ideological heritage. The experience of the several ALP state and CCF-NDP provincial governments in the period after 1944 would be a natural arena for studies sensitive to regional diversity, individual leadership, and the constitutional and fiscal constraints of junior governments in a federation. Issues of caucus and cabinet solidarity, party democracy, and accountability to affiliated organizations, for example, were clearly confronted at an early stage in Australia, while Canadian unionists were still learning the basic lessons the hard way in the very recent past. Uneven development in political organization has likewise impacted the whole spectrum of labour movement leadership, which — among many other things — was and remains far better represented in the governing councils of the ALP than in the CCF-NDP and the separatist Parti Québécois (PQ).[106] Canadian workers may yet experience the calamity of being completely marginalized amidst the grave constitutional debates of "the elites'."

As the "realists" of the 1950s argued, the "formula, 'Government of the people by the people' must be replaced by this formula: 'Government of the people by an elite sprung from the people'."[107] To a certain extent, all of the different political movements of labour in Canada and Australia historically endeavoured (regardless of their ideology and will) to achieve precisely that end, nonetheless bending it subtly, or not so subtly, in the direction of working-class power. The effort was clearly buttressed by working-class culture, rather than a free-standing political culture in the two countries. Indeed, no one interested in understanding what made these two quite remarkable countries tick (or not tick) is likely to get very far without considering the diverse realms of working-class agency in the construction of their variously distinct societies in the 19th and 20th centuries.

[105]Horowitz, *Canadian Labour*, 239.

[106]See Gunzel, "The Confédération des Syndicats Nationaux, the Idea of Independence and the Sovereigntist Movement," 145-74.

[107]Maurice Duverger, *Political Parties* (New York 1954), 425.

MODELS OF SOCIAL POWER	SOCIAL FORCES EXPRESSED THROUGH ORGANISATION: *Organised labour*	*The working class*	*'The people'* (farmers, workers and middle class)
Competition (pluralist model)	*1* Independent (union) labourism and Lib-lab politics [early ALP esp in Vic] [Canada at various times esp 1940-60]	*2* Working-class labourism [early ALP; and dominant tendency in ALP to 1950s] [Canadian labour parties sponsored by TLC after 1917]	*3* Populist labourism [ALP at various times to 1940s]
Contradiction (structuralist model)	*4* Industrial (syndicalist) socialism and industrial labor parties [IWW in both countries; 'left' labor parties in Australia]	*5* Working-class socialism (parliamentary socialism) [ALP in Qld to 1920; Curtin, Chifley] [Provincial ILPs in Canada] [CPC and CPA, 1920-1935]	*6* Populist socialism [CCF/NDP]
Harmony (consensus model)	*7* Social contract unionism (or 'right' corporatism) [ALP/ACTU leadership in 1980s]	*8* Working-class (or 'left') corporatism [ALP left 'Accordians' in 1980s] [Neo-Gomperism in Canada]	*9* Populist corporatism ('popular front' line) [LPP; CPA 1935-47] technocratic labourism