

Reviews / Comptes Rendus

Volume 24, 1989

URI : <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/llt24rv01>

[Aller au sommaire du numéro](#)

Éditeur(s)

Canadian Committee on Labour History

ISSN

0700-3862 (imprimé)

1911-4842 (numérique)

[Découvrir la revue](#)

Citer cet article

(1989). Reviews / Comptes Rendus. *Labour/Le Travailleur*, 24, 265–344.

REVIEWS/COMPTES RENDUS

- R.T. Naylor, *Canada in the European Age, 1453-1919* by Rosemary E. Ommer / 265
- Rennie Warburton and Donald Coburn, eds., *Workers, Capital, and the State of British Columbia: Selected Papers* by Robert A.J. McDonald / 267
- Gary Burrill and Ian McKay, eds., *People, Resources and Power: Critical Perspectives on Underdevelopment and Primary Industries in the Atlantic Region* by Wallace Clement / 270
- Marjorie Griffin Cohen, *Women's Work, Markets and Economic Development in Nineteenth-Century Ontario* by R.M. McInnis / 272
- Huguette Lapointe-Roy, *Charité bien ordonnée. Le premier réseau de lutte contre la pauvreté à Montréal au 19^e siècle* by Jane-Marie Fecteau / 273
- Marlene Shore, *The Science of Social Redemption: McGill, the Chicago School, and the Origins of Social Research in Canada* by Ellen Jacobs / 276
- Leslie A. Pal, *State, Class, and Bureaucracy. Canadian Unemployment Insurance and Public Policy* by Carl J. Cuneo / 277
- John R. Miron, *Housing in Postwar Canada. Demographic Change, Household Formation and Housing Demand* by Richard Harris / 279
- Micheline Labelle, Geneviève Turcotte, Marianne Kempeneers, Deidre Meintel, *"Histoires d'immigrées:" Itinéraires d'ouvrières Colombiennes, Créoles, Haïtiennes et Portugaises de Montréal* by Jennifer Stoddart / 281
- Denise Helly, *Les Chinois à Montréal, 1877-1951* by Jean Lamarre / 283
- Pierre Bélanger, *Le mouvement étudiant québécois: son passé, ses revendications et ses luttes, (1960-1983)* by Thérèse Hamel / 284
- Henri Gagnon, *Les militants socialistes du Québec, d'une époque à l'autre* by Robert A Moreau / 286
- W.A. Hagelund, *Whalers No More: A History of Whaling on the West Coast* by Eric W. Sager / 288
- Jean-François Cardin et Jacques Rouillard, *Guide des archives des Unions internationales à Montréal* by André E. LeBlanc / 289
- Jay Cassel, *The Secret Plague: Venereal Disease in Canada, 1838-1939* by Edward Shorter / 290
- Michael Goldfield, *The Decline of Organized Labor in the United States* by Donald Swartz / 292
- Paul Buhle, *Marxism in the United States: From 1870 to the Present Day* by Alan Wald / 294
- Philip S. Foner, *May Day. A Short History of the International Worker's Holiday, 1886-1986* by Claude Larivière / 296
- Gary R. Mormino and George E. Pozzetta, *The Immigrant World Of Ybor City: Italians and Their Latin Neighbours in Tampa, 1880-1980* by Franca Iacovetta / 297

- A.T. Lane, *Solidarity or Survival: American Labor and European Immigrants, 1830-1924* by John E. Zucchi / 299
- Patricia Zavella, *Women's Work and Chicano Families, Cannery Workers of the Santa Clara Valley* by Alicja Muszynski / 301
- Wayne Lewchuk, *American Technology and the British Vehicle Industry* by Bruce E. Seely / 303
- Roger A. Bruns, *The Damndest Radical: The Life and World of Ben Reitman, Chicago's Celebrated Social Reformer, Hobo King, and Whorehouse Physician* by Mark Leier / 306
- David Rosner and Gerald Markowitz, eds., *Dying for Work: Workers' Safety and Health in Twentieth-Century America* by Robert H. Storey / 307
- Altina L. Waller, *Feud: Hatfields, McCoys and Social Change in Appalachia, 1860-1900* by Michael Fellman / 310
- Elizabeth Roberts, *Women's Work 1840-1940* by Paul Phillips / 312
- Patricia Romero, *E. Sylvia Pankhurst: Portrait of a Radical* by Ian Dyck / 314
- Stephen F. Kelly, *Idle Hands, Clenched Fists: The Depression in a Shipyard Town* by Richard J. Soderlund / 315
- Peter Weiler, *British Labour and the Cold War* by John Saville / 317
- Kenneth O. Morgan, *Labour People: Leaders and Lieutenants, Hardie to Kinnock* by Nicholas Rogers / 319
- Roger Fletcher, ed., *Bernstein to Brandt: A Short History of German Social Democracy* by Lawrence D. Stokes / 321
- Dan La Botz, *The Crisis of Mexican Labor* by Richard Boyer / 323
- Lourdes Beneria and Martha Roldan, *The Crossroads of Class and Gender: Industrial Homework, Subcontracting, and Household Dynamics in Mexico City* by Mireya Folch-Serra / 324
- Ronaldo Munck with Ricardo Falcón and Bernardo Galitelli, *Argentina: From Anarchism to Peronism* by Charles Bergquist / 326
- Robert Vicat Turrell, *Capital and Labour on the Kimberley Diamond Fields 1871-1890* by Christopher P. Youé / 327
- Roy Porter and Mikulás Teich, eds., *Revolution in History* by Mark A. Gabbert / 328
- Guillermo J. Grenier, *Inhuman Relations: Quality Circles and Anti-Unionism in American Industry* by Donald M. Wells / 330
- P.K. Edwards and Hugh Scullion, *The Social Organization of Industrial Conflict: Control and Resistance in the Workplace* by Kevin Henley / 332
- Ray Marshall, *Unheard Voices: Labour and Economics Policy in a Competitive World* by Jim Silver / 334
- Chris DeBresson, Margaret Lowe Benston and Jesse Vorst, eds., *Work & New Technologies: Other Perspectives* by Paul Stevenson / 335
- Kenneth H. Ostrander, *The Legal Structure of Collective Bargaining in Education* by Ruth Rees / 337
- Carmen Sirianmi, ed., *Worker Participation and the Politics of Reform* by James Rinehart / 338
- Bonnie M. McCay and James M. Acheson, eds., *The Question of the Commons: The Culture and Ecology of Communal Resources* by Colin A.M. Duncan / 340
- Hart Cantelon, Robert Hollands, Alan Metcalfe, Alan Tomlinson, *Leisure, Sport and Working Class Cultures* by C.A. Tony Joyce / 342

REVIEWS / COMPTES RENDUS

R.T. Naylor, *Canada in the European Age, 1453-1919* (Vancouver: New Star Books 1987).

FOR THOSE OF US who teach Canadian economic history, our choice of textbook has been, until now, limited to either Easterbrook's and Aitken's classic *Canadian Economic History*, which concentrates on chronology and history, or the more recent *Canada: an Economic History* by Marr and Patterson, a book organized along thematic lines. The former has become increasingly outdated and lacks an adequate economic theoretical content; the latter sacrifices historical depth and chronology to structural analysis. This state of affairs is entirely understandable: Marr and Patterson have written with the economist in mind, Easterbrook and Aitken the historian. None, however, has successfully bridged the interdisciplinary gap. I had hoped that Tom Naylor's new book might solve the dilemma; I am sad to have to report that this is not the case.

When I first opened the book, tentative phrases for this review were running through my mind — "This challenging book ...;" "R.T. Naylor's provocative revisionist view compels us to reassess..." — the sort of topic sentence that signals a new vision, an exciting reinterpretation, a debate-inciting analysis. Heaven knows, we need something like that in Canadian economic history and some of Naylor's earlier work has indicated that he might be just the right person to do the job. The preface looked promising: the

book "subscribes to a certain view of human society. It treats history as the unfolding of economic systems over time ... a story of the assault by 'entrepreneurs' on the physical environment, on the social fabric, and on their competitors, domestic and foreign ... of power, its accumulation and use for personal ends." Wonderful! Canadian economic history at last come to life to waken the sleepy, challenge the blasé, infuriate the conservative, excite the bored.

It doesn't happen. The vision is blurred, the argument rarely provocative (though sometimes petulant), the language tendentious, and the organization (into far too many small subsections) unhelpful. This is an experiment that has failed. I want to declare my bias at this point and say that I genuinely regret that this is so: this book, and its author (as the acknowledgements indicate) have had a rough passage, and it would have been a great pleasure to have been able to greet the fruits of ten years' *angst* with enthusiasm and applause. But I cannot, despite my sympathy with the author's perspective and his aims.

There are several reasons why. First of all, the book is highly organized, but not successfully so, and the result is a general choppyness that breaks up narrative, compartmentalizes issues and events, fragments themes, destroys chronological flow, and makes the whole complicated story of the development of the Canadian economy extremely hard to follow. There is no firm grasp of temporal or even, sometimes, geographical limits to the subject matter to be contained in the

Table of Contents for Reviews is on pp. 4 & 5.

book. Why, for example, does it start with the Crusades? I had the sense, before I was more than three pages into the first chapter, of being dropped into the middle of an explanatory aside, and the same thing happened again when I read sections on such things as the Irish Plantations, the Inca Empire, India and the Rise of Industrial Capitalism (to name only three examples) — such diversions take the reader too far away from the main thread of the argument to be useful. I know, of course, that there are connections to be made to these topics, but there are also limits to what can be done, and the author lacks the requisite historian's skills for creating a cogent interpretation out of a bundle of facts. The task would be difficult enough if the subject matter of the book were restricted only to what happened in Canada, but it explicitly seeks to cover the European context and the whole related imperial scenario and, while the purpose is laudable, the execution is not. Were that all that was wrong here, the general outlines of the argument might still have been discernible and the book, therefore, readable. But onto Canada's European and Imperial broad contexts are grafted explanations of the economic contexts of, for example, the ages of bullionism, mercantilism, and industrial capitalism, including a short (two-and-one half page) excursion into the long term effects of the Industrial Revolution in Britain. It is well-nigh impossible to do all this by subsection without ending up sounding superficial or cavalier. By the time I was one third of the way through the 500-plus pages of text, I was finding the whole indigestible mass of information completely overwhelming; more seriously, I was getting irritated and bored. This book badly needed some very severe editing.

That is my first complaint, and perhaps the most serious one. My second complaint is that I found the "Notes and Sources" and the "Bibliography" sections at the end of the book just as confusing as the text itself. Sorting out where some of the information (especially the

'provocative', 'challenging' material) came from turned out to be an exercise in detection, a kind of 'spot the actual source' game. The "Notes and Sources" headings follow the chapter titles, but subsections within the chapters were not titled here, although the subsections cover a wide range of topics. That's the clue, actually, because the "Bibliography" is arranged by topic; not the same topics as the subsections, unfortunately, but broader themes like American International Economic Expansion, or Aboriginal Economy and Society. Checking a source in this volume is not easy. I still have not found "Williamson on the general contours of English expansionism" (see 536 of the "Notes and Sources," as they are called on x, or "Notes and References" as they are called on 532) in the "Bibliography:" maybe this is a printing error and the reference should be to Williams? I am not quibbling here; a book which purports to be revisionist must be very explicit about its sources, and this book is not. Moreover, despite what appears to be a rather wide overall coverage of the literature, there are also some worrying gaps. How can early Newfoundland be adequately handled without reference to the work of the late Keith Matthews? Where is Gilmour's book on the evolution of manufacturing in Southern Ontario? Or Mannion's on settlement in Eastern Canada? Have I missed them, or are they misfiled somewhere in the "Bibliography"? I don't think so, but I began to lose confidence in my ability to find things in this book, and to ask myself how patient and painstaking a reader should have to be.

Finally, Naylor fails to gather his material together into a coherent whole. In an enormously ambitious undertaking of this kind, it is essential that the mass of facts be subject to a clearly-stated and clearly-executed unifying argument: a vision. This has not been achieved. Instead, we have subsection after subsection, reading like the raw material or author's notes for a book. It will not do: lacking a clear, cogent, and sustained purpose, all we are left with is a scrapbook.

In short, this is a frustrating, disappointing volume. It is all the more so since, well done, it would have been a very important piece of work indeed. The attempts to include aboriginal peoples in a serious manner, to remember that Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, and Newfoundland did not all sink without trace once the ink was dry on the terms of Confederation, to deal in some detail with banking structures, and other efforts to include topics that are all too often ignored, dismissed, or forgotten — this is all important and praiseworthy, but the manner in which the final work is ultimately presented diminishes the effectiveness and value of the volume to a significant extent. At the end of the day, R.T. Naylor's new book lacks structural cohesion, cogent argument and, therefore, intellectual authority. It is a great pity.

Rosemary E. Ommer
Memorial University of Newfoundland

Rennie Warburton and Donald Coburn, eds., *Workers, Capital, and the State of British Columbia: Selected Papers* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press 1988).

BRITISH COLUMBIA HAS LONG enjoyed a tradition of writing about its past from a "left" perspective. Established from the 1920s to 1960s by novelists, poets, and popular historians, this "view from the left" took academic form with the publication starting in 1967 of provincial labour and political histories by Paul Phillips and Martin Robin. It then blossomed through sociological studies of the region's resource-based economy and society. *Workers, Capital, and the State* follows in this tradition, the dozen articles that form the book's core sharing a "political economy perspective." To these the editors have added in their "Conclusion" an explicitly Marxist framework for interpreting the preceding papers and, more generally, for examining British Columbia history. Essays range in approach

from historical empiricism to sociological theory, varying widely in the manner and extent to which they combine the two.

Three themes predominate. The first identifies the capitalist mode of production as the fundamental source of social relations in British Columbia, the needs of capital and demands of labour forming the essential contradiction that has shaped provincial history: consequently, "class conflict...has been and continues to be a dominant feature of BC history and social structure." (263) This theory is applied by Allan Dutton and Cynthia Cornish to suggest how ethnic discrimination became a useful tool of class subordination by British Columbia farmers as agriculture evolved from independent commodity production to corporate capitalism after World War II. A similar framework directs Rennie Warburton's analysis of the history of collective action by British Columbia teachers; it is evident, he contends, "that British Columbia's public school teachers have always been dependent wage-earners engaged in social class struggle." (258) The same theoretical perspective is implicit in three other essays. Paul Phillips sees the fundamental change in British Columbia's mining history as the structural shift from independent commodity production during the Fraser River and Cariboo gold rushes to increased capitalization and use of wage labour in underground mining on Vancouver Island and in the province's south-east region. In a loosely argued essay Allen Seager looks at the occupational and organizational structure of wage labour in New Westminster from 1900-1930, linking occupational structure with expression of class interest through a systematic survey of strikes in the Royal City. And Elaine Bernard narrates the events of a five-day strike at the British Columbia Telephone company in 1981, suggesting that the province-wide occupation of BC Tel exchanges may have established a new means by which employees whose job security is threatened by massive technological change can resolve industrial disputes.

Three essays apply modified forms of Marxist analysis to specific historical questions. Rennie Warburton and David Coburn trace the rise of non-manual labour in British Columbia since 1981, noting particularly the feminization of subordinate forms of white collar work. James Conley applies the concept of cycles of reproduction of labour to BC's salmon fishery from 1900 to 1925, illustrating how the economic and social interests of fishermen owning their own boats and gear on the one hand and those working for canning companies as wage earners on the other conditioned different, and often contradictory, forms of collective action against canners. Finally, Gillian Creese explores the relationship between class and ethnicity for Chinese and Japanese immigrants to BC from 1880-1923, arguing that the labour competition inherent in an ethnically varied capitalist society created a segmented labour market, and racism. She does so by applying historically Edna Bonacich's segmented labour market theory. Ethnic relations in a capitalist society, most explicitly discussed by Creese and Dutton and Cornish, form the volume's second dominant theme.

The third is the role of the state in British Columbia history. Essentially restating the thesis presented some years ago by Martin Robin in *The Rush for Spoils*, John Malcolmson argues that the colonial and provincial states facilitated regional economic development to 1900 by favouring capitalist class interests; the state in British Columbia was not a "neutral arbiter." (10) Less orthodox is Patricia Marchak's analysis of the character and impact of provincial forest policy since 1950, which she relates to the industry's corporate and labour force structures. The government's post-war policy of encouraging oligopolistic control of forestry by a few large, integrated companies led, she argues, to inefficient use of the forest resource, continued vulnerability of the industry to fluctuating business cycles and, since 1979, a workforce of diminishing size. She suggests as

an alternative "greater public involvement in resource policy direction, more community control over production and investment, and smaller units which manufacture more end products." (198) Finally, in a crisply written and critical examination of Canada's Indian Act, Michael Kew details the content and legacy of the federal state's legislative role in "Making Indians." A superb piece that should be read by all students of native history, this essay nonetheless seems out of place in a book that aims to understand provincial development through the "application of class theory." (viii)

The volume's strength lies in its description of economic structures that shaped class relations in the Pacific province. Of particular note are excellent tables on British Columbia agriculture since the 1930s (Dutton and Cornish), on the role of women and non-manual workers in the BC economy (Warburton and Coburn), and on labour conflict in New Westminster (Seager). Other important contributions to regional literature include a detailed portrait of the provincial labour market to 1923 for Chinese and Japanese workers (Creese), a tightly reasoned analysis of the relations of production in the coast salmon fishery combining original historical research and sound theoretical direction (Conley), and useful historical overviews of BC's mining industry before 1900 (Phillips) and forest industry after 1945 (Marchak).

The book succeeds less well at the level of explanation. While claiming that it is "a work in historical sociology" (7), the editors have neither defined the concept nor required that contributors apply it consistently. Historical sociology should draw from the social sciences the goal of explicit identification of theoretical assumptions and from history an understanding of how the influence of time and place can modify even the most compelling general pattern. However, only half the authors in this volume identify clearly their theoretical framework. And in several instances the particulars of history rest uneasily with the generalizations

drawn from them. Malcolmson's statement that "a generalized system of independent commodity production" pervaded British Columbia before the C.P.R.'s arrival, except in coal mining (15), ignores many years of wage labour prior to the mid-1880s in salmon canning, lumber milling, and ranching. Similarly, Phillips's portrayal of the placer gold mining era as one "largely" of "independent" miners (41) underemphasizes the role of wage labour in the Cariboo. Malcolmson treats historical accuracy with particular disdain: he talks of Hendry timber interests in New Westminster and Dunsmuir railway interests on Vancouver Island supporting BC's union with Canada in 1871 (14), when in fact John Hendry did not migrate to British Columbia until 1872 and the Island rail line did not connect Esquimalt with Nanaimo until 1886. Creese argues that "the massive expansion of (BC's) unskilled labour force was beginning to slow down by the turn of the century" (71), a statement that provincial railroad contractors of the pre-war decade would have found curious. Allen Seager talks of New Westminster falling into Vancouver's economic orbit in the 1930s (119), a generation after the Fraser River community had actually been reduced to dependence. And in stating categorically that the "considerable improvement" over the past century in teachers' salaries, working conditions, and policy-making influence is to be explained by the teachers' "success in organizing and putting pressure on their state employers" (256), Warburton ignores factors such as demographic pressure, economic conditions, and intellectual climate that also influenced profoundly the development of British Columbia's educational system.

In addition, with one exception — Jeanne Meyer's study of how the "remarkably stable and socially cohesive" (141) character of Maillardville/Fraser Mills sustained the sawmill community during a major strike in 1931 — writers in this volume say little about working-class culture, family and community rela-

tions, or more broadly the world of working people outside the context of direct conflict with capital. In this they reflect the general lack of analytical literature on working-class culture and life in British Columbia. By contrast, the book's argument that racism is a product of capitalist relations of production emerges from the theoretical perspective of its authors. While significantly expanding our understanding of how capitalists manipulated ethnic tensions for class purposes and revising the traditional view that racial barriers precluded working-class co-operation across racial lines, writers fall back on a one-dimensional economic explanation of racism itself. This argument can only be convincing when cultural and intellectual factors have also been considered seriously, and discounted analytically. Such is not the case here. In addition, while these authors delight in finding more and more individual examples of how racial conflict stemmed from class tensions, evidence of this kind does not prove that economic conflict alone sustained racism over time. In short, this volume indicates that the relationship between culture and class continues to elude scholars writing about British Columbia from a "left" point of view.

Workers, Capital, and the State in British Columbia is a qualified success. It lacks the coherence of approach and interpretation and the consistently high standards of scholarship necessary to present a truly compelling reassessment of provincial development. The individual essays are also much less innovative in exploring questions of class and social conflict than the editors in their concluding remarks suggest. Yet the book broadens significantly our understanding of important areas of provincial history and forces us to think seriously about the role of capitalism in shaping institutions, social relations, and the distribution of power in Canada's "Company Province." The latter may prove to be its most enduring accomplishment.

Robert A.J. McDonald
University of British Columbia

Gary Burrill and Ian McKay, eds., *People, Resources and Power: Critical Perspectives on Underdevelopment and Primary Industries in the Atlantic Region* (Halifax: Gorsebrook Research Institute 1987).

JOURNALISTS, ACADEMICS OFTEN complain, miss the "bigger picture," reporting only the most obvious immediate events without locating them in broader socio-historical and theoretical/analytical contexts. Academics, however, are often too obscure, abstract, or quarrelsome for public consumption. *People, Resources and Power* finds a terrain between journalism and academia. The articles here are a rich testament to a vibrant intellectual tradition in the Atlantic region: of the 15 contributors only two appear to be university teachers; the rest are community activists and commentators. Most contributors are active members of an intelligentsia engaged in "popular political economy."

This collection is the first of the Gorsebrook Studies in the Political Economy of the Atlantic Region. Fifteen articles are reprinted from *New Maritimes*, one from the series *Round One*; articles often combine several pieces originally published in the magazine while some include up-dated material. The book appears designed mainly as a teaching aid and "does not claim to be either comprehensive or neutral" but it is refreshingly free of the bitterness and rivalry characterizing some academic commentary. Sections are organized on each of Agriculture, Fishing, Forestry, and Mining and Energy with each listing additional readings.

People, Resources and Power is a good motivator for undergraduate students and an even more broadly-based readership. The Introduction makes the point rather graphically that "we simply do not know some of the most basic things we need to know about the social and economic structures which shape our lives." The book has a strong regional sensitivity and is mainly about the issue of power: who has it, for what purpose,

and counter attempts to empower those who should know, namely those most affected. The Introduction provides an historical and labour market context to the appropriation of natural resources by outlining the "acute crisis" in industrial capitalism experienced by the region since World War II.

Part I focuses on Agriculture, especially the link between small producers and the concentrated capital of the McCain's and Sobey's empires. Tom Murphy's "Potato Capitalism" focuses on New Brunswick and McCain's domination, outlining in an historically sensitive way the process that has subordinated the province's farmers. Darrell McLaughlin pursues the same issue but examines the "divided world" of New Brunswick potato farmers who are separated "by language, distance, ideology, and contrasting levels of knowledge and awareness; and competing economic interests separate large farmers from small farmers, contract growers from open-market growers, and seed producers from table-stock producers and processing-potato growers." The key point is that the world of these farmers is heterogeneous, thus requiring quite a textured and detailed analysis to comprehend its politics. Moreover, the state promotes divisiveness among the farmers through its various practices, including funding of organizations. McLaughlin presents a dialectical analysis of state funding which appears to support farmers but, in fact, fragments them and undermines the efforts of the National Farmers' Union which seeks to unify a broad oppositional farmers' movement. Marie Burge also writes on potatoes but on Prince Edward Island where she focuses on the dealers who command the seed and fresh table markets, controlling two-thirds of the crop which passes through their hands. She documents a "paternalistic tradition" of 80 licensed dealers (25 of whom control 80 per cent of production), many of whom are themselves large growers. Burge documents the struggles over control of marketing boards which have taken place in

this complex system of politics. Finally, there is a piece by Eleanor O'Connell on the "Sobey's Empire" but I am not sure why it is in this section, indeed this book, except that it is an interesting article about the Sobey corporate complex — the Sobey's being one of four powerful Maritime families (the others are the Jodrey's, Irving's, and McCain's).

Part II is about Fishing. The Introduction locates key issues in the fishery, especially the practices of the state. Rick Williams's piece on "Machiavelli" is an insightful, cutting commentary on Michael Kirby and his *Task Force Report*, focusing on the context and content of this document. Williams also did the next piece on "Restructuring" which is a well-written article developed from the perspective of the inshore fishery making a critical assessment of the major fisheries' processors. It is a fairly detailed account of the so-called restructuring of the National Sea corporate empire and is especially critical of the role of the media. It provides an unusual insight into the inner workings of the Nova Scotia ruling class. In contrast, Bernie Conway's piece on the "PEI Fishery" is a rather thin overview of the problems with state support for Island fisheries. Mary Boyd concludes the section with a strong piece on Island Irish moss harvesting. Moss contains carrageen, a key industrial ingredient. Interestingly, 70 per cent of its harvesters are women. Boyd documents the political groups formed around the harvest and sale of moss, led by the Mimenegash Women in Support of Fishing.

Part III is about Forestry and the debate over its management and issues of public access. The Introduction alerts us to the forestry shift from lumber to pulpwood; while prior to 1961 pulp was only 30 per cent of the harvest, that now reaches 80 per cent, thus forcing producers into a more concentrated market dominated by multinational companies. Equally notable are the environmental issues of aerial spraying and clear cutting. Julia McMahon provides a substantial analysis of the relationship between cor-

porate capitalists and woodlot owners in Nova Scotia, focusing on Stora, the Swedish giant pulp and paper firm, its concession of 1.5 million acres and 50-year crown lease. She contrasts the practices of this firm in Nova Scotia and Sweden: 85 per cent tree replacement in Sweden compared to a mere 15 per cent in Nova Scotia and a cutting cycle of 75 years in Sweden compared to only 45 years in Nova Scotia. She focuses on the implications for woodlot owners, 80-90 per cent of whom no longer cut their own pulpwood, and especially its destructive consequences for rural peoples. The final three pieces are on spraying. Christopher Majka evaluates the use of herbicides, particularly for what is known as "conifer release" which eliminates competitive growth thus allowing specific trees to grow more quickly. He contrasts the chemical and manual methods, arguing that manual thinning is cost competitive without the complications of chemical spraying. Moreover, it provides more local jobs and reduces environmental damage. Bruce Livesey provides a frightening report on the use of sprays ranging from Agent Orange herbicides to pesticides against spruce bud worms, exposing the weakness of New Brunswick government regulation despite the grave danger associated with their use. Finally, Aaron Schneider reinforces some points from an earlier piece but using Nova Scotian examples, contrasting capital-intensive forest management techniques with labour-intensive ones. He focuses on responses by the chemical industry to environmentalists by attacking criticisms through 'counter-intelligence' practices.

The final section is Part IV on Mining and Energy, the Introduction highlighting the "hidden injuries of dependence" with its pattern of discovery, foreign investment, state subsidy and failure characterizing the region's resource projects. The failures, however, have been detrimental to the locals, not necessarily to multinational capital. Brian O'Neill wrote two pieces. The first, on Nova Scotia's "Vanishing Offshore," is written from the per-

spective of the "heady-days" of the province's 1984 oil and gas boom optimism. It is a full-length analysis of how the "agenda is set by external forces." This is a very capital-intensive industry with few local jobs but makes great political hay. He concludes with a 1987 Afterword on the collapse of the boom. O'Neill also contributes a piece on the Ocean Ranger, claiming "those primarily responsible for a preventable disaster could escape without blame" when 84 crew members died in February 1982. He argues against the "tragedy of a whole system of development" which privileges profits and taxes over people. The final two pieces are also about tragic disasters. "Springhill 1958" by Ian McKay is an excellent account of the collapse and closing of a coal mine. McKay depicts this as a "man-made" rather than "natural" disaster. His strong account keeps this vital lesson alive. Alan Story writes about the fluorspar mines of St. Lawrence, Newfoundland which consumed over 300 men with lung cancer and silicosis before being closed in 1978, yet when the mines re-opened in 1985 there were 400 people lined up for 90-120 jobs because of the desperate employment situation in the region. Local workers have sacrificed themselves under a labour contract which keeps wages low, genuine unions out and prohibits strikes.

Rick Williams concludes with an insightful Afterword built around four themes he finds in the collection: the adaptation of local capitalists to underdevelopment, the state's role in perpetuating underdevelopment, the key place of resource industries in the region, and the difficulties primary producers face when organizing resistance. He concentrates his remarks on the means of resistance which have, indeed, developed and many prove helpful in the future. This book can go some way toward empowering people from the region to struggle for their own development.

Wallace Clement
Carleton University

Marjorie Griffin Cohen, *Women's Work, Markets and Economic Development in Nineteenth-Century Ontario* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press 1988).

THIS IS, FOR THE most part, a persuasively argued account of a continuously increasing involvement of women with the market as the economy of Ontario developed over the course of the nineteenth century. It is not so much an attempt at a comprehensive study of women's role in the Ontario economy as an extended essay that offers an interpretation of the changing involvement of women in the market economy. Cohen's central thesis is that Ontario is not accurately described by what has come to be the prevailing interpretation of the evolution of women's work. By that interpretation women lost ground over the course of the nineteenth century. While they had once been substantially involved in a wide range of market production, women found that industrialization increasingly consigned them to "non-productive" household tasks and that "real work," regarded as involvement with the market economy, came increasingly to be a male preserve — a situation reversed only in recent years. Cohen's argument is that such a portrayal, developed from European and especially British experience, does not reflect what occurred in Ontario.

The essence of the argument is that newly-settled Canada began with an economy organized for the most part into largely self-sufficient agricultural households, sparsely distributed in space. That was the backdrop against which the more widely publicized export staple story was played. The great staples of wheat and timber that have received the attention of the economic historians involved male labour. Underpinning the staples economy, though, was an economy of household production, largely for its own consumption. That "subsistence" economy involved the labour of women and children. The proportion of total economic activity subsumed in the household economy has commonly been un-

derappreciated.

Over time, as Ontario moved away from the strictly pioneer economy to one of more substantial farms in more economically integrated communities with villages and towns that provided non-farm markets for household production, larger marketable surpluses were produced. Women's involvement with the market increased, but mainly as producers and sellers of butter, eggs, poultry, and garden vegetables rather than as sellers of labour services. Eventually, but mainly in the late nineteenth century, a rising proportion of women turned to paid work in an ever-widening range of occupations.

The synthesized account that Cohen offers is generally persuasive, yet is drawn from a rather modest basis of evidence. There is little that is new in the details and particulars. Cohen reasserts what many have believed, that Canadian farm women typically did not do field work, but she adds no new supporting evidence. Chapter six, on women's paid work, is just a narrative account of what one can read from census tables. The suspicion that the nineteenth-century censuses may have systematically and significantly understated the involvement of women in the labour force is not thoroughly pursued nor is there any real attempt to reconcile some of the large differences between the personal and industrial censuses. For the most part Cohen's interpretation is a reliable reflection of the existing evidence but I might have wished her to have been more thoroughgoing in her skepticism. Her central thesis grew out of her doubts about the received view of the historical evolution of women's work. She might have been equally skeptical of other received views. She fully accepts, for instance, the staples scheme of the development of Upper Canada in the first half of the nineteenth century although she indicates that she is quite aware of some of the serious doubts that have been raised in the literature. She nevertheless uses the staples framework as an organizing theme. It seems that she has not realized that her main argument

does not really depend upon the validity of the staples scheme.

A more acute skepticism would have warned the author against stating that "The tendency for young males to leave the province is more a reflection of the shift in the agricultural frontier farther west than of the inability of the agricultural sector in Canada to absorb their labour." (124) A quick manipulation of some numbers would show the invalidity of this proposition. The population of rural Canada was growing rapidly. Similarly, no matter who wrote it, a true skeptic would not have quoted such a claim as "...in the short period between 1849 and 1851 it is estimated that butter production increased by more than 350 percent." (105) And there are other unreliable details such as the serious misinterpretation (62) of Canada's situation before 1842 in relation to the British Corn Laws.

The foregoing are quibbles about a generally good book. The more serious criticism that I would register is that, to be firmly nailed down, Cohen's argument needs more supporting evidence and a more intensive quantitative approach. It would have been more convincing if she had been able to demonstrate that the combination of increased labour force participation and increasingly specialized production for the market by farm women was really enough to assure that ever increasing involvement of women in the market. It is a quantitative issue and ultimately it needs to be addressed quantitatively.

R.M. McInnis
Queen's University

Huguette Lapointe-Roy, *Charité bien ordonnée. Le premier réseau de lutte contre la pauvreté à Montréal au 19e siècle* (Montréal: Boréal Express 1987).

VOILA UN SUPERBE THEME DE recherche, curieusement négligé dans notre historiographie. L'histoire du traitement de la pauvreté, c'est ce regard souvent cru

sur l'envers du travail dans la société de marché, c'est l'écoute de ces silences révélateurs dans le discours bavard de la richesse et du progrès. Pour sa part, Huguette Lapointe-Roy a choisi de nous dépeindre ce monde du point de vue de ceux et celles qu'elle appelle les "intervenants de la bienfaisance." (p. 12) On trouvera donc dans ce texte une description plus ou moins détaillée, selon les sources primaires accessibles, du réseau d'assistance qui s'implante au milieu du 19^e siècle.

Premier constat: le titre peut prêter à confusion, car il s'agit essentiellement du Montréal catholique, et le "19^e siècle" dont il est question ici se limite strictement à la période 1831-1871, sauf quelques brèves incursions dans la période antérieure. De plus, même si le concept de "réseau de lutte" n'est jamais défini dans le texte, il est faux de prétendre qu'il s'agit du "premier" réseau: dès avant la Conquête, la Nouvelle France avait vu s'instaurer un ensemble d'institutions qui, du bureau des pauvres à l'hôpital général, prétendait gérer à sa façon le problème de la pauvreté. Enfin, l'expression "charité bien ordonnée" est pour le moins ambiguë; si elle fait référence, selon l'adage bien connu, au principe de responsabilité individuelle comme méthode première de gestion du social, il en est très peu question dans ce livre. Si, par contre, l'expression est à prendre au sens premier, la description des institutions d'assistance entreprise ici donne plutôt l'impression d'un joyeux désordre, la "lutte contre la pauvreté" apparaissant tout au plus comme une guerre d'escarmouche laissée à l'initiative débridée des bienfaiteurs et bienfaitrices....

Dans une première partie, l'auteure nous décrit les "intervenants" dans le domaine de l'assistance, soit le clergé, les congrégations religieuses féminines, les laïcs et les pouvoirs publics. Elle nous présente essentiellement les buts de l'institution en cause, le personnel de direction et les sources de financement. Une deuxième partie traite des "pauvres en

institution," distinguant entre les déshérités-es "inadaptés au travail" (enfants abandonnés, orphelins, vieillards et infirmes) et ceux-celles qui, aptes au travail, sont pris-es en charge par des institutions comme la maison d'industrie, la Confrérie du bien-public ou les divers services de placement. La troisième et dernière partie nous fait découvrir le monde extra-institutionnel des services à domicile. Trois types de services y sont privilégiés, soit les visites à domicile, les dépôts des pauvres et l'oeuvre de la soupe. Dans chaque cas, les initiatives de diverses institutions, telle les Sulpiciens, les Soeurs de la Providence, les Soeurs Grises et la Société de Saint-Vincent-de-Paul, sont énumérées.

Une telle stratégie d'exposition provoque de nombreuses redites entre la première partie et les deux suivantes, la distinction entre la description de l'institution et celle des services offerts n'étant pas toujours si tranchée. De plus, la profusion de chiffres concernant le financement, les dépenses et la clientèle rend souvent la lecture pénible et l'analyse difficile. Quelques tableaux statistiques (l'ouvrage n'en contient aucun) auraient été les bienvenus.

Le travail de Lapointe-Roy témoigne d'une patiente et longue recherche dans des archives dispersées et sous-exploitées. A ce niveau on doit donc la remercier de nous livrer le témoignage qu'ont laissé d'elles-mêmes les institutions. Cette histoire, descriptive au premier degré, est en effet essentiellement basée sur l'exploitation directe des archives, sans la médiation importante qu'apporte habituellement l'analyse critique.

Le récit de l'auteure se situe en effet dans la plus belle tradition des hagiographies institutionnelles, dans cette atmosphère éthérée où le pauvre, faire-valoir de la charité, n'est présent que comme objet d'assistance, témoin involontaire de la dureté des temps et de la charité des élites. De même, l'État apparaît comme ce grand absent que la philosophie du temps confine à l'attentisme méprisant face aux

problèmes sociaux. Dans ce double vide, vide de l'État et vide des besoins à remplir, l'Église et quelques généreux laïcs ne peuvent que voler la vedette, et sauver l'honneur de ces temps cruels...

Une telle problématique conforte l'image traditionnelle d'un Québec soumis au paternalisme bienveillant de l'Église au 19^e siècle. C'est pourtant trop simple pour être vrai... L'historiographie québécoise, heureusement, a fait bien du chemin depuis les temps glorieux de la philosophie du "rattrapage." En ce sens, la bibliographie de l'ouvrage, par ses nombreuses carences, témoigne de la profonde faiblesse théorique de cette synthèse. Dès l'abord, plusieurs analyses directement pertinentes au champ d'étude n'ont manifestement pas été utilisées, notamment les travaux de Drapeau (1978), Mongeau (1967), Bernier (1981), Bilson (1980), Guest (1980), Fecteau (1983), Casgrain (1978), La Broquerie Fortier (1965), Leblond (1951), Macdermot (1950). Plus encore, l'auteur semble avoir écarté comme non pertinente toute l'historiographie occidentale sur la question de l'assistance. Quand on sait l'importance des débats méthodologiques et théoriques menés depuis 20 ans par les Foucault (1963, 1975), Rothman (1971), Ignatieff (1981), Thompson (1962, 1971), Scull (1977), Poynter (1969) et plus récemment Himmelfarb (1984), on ne peut que rester perplexe devant la pauvreté analytique de cette synthèse.

Ainsi l'auteure affirme, sans jamais le démontrer, que "le Canada français a apporté une réponse sociale originale" (p. 291) aux problèmes causés par l'industrialisation. Pourtant, on ne peut s'empêcher de constater la symétrie frappante entre les institutions mises en place au Québec dans les années 1840 et 50 et le développement institutionnel relevé aux États-Unis par Rothman, en Angleterre par Scull et Cohen, en France par Foucault.

De même, l'auteure situe dans les années 1820-40 l'origine de la plupart des initiatives prises. Ce constat, d'ailleurs

douteux (il n'est pas sûr, par exemple, que les initiatives charitables de la paroisse de Montréal relèvent de la même logique avant 1840), semblent postuler une continuité de la philosophie philanthropique au Bas-Canada depuis la Conquête. Or il s'avère qu'à partir de 1815 surtout, un débat majeur a fait rage au Québec sur ce point, et que les grandes lignes de la gestion "libérale" de l'assistance ne se dessinent clairement qu'au début des années 1840, avec Mgr Bourget. Les rébellions de 1837-38, et la crise socio-politique qui les sous-tend, en mettant en cause l'équilibre des pouvoirs chez les notables et en ouvrant à l'Église un espace politique d'intervention, sont au cœur de cette mutation. Car l'assistance aux pauvres, et la gestion du social qu'elle implique, est aussi un problème *politique*, qui interpelle au premier chef l'État et pose la question du pouvoir. Le rôle de l'Église dans ce domaine reste beaucoup plus à expliquer qu'à décrire. Quoi qu'en dise l'auteure, l'État est constamment présent, ne serait-ce qu'en filigrane, dans la gestion des problèmes sociaux, notamment en mettant en place le cadre légal des mesures à prendre (exemptions d'impôt, procédures d'incorporation, inspection de certains établissements, réglementation plus ou moins sévère de certains autres, etc.).

En fait, la période postérieure à 1840 voit se dessiner un *partage* social et politique des responsabilités d'assistance qui est autrement plus ambigu et complexe que l'image optimiste qu'en donne l'analyse de l'auteure. La détermination scientifique des modalités de ce partage exige qu'on ne fasse pas l'économie d'une réflexion théorique et méthodologique urgente. Cette réflexion reste à faire.

Jean-Marie Fecteau
Université du Québec à Montréal

Marlene Shore, *The Science of Social Redemption: McGill, the Chicago School, and the Origins of Social Research in Canada* (Toronto: Toronto University Press 1987).

WESTERN GOVERNMENTS TODAY customarily call upon the work of social scientists in the formulation of public policy. The quest for a scientific method of social and political analysis dominated the latter half of the nineteenth century. From the 1880s onward, contemporaries witnessed the attempt to define and to institutionalize aspects of social study, within distinct disciplines of study, including sociology, political science, economics, social psychology, and anthropology.

In Britain, northern industrial towns such as Manchester and Liverpool, already responsive to the demands of women and labour for university-level courses of instruction, were also receptive to the formation of departments of social study. In London, newly-created institutions such as the London School of Economics gained entry into the University of London, offering courses of study in sociology, political science, and economics. Two other centers of social study, the London school of Ethics and Social Philosophy (1897-1900) and the School of Sociology and Social Economics (1903-12) provided courses of study in idealistic social philosophy, social economics, and social administration. Lack of funds forced the latter to merge with its rival ideological institution, the LSE, in 1912 as the Department of Social Science and Social Administration. In the University of London, courses in sociology and social work, founded in the same climate of social fervor, represented increasingly opposing ideological views of the nature and purposes of social investigation.

If the rise of the social sciences followed an intricate path in Britain, the Canadian tale is no less fascinating. Marlene Shore's book, *The Science of Social Redemption: McGill, the Chicago School, and the Origins of Social Research in*

Canada, is a contribution to Canadian social and intellectual history. Her study focuses upon the attempt to institutionalize social science research at McGill University in the interwar years.

McGill's Department of Social Study and Training was created in 1918 as part of a three-year experiment. It was intended to contribute to the social welfare of the city of Montreal — providing students with training in social service work. It was also hoped that it would enable McGill to gain national recognition in areas other than the already renowned Faculties of Science and Medicine.

British-born, Balliol social expert John Howard Toynbee Falk, was brought in to lead the department. As the experiment of three years drew to a close, McGill's theological colleges withdrew their support, presumably because a secular program of social study risked the loss of students from their own programmes of study. And Montreal businessmen abandoned their approval of the program, preferring a more "theoretical" approach to social problems. Although Shore does not pursue the point, it is almost certain that a large number of women were among those who pursued the course of studies in the Department of Social Study from its first year as a university-extension course, to a two-year diploma course.

The emergence of sociology at McGill was not without its casualties; in the ruins of the social study and training program, the University appointed Chicago-trained Divinity student and sociologist Carl A. Dawson, who shifted the Department of Social Service away from applied social work toward social research and investigation. Shore provides an excellent analysis of Dawson's social thought and his influence upon the growth of sociology at McGill. Dawson regarded informed discussion of research data as a form of social service, leading eventually to the formulation of social policy.

Shore argues that, unlike the development of social studies at Queen's and Toronto Universities, where British social

philosophy dominated, the emergence of sociology at McGill represents an indigenous brand of social thought with roots derived from Baptist social gospel. She argues that the Baptists origins of several key individuals, such as Dawson and Everett Hughes, and their association with the Baptists-founded institution, the University of Chicago, helped to create a North American mode of social analysis. But she fails to provide any particular evidence which distinguishes the "social gospel" of Baptists from any other Protestant denomination, or from any other contemporary doctrine of social reform, including the ethical idealism which informed the work of a large number of British-trained social reformers.

The role of ideology in shaping the scope and direction of social research at McGill merits more attention from Shore. The weight of her own evidence suggests that ideology, rather than a quest for a redemptive social gospel, influenced the direction of social research at McGill in the interwar years. How else to explain the hostile reception, as "too collectivist," to the results of LSE-trained economist Leonard Marsh's investigation of employment and unemployment in Montreal under the aegis of McGill's Social Science Research Project? If, as Reba Soffer has recently suggested, the survival of sociology as an academic discipline depends upon its function as an instrument of social criticism, it is a wonder that the discipline survived the decade of the 1930s at McGill.

The book would have benefited from a more extensive discussion of the emergence of social studies in other Canadian institutions, including Queen's and Toronto, as well as a more extensive discussion of the fate of sociology and social research at McGill in subsequent years. The absence of a comparative perspective is all the more glaring with regard to the development of social research in French Canada. Poverty in Montreal cut across ethnic, religious, and linguistic boundaries; but aside from the occasional mention of Edouard Montpetit's collaborative

efforts and the discussion of Everett Hughes's study of French Canadians, there is scant mention of the nature and extent of social work and social research in French Canada. The author also merits a more careful editing: McGill's Department of Social Study and Training is variously described as the Department of Social Service, adding confusion to an already nuanced study (see 50, 51, 52 and 67 for example). Another slip: the first Warden of Toynbee Hall in London was Canon, not Colonel, Samuel Barnett.

These reservations aside, this book provides a valuable contribution to our understanding of the development of Anglo-Canadian social science and social research in their formative years. It is essential reading for students of history, sociology, economics, and geography.

Ellen Jacobs

Université du Québec à Montréal

Leslie A. Pal, *State, Class, and Bureaucracy. Canadian Unemployment Insurance and Public Policy* (Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press 1988).

THERE IS A GROWING body of academic literature that attempts to downplay the salience of class struggles between workers and capitalists by emphasizing the centrality of professional or managerial new middle class interests masked as non-class and non-ideological scientific knowledge. Pal's recently published book falls within this genre. He attempts to explain changes in Canadian unemployment insurance policies, primarily between the 1920s and 1980s, by comparing several theories. Pal collapses what he calls neo-marxist and neo-pluralist theories into society-centred explanations of public policy based on pressures exerted on the state by economic producer groups (business and labour). His state-centered theories consist of bureaucratic politics (intra- and inter-organizational conflict within the state) and institutionalism (the

centralization of powers under the federal government) within autonomous state structures insulated from class and other social forces. Pal's thesis is that business and labour, although taking opposite positions, had no impact on the development of unemployment insurance policies. He argues that the best explanations are bureaucratic politics, centred on the actuarial ideology of insurance principles, and inter-bureaucratic conflicts, especially between the Unemployment Insurance Commission and the Department of Labour. He also prefers to explain changes in unemployment insurance in terms of the structure and process of dominion-provincial relations and negotiations.

Pal's book is deficient in several respects. His understanding of marxism, one of the major theories tested and found wanting, seems no greater than that commonly found among first-year undergraduate students. He reduces the plethora of marxist political theories to crude external labour and business pressures on state policy-makers. Perhaps most embarrassing to Pal, he treats the proposition of divisions within the capitalist class as a "new approach" or "development" within marxism (54-5; 189n1). Pal does not seem to realize that this was fundamental to Karl Marx's treatment of the bourgeoisie in *Class Struggles in France, 1848-50* and the *Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*. In effect, Pal has folded what he calls neo-marxism into his neo-pluralist pressure model, and ends up with no test at all of the marxist model. Throughout the book, he gives no sign of being aware of the marxist structural model of the state which posits the inscription of material interests and class contradictions onto seemingly independent and autonomous state structures. Only at the end of the book, in response to some criticisms of his work, does he indicate an awareness of this model, but then mistakes its author as Rianne Mahon (it should be Nicos Poulantzas who, interestingly enough, Pal cites in his bibliography).

The reduction of marxist theories to a crude neo-pluralism has the effect of ban-

ishing the worker from any central consideration in unemployment insurance policy. The book is written from the viewpoint of state bureaucrats, officials, and experts whose views on unemployment insurance most often are "coincidental" with those of the business community (109,135). Pal has no explanation for this. By portraying such state officials as having a disinterested commitment in the actuarial soundness of unemployment insurance, he refuses to recognize either their own class interests or their socialization into a bourgeois hegemony in the style of either Ralph Miliband or Dennis Olsen. The experiences of workers living under unemployment insurance are not considered worthy of comment or investigation (in contrast, see Patrick Burman, *Killing Time, Losing Ground*, 1988). At numerous points throughout the book, evidence leaps out of the pages that workers are being controlled by the state on behalf of a dominant bourgeoisie, yet Pal seems blind to this process. A central concern of policy makers was how to insert a labour market strategy into an unemployment insurance that would force unemployed workers back into "stable" employment and dissuade employed workers from leaving their jobs. This was especially evident in the tightening up of the programme after 1971 as benefits were reduced and entrance requirements were made stricter. In effect, the unemployed worker became suspect and guilty of "abusing" the system until proven innocent. The buzzwords among bureaucrats were "moral hazard" (workers "abusing" the programme by remaining "too long" on benefits), "bad risks," "excessive generosity," and "slack administration" (workers were drawing "too much" in benefits). Claimant's "willingness to work" had to be tested. "A psychology of vigilance was thus embedded in the program from the start." (107) "If the benefit exceeds wages, you get a tendency to malingering; men will prefer unemployment benefits to a job." Seasonal workers were considered "bad risks who might make a habit of drawing UI benefits." (108) The

1978 amendments had two goals. "First, we want to reduce some of the disincentives to work which are present in the program. Second, we want to encourage workers to establish more stable work patterns and develop longer attachments to the active work force." The minister added that the "new emphasis will be on encouraging all Canadian workers to look for, accept and remain at work." (117) These labour market strategies for Pal do not emanate class struggles, or from the inscription of class contradictions on state structures, or from the socialization of state bureaucrats into bourgeois ideology, but from the objective actuarial ideology of ensuring that the UI programme operated on a sound insurance basis. But where did this ideology come from? What are its organizational roots? What are its class roots? Pal never answers such questions except to locate them in the mysterious inner sanctums of state bureaucracy isolated and cut off from society.

Pal has quite ambitious aims for his rejection of society-centered explanations by over-generalizing his conclusions to *all* state social programmes: "If a society-centered explanation [that is, neo-pluralism and neo-marxism] is not very useful for UI, then it is unlikely to be very useful in explaining long-term developments in other policy areas." (170; also 173-4) This logic escapes me, but its general debunking of pluralism and marxism seems clear enough.

Perhaps the strength of the book is the rich, though dry, description in Chapters Five and Six of bureaucratic intrigue, intra- and inter-organizational conflicts, and federal-provincial negotiations over unemployment insurance. But although Pal wants to use these two chapters as his preferred explanatory models, they cry out for a society-centered contextual explanation. For example, how can Pal ignore the unrest and revolts by thousands of unemployed across Canada in his explanation of the introduction of the 1935 Employment and Social Insurance Act? By focusing exclusively on an autonomous state operating in isolation from so-

cial-historical processes, Pal suggests that the Act might have been passed during the 1920s had the British North America Act given the federal government the legal power to do so. In other words, the Great Depression of the early 1930s is not necessary to understand Pal's explanation of the origin of state unemployment insurance in Canada. The book would be much stronger had Pal showed less of a willingness to grind an ideological axe against pluralism and marxism, and more of a well-rounded reading of the political science literature. He should have approached his subject matter from a balanced theoretical position that allowed a more equal competition among rival theories.

Carl J. Cuneo
McMaster University

John R. Miron, *Housing in Postwar Canada. Demographic Change, Household Formation and Housing Demand* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press 1988).

IN RECENT YEARS there has been a revival of interest in the household. Increasingly, it is recognized that, despite the removal of much productive activity from the home, households are still important work units through which labour power is reproduced and gender relations defined. Except for a few researchers who have examined boarding and lodging, however, most writers have taken for granted the formation, and therefore the aggregate structure, of households. This is doubly unfortunate: first, because rates of household formation are highly variable, being contingent on many contextual influences; second, because household formation has important implications, most notably for the standard of living. In recent years, for example, the rise of the two-earner household has helped to push up housing prices and to place one-person or single-earner households at an economic disadvantage. By choosing to ex-

amine in detail the process of household formation in Canada since World War II, then, John Miron seeks to cast new light on an important and neglected topic.

The rate at which households are formed depends upon many factors. The most important of these are family formation (which affects people's desire for private housekeeping) and the standard of living (which affects their ability to set up their own home). In the first section of *Housing in Postwar Canada*, the author documents changes in the rate of family formation and traces these to varying rates of immigration, marriage, fertility, and longevity. In the second and longest section, using census and national survey data, he shows that population growth and family formation can explain most, but by no means all, of the rapid growth in the number of households. He estimates that about two-fifths of the recent increase in households can be attributed to the undoubling of families who had previously shared dwellings (15 per cent) and to a growing propensity for single (and especially young) people to live alone (25 per cent). Undoubling was important chiefly in the immediate post-war years, while singles living became a significant factor with the maturation of the baby-boom generation starting in the 1960s. Underlying both trends was a long-term growth in real incomes, although new, time-saving household technology and changing attitudes were also important. In the third and concluding section, the author interprets these changes in household formation in relation to the changing character of the housing stock and also in relation to government policy.

For anyone who wishes to understand housing trends, and for that matter standards of living, in Canada in the postwar period this book is indispensable. The author offers a thorough discussion of available census and survey data; he presents his argument clearly and methodically and shows that household formation may be viewed as the product of a complex combination of forces. An exemplary treatment of the subject, this book

should also be read by those who are interested in housing and households at other places and times. But the book does have some limitations. The author is concerned with aggregate national trends and says very little about regional and local differences. As well, he says rather less than he might about what work is done in the home, by whom, and with what implications for people's decisions to form and dissolve households.

Perhaps most significant for readers of this journal, he says nothing about class or ethnicity. This is important because there are good reasons to believe that the process of household formation among the working class, and especially immigrant workers, has been different from that of other groups. Evidence for the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries suggests that, other things being equal, immigrants and workers have been especially likely to double-up, so that they could save money to buy a home. In contrast, the families of middle-class professionals were seemingly more likely to form their own household early on, even if this meant deferring house purchase. It would be useful to know whether such generalizations hold for the recent past.

These specific limitations of the book point to a more general characteristic. Miron argues, rightly in my view, that it is often misleading to abstract one aspect of social reality from its wider context. He examines, and shows the significance of, "several demographic and economic factors." (269) But his approach is not wholly synthetic, for he does not attempt to consider these factors as part of a broader pattern of social structure and change. Some readers will regret Miron's reluctance to venture a broader interpretative synthesis; others will appreciate his determination to disentangle, by sticking close to, the available evidence. Either way, the author has done us a service. A convincing synthesis is not possible without a prior analysis, and in the latter regard *Housing in Canada* is exemplary.

Richard Harris
McMaster University

Micheline Labelle, Geneviève Turcotte, Marianne Kempeneers, Deidre Meintel, *"Histoires d'immigrées: Itinéraires d'ouvrières Colombiennes, Grecques, Haïtiennes et Portugaises de Montréal"* (Montréal: Les Éditions du Boréal Express 1987).

MEDIA COVERAGE OF immigration issues reinforces our image of the immigrant as male. Interviews with almost exclusively male Sikh boat people or Turkish men protesting deportation orders corroborate popular understanding of immigration as a masculine phenomenon. Historians have portrayed immigrants (the King's Daughters excepted) as the clearers of forests, the tillers of land, the trappers of fur-bearing animals and the builders of canals and railroads. Only recently have social scientists turned their attention to the female side of international migration.

This book, written by a group of professors and researchers in the disciplines of anthropology, sociology, history, and demography is an important contribution to our knowledge of the experiences of contemporary working-class female immigrants in the Montreal area. The generous sprinkling of personal interviews with immigrants makes for highly enjoyable reading, while the theoretical framework and the range of the analyses clearly place it in the category of a scholarly work.

Based on secondary sources, but more importantly on interviews with a sample of 76 women workers from Colombia, Haïti, Greece, and Portugal, the book explores the personal experiences of immigrant working-class women who have settled in Montreal in the last 20 years. The choice of the interviewees represents the significant change in the pattern of migration to Canada. While before 1971, 80 per cent of female immigrants came from northern Europe, current trends show that newcomers originate mainly from the European periphery or the third world.

In an excellent introduction, the authors situate the relevance of their work

within existing theoretical and empirical studies. The latter emphasize the effects of the increasing international division of labour, the need for cheap labour in the declining industries of the industrialised world as well as the personal services sector, and the paid and unpaid aspects of women's labour.

The central theme of the book is women's work, particularly salaried labour. Other realities are explored in so far as they affect patterns of participation in the paid labour force: kinship networks, domestic labour, conditions in sweatshops and other job ghettos, and the persistence of patriarchal family structures. This shifting focus raises more questions in the reader's mind than it answers about the role of paid labour in the lives of women enmeshed in highly traditional societies where the predominant maternal role of women has yet to be successfully challenged.

The first section of the book traces individual itineraries from Portugal, Greece, Columbia, and Haïti to Montreal, analysing the effects of the agricultural crisis and the flight of individuals and families from lives of unremitting labour yielding only chronic poverty. Women's decisions to emigrate are rarely for individual, more often for family, reasons: to join a husband gone on ahead or pushed out by a family no longer able to support its members. Jobs as domestics, agricultural labourers, or sidewalk merchants are the only ones available in the old country where their lack of schooling or knowledge of a skilled craft relegates them already to a frugal existence.

As the authors point out, hard work is nothing new for these women. It is the qualitative differences which create difficulties for them. Work in Montreal factories where most women are employed is run by the clock and emphasizes the repetition of the same tasks in order to increase efficiency. It is not a place for making friends, exchanging gossip, or telling one's troubles. To this isolation is added the stress of a divided work life in a big city: the long daily trips on public

transportation, the race against the clock to care for children, make meals, do laundry and housecleaning in the few waking hours. The shrinking of the extensive kinship networks of the old country and the absence of the easy sociability which characterize these societies leave women alone with their domestic labour and family problems. Because, as earlier generations of Canadian women discovered, access to a steady, if modest, income does not necessarily change the division of labour within the household production unit nor indeed alter the daily habits of a husband's power over his wife's salary or her person.

In spite of possibly the least enviable working conditions on the Canadian labour market and a full load of domestic responsibilities, most interviewees wish to stay. A better standard of life, access to more extensive schooling for their children, and their families' integration into Quebec society are given as compelling reasons.

The "récits de vie" of the women interviewed occupy possibly a third of the book and constitute its most interesting contribution. The reader soon learns to recognize the individual women whose life experiences are drawn upon throughout the narrative. Different ethnic patterns and practices are highlighted by individual examples. However, the commentaries linking the interview material often seem to ignore its rich possibilities for analysis. While the stated objective of the book is the study of immigrant women as workers, it is difficult for the authors to do justice to the variety of elements which influenced migration in search of work and the difficult cohabitation of paid and unpaid labour. Domestic labour itself merits further attention if only for the time it consumes in the average woman's day. Family and interpersonal relations are only briefly examined, surprisingly so considering that family life appears to be the central fact of most of these women's existences.

Finally, one might regret that such voluminous material (15,000 pages of

oral interviews carried out in 1981) has yielded such a familiar portrait — one that does not appear to vary much from the little we know about the historical experience of previous generations of immigrant women. Or, if it does, this study has not pointed it out. Emphasis on the description of labour, paid and unpaid, leaves little place for the investigation of attitudes, experiences, and mentalities which can best be done by interview. We know too little about these women whose silhouettes are poised against the recognizable backdrop of low salaries and a double working day. What are their goals now that they have emigrated? Do they see themselves any differently? Do the lives of non-immigrant women in Canada seem any different to theirs, and why? Have relationships with children changed? It would be interesting to know about maternal ambitions, since their children's future is a major reason women cite for staying in Quebec.

Where do these women's lives lead? It would be useful in this regard to know about rates of social mobility, if any, for various ethnic groups. Do non-European women feel any impact from negative social stereotypes or prejudice? Perhaps most crucial for the shape of Quebec's future is the question of the linguistic community with which their children identify. Why do more recent immigrants choose Montreal and how long will their families stay there? The book's inability to distinguish between Québec and Canada on this topic does not answer the question. But these questions stray beyond the book's original purpose. Let us hope for another volume in which these and other questions are developed.

Jennifer Stoddart
Commission des droits de la personne
du Québec

Denise Helly, *Les Chinois à Montréal, 1877-1951* (Québec: Institut québécois de recherche sur la culture 1987).

PRESENTS DEPUIS LONGTEMPS AU COEUR même de Montréal, les Chinois qui y vivent ont été, peut-être davantage que d'autres groupes immigrants, associés à un certain exotisme. Au-delà des manifestations folkloriques de la culture chinoise, l'étude détaillée que nous présente Mme Denise Helly, anthropologue et sinologue de formation, nous fait découvrir la réalité encore fort méconnue de ce groupe immigrant.

En retraçant leur arrivée à Montréal, leur difficile insertion au marché du travail et leur formation en communauté organisée, Mme Helly nous renseigne de façon précise non seulement sur l'évolution de ce groupe immigrant mais également sur la société montréalaise dans laquelle il s'insère.

La présence chinoise à Montréal se manifeste dès le début des années 1880. Cependant, contrairement à l'immigration européenne qui touche la ville au même moment, l'immigration chinoise ne provient pas, à tout le moins au début, directement du pays d'origine. Les Chinois quittent ainsi leur pays de façon temporaire dans le but d'amasser de l'argent afin d'y retourner dans de meilleures conditions financières.

En fait, les premiers Chinois qui s'installent à Montréal le font à la suite de migrations intra-continentales. Originaires principalement du Guangdong, province du sud-est de la Chine, les Chinois atteignent d'abord l'Amérique au milieu du XIX^e siècle, attirés par la "ruée vers l'or" qui se dessine à ce moment-là en Californie. Confrontés rapidement à des réactions nativistes aux États-Unis, principalement dans le secteur ferroviaire où les Chinois s'engagent massivement, ces derniers cherchent alors plus au nord un endroit plus clément. C'est ainsi qu'un contingent s'installe en Colombie-Britannique notamment, et que d'autres poussent plus à l'est vers Toronto et Montréal.

La population chinoise de Montréal demeure néanmoins peu nombreuse à la fin du XIX^e siècle. Moins de 900 Chinois sont recensés sur l'île en 1901 et jamais plus de 2 000 y résident avant 1951. Les Chinois qui arrivent à Montréal à cette époque ont très peu d'alternative quant à leur intégration au marché du travail. Constamment au centre de conflits raciaux et l'objet de pratiques discriminatoires, les Chinois adoptent rapidement, selon Mme Helly, des stratégies d'évitement. Dès qu'ils le peuvent, ils délaissent leur statut d'employé pour devenir leur propre employeur. Ils se concentrent dans le secteur des services, en mettant sur pied de nombreuses buanderies à la main, un secteur dans lequel ils ont déjà oeuvré aux États-Unis et dans l'Ouest canadien et qui est encore, à cette époque très peu structuré.

Ce secteur attire les Chinois dans la mesure où la création de buanderies ne nécessite pas une mise de fonds considérable. De plus, l'institution clanique, maintenue à travers le processus migratoire, favorise l'association des membres d'un même clan qui peuvent mettre ainsi leur avoir en commun. De cette façon peuvent-ils maintenir actifs certains préceptes du confucianisme (assistance, solidarité) et également offrir du travail aux leurs. Les Chinois s'insèrent ainsi dans un créneau précis de l'économie montréalaise. Cependant, dès le début du XX^e siècle, ce secteur connaît de nombreuses innovations technologiques qui obligent les Chinois à orienter une partie de leurs activités vers d'autres secteurs, notamment, la restauration et le petit commerce.

Malgré cette stratégie d'évitement, les Chinois continuent d'être l'objet de discrimination, notamment par l'imposition d'une taxe d'entrée qui s'élève à \$500.00 en 1903 et ce, sans parler du prix des licences d'exploitation des buanderies qui ne cesse d'augmenter.

Face à ces manifestations discriminatoires et au statut économique précaire des nombreux Chinois, les

clergés catholique et protestant vont s'impliquer auprès de ces immigrants au début du siècle, notamment en leur fournissant aide matérielle, éducation et représentation auprès d'agents d'immigration. Cependant, l'approche préconisée par ces deux confessions face à l'immigrant semble lui réserver là encore bien peu de place au sein de la société québécoise. Le clergé protestant ne s'oppose pas au maintien des croyances religieuses différentes des Chinois mais vise avant tout leur assimilation dans la hiérarchie socio-économique où le Canadien anglais domine. L'Eglise catholique, pour sa part, imbuée de sa mission historique de protection de la langue et de la foi des Canadiens français, exige des Chinois un renoncement à toute identité chinoise et confucéenne tout en les maintenant à l'écart du groupe canadien-français.

Mme Helly soutient qu'au-delà des pressions économiques qui isolent les Chinois, les différentes approches religieuses à leur endroit liées à la dynamique socio-linguistique et politique québécoise obligent les Chinois à se replier dans un espace "neutre" où ils peuvent difficilement s'intégrer pleinement à la société-hôte.

Cette situation de mise à l'écart ne semble pas étrangère au type de relations très étroit qu'entretiennent les Chinois avec leur pays d'origine à partir du début du XX^e siècle. Il se développe alors à Montréal des organisations qui se veulent des prolongements des partis politiques en Chine. Par ce militantisme politique, les Chinois immigrants espèrent modifier les conditions socio-politiques dans leur pays d'origine et ainsi, relever le statut marginal de la Chine au niveau international, source de la discrimination dont ils font l'objet à l'extérieur.

Enfin, Mme Helly, sans y voir de manifestation d'ethnicité comme telle, associe plutôt le comportement chinois à une stratégie de défense et de résistance active, indiquant néanmoins que la présence d'associations claniques, de par-

tis politiques de même que le maintien de l'endogamie et du rite confucéen chez certains ... ne correspond pourtant pas à une simple transplantation d'usages canonnais dans la métropole du Québec. (p. 267)

La travail de Mme Helly, qui repose sur une utilisation judicieuse de sources originales telles le fichier du Service de raison sociale de la ville de Montréal, des entrevues avec des dirigeants ou membres d'associations chinoises ainsi que sur un choix fort pertinent d'articles de journaux qui nous situent très bien dans le contexte de l'époque, constitue certes une oeuvre de grand intérêt. Au-delà de l'analyse de l'évolution de la communauté chinoise de Montréal, l'auteure appelle à une réflexion sur l'effet de la dynamique particulière du Québec au niveau socio-politique et de son influence sur le développement des relations inter-ethniques.

Le travail de Mme Helly représente donc un apport des plus constructifs à l'étude des groupes immigrants de Montréal, à l'heure où son principal défi est de "gérer" son cosmopolitisme montant.

Jean Lamarre
Université de Montréal

Pierre Bélanger, *Le mouvement étudiant québécois: son passé, ses revendications et ses luttes, (1960-1983)* (Québec: Association nationale des étudiants et étudiantes du Québec (ANEQ) 1984).

Parmi l'ensemble des mouvements sociaux, le mouvement étudiant semble toujours susciter un intérêt particulier qui inspire soit la crainte, l'admiration, la nostalgie d'une époque mais ne laisse certes pas indifférent. A plusieurs moments dans l'évolution d'une société, l'agitation étudiante exprime en effet des doléances qui dépassent souvent la seule sphère éducative. Mai 1968 ou encore l'actuel soulèvement en Birmanie, où les étudiants jouent un rôle de premier plan

aux côtés des moines bouddhistes, témoignent d'une remise en question profonde des fondements de la société.

A cet égard, l'idée de se pencher sur l'évolution de notre mouvement étudiant est intéressante à plus d'un titre. A notre connaissance, peu de textes ont été écrits sur le mouvement étudiant québécois. D'autres parts, certains temps forts de cette mobilisation étudiante correspondent à une période de restructuration en profondeur de notre système éducatif. En France, mai 1968 s'était entre autres attaqué aux structures anciennes de la Sorbonne alors qu'au Québec, l'agitation de la fin des années soixante s'enracinait dans une période de changements et même de création de nouvelles institutions et filières comme en témoigne l'organisation des Cégeps. Une telle recherche pouvait donc éclairer certaines facettes de ce nouveau mouvement social qui se développait à la suite du développement de la scolarisation d'une couche importante de la société québécoise.

Malheureusement, l'étude de Pierre Bélanger se situe bien en deçà de ces objectifs. En effet, d'entrée de jeu, le mot du conseil central de l'ANEQ (commanditaire de l'étude) précise aux lecteurs et lectrices: "Il ne nous appartient pas ici ni de commenter, ni d'expliquer la situation actuelle du mouvement étudiant. Ce dont il s'agit plutôt c'est de fournir un outil qui permettra de saisir et de mieux comprendre l'histoire du développement du mouvement étudiant." (3) A cet égard, l'étude de Pierre Bélanger semble avoir délibérément choisi la voie de la chronique. On nous fournit une foule de faits, de renseignements où il est quelquefois difficile de s'y retrouver. L'énumération touffue d'événements oblige les lecteurs à une synthèse à posteriori difficile à opérer. La présentation congrès par congrès, qui en outre ne nous épargne aucune session spéciale, rend la compréhension de ce mouvement fort pénible. Aucune balise thématique permettant de se raccrocher ici et là ne guide nos pas dans ce dédale où l'importance

relative des revendications est difficile à cerner. Une organisation thématique du matériel aurait certes rendu la lecture de cette étude moins ardue.

Cette lacune est d'autant plus importante que le cadre même de l'ouvrage s'organise autour de deux grands axes qui auraient pu structurer l'ordre de présentation des revendications étudiantes: le mouvement étudiant avant et l'après l'ANEQ. Ce parti pris est pour le moins évident comme en témoignent les titres de chacune des parties. En effet, la période 1960 à 1974 s'intitule: "Un difficile combat pour le syndicalisme étudiant," et la seconde, qui couvre de 1975 à 1983 s'appelle "L'ANEQ: un second souffle pour le syndicalisme étudiant". Alors que l'ouvrage vise à présenter l'apport de l'ANEQ dans le cadre d'une étude globale de l'ensemble des associations étudiantes, le titre et le ton du texte semble nous orienter vers une analyse plus spécifique des luttes et difficultés de mobilisation de l'ANEQ. Or si l'auteur optait pour la chronique des principaux événements du mouvement étudiant québécois, il fallait éviter me semble-t-il cette partisanerie patente, en dépit de la commande. Un des principal reproche que l'on peut faire en outre à cet ouvrage est d'utiliser un double ton qui oscille entre la simple description des faits et le discours du militant qui a peine à s'extraire de l'analyse.

Malgré ces lacunes, cette étude illustre de façon fort intéressante la difficulté de légitimer certaines revendications, comme par exemple celle des prêts et bourses, de la part d'une catégorie sociale considérée par plusieurs comme des privilégiés. La lutte pour la gratuité scolaire et l'accessibilité de tous à l'éducation représente sans contredit le fer de lance qui a le plus mobilisé les étudiants.

Ceci n'a pas empêché la participation à des mouvements politiques plus généraux comme en témoigne le soutien au mouvement contre le Bill 63, la prise de position lors du référendum de 1980 ou même l'appui à des actions internatio-

nales. A cet égard, l'auteur insiste à quelques reprises sur la nature du mouvement étudiant qu'il qualifie d'emblée de syndicalisme étudiant par opposition aux associations de services qui, selon lui, ont caractérisé le mouvement étudiant avant 1960.

Il nous reste à souligner un aspect qui à notre avis aurait mérité une place plus importante dans cet ouvrage soit les clivages qui pratiquement à tous moments ont divisé l'organisation étudiante. L'auteur en parle et la jaquette du livre annonce même: "Enfin un livre qui fait toute la lumière sur l'histoire du mouvement étudiant et des causes profondes de sa division en associations rivales." Pourtant, lorsqu'il traite de ces questions, Pierre Bélanger, lui-même militant étudiant, reste à la surface des faits et se limite à viser quelques groupements politiques sans analyser en profondeur les fondements des divergences qui divisent si profondément plusieurs tendances politiques à l'intérieur du mouvement étudiant.

Thérèse Hamel

Institut Québécois de recherches sur la culture

Henri Gagnon, *Les militants socialistes du Québec, d'une époque à l'autre* (Saint-Lambert: QC: Les Editions Héritage Inc 1985).

DEPUIS LES ANNEES 1970, l'historiographie canadienne s'est penchée relativement beaucoup sur les partis politiques de la gauche canadienne. Le texte d'Henri Gagnon vient s'ajouter à une liste de plus en plus longue de monographies portant sur le Parti communiste du Canada (P.C.C.). L'ouvrage se distingue toutefois des autres oeuvres par son auteur qui n'est pas un historien mais plutôt un ancien militant du parti. Pendant plusieurs années Henri Gagnon fut en effet une figure de proue du P.C.C. au Québec. Il fit partie de la première génération de Canadiens français qui

entrèrent dans le mouvement communiste au cours de la grande dépression économique des années 1930. Gagnon monta assez rapidement dans les rangs du parti et fut mis à la tête de la section francophone de la Ligue de la jeunesse communiste, un organisme auxiliaire du P.C.C. chargé d'organiser les jeunes travailleurs. Comme tout bon militant communiste de l'époque, il s'enrôla dans l'armée canadienne à partir de 1941 et alla lutter en Europe. A son retour de la guerre, il retourna à ses fonctions au sein du parti et se trouva bientôt au centre de conflits internes qui menèrent à son expulsion et à la défection de plusieurs centaines de militants.

Pour ceux et celles à la recherche d'une nouvelle version de l'histoire du P.C.C., *Les militants socialistes du Québec, d'une époque à l'autre* sera en partie une déception puisqu'il ne s'agit pas d'un ouvrage de grande érudition. D'ailleurs l'auteur avertit bien ses lecteurs dès le premier chapitre qu'il laisse la tâche d'écrire l'histoire du parti aux historiens. Par son écrit, Gagnon vise plutôt à donner une nouvelle direction à la génération de militants socialistes québécois d'aujourd'hui. C'est ainsi qu'il fait une analyse rétrospective des grands événements qui marquèrent le développement du mouvement communiste au Québec afin de souligner les "erreurs" du passé à ne pas répéter.

La première moitié du texte de Gagnon porte principalement sur l'histoire du P.C.C. au Québec jusqu'à la fin de la Seconde Guerre mondiale. Comme tout chroniqueur d'événements largement vécus, la mémoire de Gagnon est à la fois sélective et partielle. Il cherche tout d'abord à montrer que le mouvement socialiste au Canada exista bien avant la révolution bolchévique de 1917 et qu'il ne fut pas uniquement celui d'émigrés européens. Puisqu'il s'adresse essentiellement aux militants québécois, Gagnon survole ensuite les "achèvements" des communistes au Québec — leurs luttes pour le syndicalisme, contre le fascisme et pour les

besoins immédiats des travailleurs et chômeurs. L'auteur cherche aussi à souligner que le P.C.C. au Québec ne fut pas une simple extension de la section canadienne-anglaise. Il énumère ainsi à plusieurs reprises les noms des Québécois francophones qui firent partie à l'époque des forces communistes au Québec.

Gagnon situe également dans le texte son engagement dans le mouvement communiste (chapitres 5, 8 et 11) et décrit son rôle dans la division de 1947 (chapitres 12 à 16). C'est surtout ces sections à forte teneur autobiographique qui offrent le plus de matière intéressante pour les historiens de la gauche canadienne. En particulier, les sections sur les événements qui précédèrent et qui découlèrent de la crise de 1947 éclaircissent une période de l'histoire du parti au Québec que l'historiographie canadienne-anglaise tend à négliger. La division de 1947 bouleversa profondément l'aile québécoise du P.C.C. Elle vint à la suite de désaccords au sein du parti au sujet de la politique envers le droit à l'autodétermination des Canadiens français, le degré d'autonomie accordée aux comités provinciaux du parti et le genre d'activités que devait mener le parti. Le comité central du P.C.C. décida alors de mettre fin aux désaccords en étouffant les voix de discorde qui émanaient de l'aile québécoise. Au congrès provincial du Québec en 1947, la direction du P.C.C. prit des mesures pour faire élire des représentants fidèles à ses directives et dénonça certains membres du parti comme agitateurs, dont Gagnon. Les actions du comité central occasionnèrent la défection de plusieurs centaines de membres. Au moment où le parti devait consolider ses forces afin d'affronter la nouvelle vague de répression engendrée par la guerre froide, le P.C.C. se trouva déchiré en deux au Québec. Au cours des prochaines années, le parti tenta de panser ses plaies mais ne put jamais vraiment se rétablir. Les déclarations de Khrouchtchev en 1956 et les défections subséquentes vinrent mettre fin à toutes chances de

rétablissement.

Pour Gagnon la cause de la division de 1947 fut le refus de la direction du parti après 1945 de s'éloigner du modèle soviétique. Au lieu d'adopter de nouvelles idées, le parti demeura figé dans le passé, ce qui signifia le maintien d'une vision monolithique au sein du P.C.C. et, plus important encore pour l'auteur, la non-reconnaissance du droit à l'autodétermination des Canadiens français. Bien qu'il reproche au parti d'être demeuré accroché au modèle soviétique, Gagnon ne se lance pas dans une longue diatribe contre le P.C.C. A certains endroits dans le texte il tend au contraire à justifier les actions du parti, soulignant qu'il s'agissait d'une période de forte répression pour les militants communistes et que le nationalisme canadien-français de l'époque était fortement cléricale et réactionnaire. Gagnon souhaite néanmoins que les événements de la division de 1947 servent de leçon à la nouvelle génération de militants socialistes il faut laisser de côté les concepts bâtis au temps de Lénine et construire de nouvelles idées.

Dans la dernière section de son texte l'auteur expose la nouvelle orientation que doit prendre la lutte des forces "populaires" au Québec. Selon le militant socialiste, la révolution technologique occasionnée par l'automatisation des processus de production et l'utilisation croissante d'ordinateurs a créé une nouvelle crise sociale. En effet, il y a de nos jours de plus en plus de travailleurs rejetés par le système de l'entreprise privée. Ayant atteint un développement technologique avancé, l'investissement de capitaux et l'augmentation de la production n'entraînent plus la création d'emploi. Pour Gagnon, seul l'appareil d'Etat peut venir en aide au nombre croissant de travailleurs délaissés. C'est vers cet objectif qu'il souhaite diriger les efforts de la nouvelle génération de militants socialistes. En particulier, ceux-ci doivent voir à ce que le pouvoir économique de l'Etat soit utilisé d'abord pour le bénéfice du peuple. L'auteur

ajoute que c'est par cette même voie que la libération nationale des Québécois sera atteinte.

Bien que la dernière section du texte ressemble à un tract politique, l'ensemble de cet ouvrage mérite néanmoins d'être lu. Il s'agit d'une importante contribution qui est représentative de cette première génération de Canadiens français, à la fois communistes et nationalistes, dont la foi aveugle envers la cause communiste passa avec les années à une foi critique. Il est à souhaiter que d'autres mémoires politiques d'anciens militants communistes seront publiés dans un avenir prochain.

Robert A. Moreau
Ottawa

W.A. Hagelund, *Whalers No More: A History of Whaling on the West Coast* (Madeira Park, BC: Harbour Publishing 1987).

WILLIAM HAGELUND'S BOOK is not so much history as personal memoir. The memories recorded here are not only his own, but those of former whalers from the Pacific Northwest whom the author has interviewed.

The result is a handsomely produced and well-illustrated volume, which will please many lovers of sea lore. Economic historians and labour historians may be disappointed, for this is not systematic analysis of whaling. We learn little about the economic importance of this industry, and only a little more about the structure of ownership or the nature of the labour force. Whaling, suggests Hagelund, has always been the work of poor, hungry, and desperate men. To be sure, he entered the industry as a teenager in the Depression, when his family needed him to work. But for Hagelund, and for others who appear in this book, it was not only desperation but also a peculiar fascination for this kind of work which impelled them to go to sea. Hagelund accounts for this fascination on the part of a young man in

the 1930s, but without a different kind of analysis we do not know much about the workers or about workplace relationships in whaling.

Yet any history of whaling must benefit from this record of the memories of its workers. Hagelund is at his best when describing the techniques of whaling and the use of gear in the old steam-powered whalers. All too often memorialists shun the subject of machinery, for fear that readers will not be interested. But not Hagelund. It is all here — manila rope, harpoons, lances, flensing irons, blubber spades, piercing irons, whaling prams, whaling winches, and guns. He also gives a good account of the whaling stations and their processing equipment.

The brief history of whaling companies offers little that is new, but the stories of owners and employees offer useful glimpses of social relations of production. Although readers must allow for the selective nature of seamen's memories and discount something for exaggeration, nevertheless we perceive what Hagelund recognizes to be survivals from "the era of wooden ships and iron men." The owners were self-made men who practised ruthless parsimony, delegating supervisory powers but very little working capital to harassed ship-managers. The managers expected the same ruthless parsimony of their masters and mates, sent them to sea "with half a crew most of the time," and quibbled even over work done for half-pay.

The masters and mates were a hard breed of Scandinavian, "so tough they could almost use their fingers for marlin spikes," who might knock a man cold if he coiled rope the wrong way. "You did it their way, or they'd kick your ass right off the ship." When a barrel of salt beef is discovered to contain dead rats, the crew are expected to eat the beef anyway. The crew were given "no privileges beyond the letter of our article of agreement."

The rewards, of course, included money, paid in the form of shares from the catch, and the prospect of good money if one's vessel were lucky and the gunners

accurate. There were other rewards, which came from the high levels of skill required, the thrill of the hunt itself, and the pride in learning a hard craft. Having done a seaman's job correctly, Hagelund found, "the skipper never called me lad or boy after that."

To the many fine chronicles of seafaring in the Pacific Northwest, this book adds a vivid assembly of memories. Historians of British Columbia's marine industries will find it a useful source. Such chronicles also remind us that outside academe the search for a meaningful past is urgent and keen, reflecting as it does the need of working people to understand their past and preserve it in memory for those who follow.

Eric W. Sager
University of Victoria

Jean-François Cardin et Jacques Rouillard, *Guide des archives des Unions internationales à Montréal* (Montréal: Université de Montréal, Département d'histoire 1987).

WITH ITS BLACK spiral binder, its "hot off" the computer's dot-matrix printer look, the archival guide prepared by Cardin and Rouillard truly appears bland. This is quite deceptive since the production is perhaps the most significant research tool on Quebec labour to appear to date, and the compilers are to be congratulated for having stuck with it.

In the presentation Rouillard points out that Quebec has "welcomed" around 150 international unions since the end of the nineteenth century, and come what may the internationals in the province have encompassed 40 to 70 per cent of organized workers since their implantation. One would never believe this with the near exclusive attention that has been given by scholars to the catholic and national union movement with its metempsychosis into the militant, "go-go" left CSN/CNTU of the 1960-70s. Or should this surprise one? This is what myths are

made of, for the mythical prism refashions and redirects light. The panorama produced is beautiful in itself, but reality is eclipsed. This was perhaps a stage that a reawakening Quebec had to go through.

The international labour movement in Quebec from a historical perspective is just beginning to emerge from obscurity, and this is quite in keeping with the redefinition that present-day Quebec society has undertaken in its post-Referendum period. The result of this redefinition will be surprising to say the least. It will show just to what extent workingmen and women sought to appropriate control of their own identity under the international union banner, and how their composition with the North American labour movement and market was just another example of the 'québécois' collective will. International unionism grew in Quebec only to find itself — in the long run — transformed and well on its way to being assimilated for what it was worth!

It has been recognized for some time that the archival patrimony of the international unions was in a state of advanced neglect. Every time the rent went up or the centers of employment changed district, union headquarters trekked to a new office. With this a few more "boxes" from the storage room made it to the trash bin. There was also the post-1950 fusion and Canadianization period when the alphabet soup of union acronyms boiled over accommodate the new titles (the cigar makers end up with the retail clerks!). The outcome was the same sort of insouciance for what was past as the day-to-day demands of union life loomed large. With little interest being shown towards exploring the international union dimension, such a dilapidation could not realistically be arrested. In 1979 the Quebec Federation of Labour surveyed its members and sundry other international bodies to try to get a picture of the archival situation, but other priorities resulted in no follow-up.

At about this point, Jacques Rouillard of the University of Montreal was becoming more and more interested in the im-

pact of the internationals on the Quebec scene. In addition to his own research he was able to point several of his graduate students in the same direction, and a probing of the terrain started to take place. From this came the notion of locating and itemizing the records of the internationals before it was too late. It was surmised that by highlighting their existence their chance of survival would be accentuated. With the support of a grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, the good will of Fernand Daoust, secretary general of the FTQ/QFL, and the spade work of Jean-François Cardin, the *Guide* came into being.

Over 110 international union organizations find their way into the *Guide* although only 46 are graced with a full inventory; for the most part, those not inventoried have ceased to exist in Quebec, do not have headquarters in Montreal, or were not interested in collaborating. For each union in the book there is a historical sketch that traces its evolution in the province. For the 46 inventoried, the *Guide* goes on to identify the period that the archive covers and its location. This is followed by a brief overall evaluation of the collection, then a comprehensive description of its contents. This description regroups documents on the basis of their composition, their subject, and their source of origin; it also provides details on the document itself: title, quantity, date of production. The *Guide* then locates other archival sources in the United States and Canada that can be complementary. Finally, a bibliography of secondary source titles concerning the union in question is included. While fitting close to the section, the list is generally meagre and attests to just how little research has been undertaken on the internationals in Quebec.

Presented in an orderly fashion, the entire *Guide* — to use the jargon of our day — is user-friendly. Although it was printed in a limited edition, the compilers have intelligently seen to it that copies were distributed to all university libraries,

archival centers, and major union organizations in the province. The *Guide* was produced to be consulted, and it will undoubtedly provide the stimulus to delve into Quebec's other union tradition. The rest will follow on its own.

André E. LeBlanc
Champlain Regional College

Jay Cassel, *The Secret Plague: Venereal Disease in Canada, 1838-1939* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press 1987).

THIS WOULD BE A considerable monograph for any scholar to have under his or her belt, to say nothing of a young Ph.D. candidate who had not yet even completed his dissertation on another subject at the time he wrote it. Based heavily on archival material, the book offers a sound, scholarly account of efforts to reduce venereal disease — chancroid, syphilis and gonorrhea — in Canada between 1838 and the start of World War II. It was in 1838, a somewhat arbitrary starting point, that syphilis and gonorrhea were first differentiated. And by the beginning of World War II the efforts of the public health movement to eradicate venereal disease, which constitute the main subject of the book, had won much success.

Several initial chapters explain what these diseases are and the particular difficulties in treating them that made the VD story a much more arduous one than, for example, the various vaccinations campaigns. Cassel traces advances in knowledge of the diseases on the international level, having consulted the original medical accounts in French and German. The expressly Canadian part begins in chapter four, "The Victorians and VD, 1840-1899," with the unblinking assertion that, "Numerous studies by psychologists, anthropologists, sociologists and historians have shown that sex is an unavoidable element of human experience." (75) His argument is that Victorian ambivalence about sex shows up in the half-heartedness of their efforts to control venereal

disease.

The remainder of the book, a meticulous account of the control campaign in Canada, is drawn largely from unpublished archival sources. Chapter five, "Social Reform and VD, 1899-1914," traces the profusion of purity organizations in Canada, for example the Canadian Purity Education Association founded in 1906 in Toronto. These associations have already provided rich grist for American and British social historians and it is important to have a Canadian account. Much of their activity leads up to a famous meeting of physicians at the Toronto Academy of Medicine on 15 January 1914, which becomes a kind of red thread running through the rest of the book. The physicians at that meeting heard reports that 50 to 60 per cent of the female patients in Toronto hospitals — admittedly not a representative cross-section of the population — had had syphilis at some point, meaning that they had a "positive" Wassermann test. The physicians formed a committee and came out against sex education. (One begins to understand why Ernest Jones, Freud's biographer, found himself unhappy in Toronto during his Canadian exile.) Sources for this section include the records of the Vancouver City Health Department in the Vancouver City Archives, and records of the Manitoba Department of Public Works, and the Toronto Academy of Medicine, in addition to the extensive reports in medical journals and the popular press on VD.

A chapter on World War I analyzes the astonishingly high infection rates among Canadian troops, the highest in fact among all Allied forces: in 1915, 29 per cent of the men in the Canadian Expeditionary Force had a venereal infection. In the eyes of the authorities, the basic problem was "lewd women." The material here was drawn almost entirely from several files at the Public Archives of Canada: correspondence in the RG 9 series on the CEF, and in the RG 24 series on the home situation.

Alarmed at the widespread infection

among troops, authorities on the home front began in 1917 a major campaign against syphilis and gonorrhea. Cassel traces the infighting that went on, for example, about provisioning the population with a variant of Salvarsan, the only effective drug against syphilis (which the German chemist Paul Ehrlich had announced in 1910). In summer 1919 these efforts turned into an unprecedented educational and therapeutic program, offering over the next 20 years free drugs in public clinics, with follow-up by public health nurses. Cassel concludes that the program succeeded, for syphilis and gonorrhea rates were apparently much lower by the beginning of World War II than at the end of World War I. These two chapters are based heavily on the RG8 series in the Ontario Archives, on the RG 26 series of the provincial Board of Health, and on the VD files of the Dominion Department of Health in PAC RG 29. Cassel also has some good material from the New Brunswick Department of Health.

Among the most poignant in the book is the story of the educational program in the 1920s, especially the movies and the slide lectures. Cassel describes the line-ups at county fairs to see wax models with explicit venereal lesions. (These models were all smashed in 1927 while in transit on the CNR.) A horrors-of-VD movie, *Damaged Lives* (1933), represented the first international Canadian film success. It was a successor to an American horror-educational film, *End of the Road*, that circulated widely in Canada in the early 1920s, but it had sound. The main message of all this education did not concern "safe sex" and the like but rather urged the population to remain continent until marriage and monogamous thereafter.

Although Cassel refrains from drawing comparisons between the fight against syphilis and gonorrhea in the 1920s and that against AIDS today, they leap out at one from the text. We see the same official eagerness to drive home what are basically moral agendas in the guise of technical "education" programs. We see the same frightened scurrying of the pop-

ulation in the face of diseases that are not well understood, the same agonizing about the boundaries between "public" and "private," as they were called in those days, and "human rights" versus "the public's right to protection," as these matters are couched now. It is unfortunate that, in telling the history of syphilis, Cassel passes almost in silence over the drama of neurosyphilis, the spread of syphilis to the nervous system. This complication appeared only in the nineteenth century, and alarmed the middle-class, middle-aged male population in exactly the way AIDS alarms today. In addition, the mechanism of contracting "progressive paralysis" or "tabes dorsalis" (as varieties of neurosyphilis were then called) remained unknown before World War I, just as the risk of acquiring AIDS in heterosexual intercourse is unclear today. So both diseases filled an influential group of the population with a fear of the unknown each time they contemplated intercourse outside the marital bed.

With this excellent book Cassel establishes himself as one of the first rank of Canada's young social historians. We look forward with anticipation to his future efforts.

Edward Shorter
University of Toronto

Michael Goldfield, *The Decline of Organized Labor in the United States* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press 1987).

GENERALLY SPEAKING, the last decade has not been a kind one for labour movements in Western capitalist countries, above all for that in the United States. The travail of the American unions is graphically illustrated by the precipitous drop in union density from a post-war peak of around 35 per cent of the nonagricultural workforce (in the mid-1950s) to its current level of a mere 17-18 per cent. This decline, and the reasons for it, are the subject of Goldfield's important book, the first of a projected two-volume study of

the American labour movement.

Goldfield begins by showing that the decline in union density is not a recent phenomenon but has essentially been continuous since the mid-1950s, accelerating somewhat over the last decade. The proximate cause of this decline is not actual membership losses (which fluctuate over the period although this does explain the recent acceleration of the decline in union density) but a virtually unbroken fall dating from 1945 in fact in the annual number of workers voting union in certification elections (and in the percentage of such elections won by unions). Having established the actual contours of this decline, Goldfield turns to his central task of assessing the various attempts to explain it.

Conventional explanations are divided into two general categories; those stressing cyclical economic and political variables (such as the unemployment rate or the electoral fortunes of the Democratic Party); and those emphasizing sociological factors (such as geographic and sectoral shifts in employment, the proportionate decline in blue collar workers, and the trend toward smaller workplaces), all of which allegedly make workers less organizable. Against these Goldfield advances his own argument that this decline reflects a shift in the balance of class forces; a capitalist class offensive, abetted by the state, to which the labour movement has been unable to respond effectively.

Goldfield makes several telling theoretical criticisms of the conventional explanations. But the main burden of his analysis is at the empirical level, and herein lies the real contribution of his book. Goldfield has drawn together an extensive array of historical and statistical data on union organizing, including his own original research using National Labor Relations Board records of union certification elections. Here, historical and cross-sectional variations in the number of workers voting union and/or the percentage of union victories are carefully explored, with multivariate statisti-

cal techniques used in an attempt to isolate the impact of specific factors.

The evidence amassed offers little support for either cyclical or sociological explanations for the decline of American unions. Cyclical explanations cannot account for the steadily declining rate of new organizing, and are shown to be theoretically ambiguous. Little correspondence is found to exist between the sociological explanations and the decline in new organizing. Essentially, only the shifts in occupational structure toward service sector and white collar jobs have the predicted negative impact on new organizing, but it is very small and varies substantially within these categories. Indeed, the data often contradict these explanations. For example, Goldfield finds that it is among blue-collar workers in the traditionally more organized states that the percentage of successful certification elections has fallen most, a finding reinforced by attitude surveys which show this group, rather than women or blacks, to be most hostile to unions. Finally, and somewhat surprisingly to say the least, it is in the larger units that union success is lowest and the trend over time is shown to be a declining one.

Notwithstanding his focus on conventional explanations, Goldfield does not exempt his own argument from empirical scrutiny, adducing substantial support for it. In particular, employer opposition to unions, is shown to have increased dramatically and generally to be closely associated with lower 'union' votes in elections. Significantly, this has not stemmed from recent changes in the legal framework so much as a growing willingness of employers to exploit longstanding loopholes in it and to simply disregard existing provisions. Limited attention is given to detailing the specific shortcomings of the unions' responses. The data on union organizing activities examined, however, suggests that most have been in a state of paralysis, with organizing budgets, in deflated dollars, falling by as much as 30 percent.

The book concludes, in what un-

doubtedly is a preview of the projected second volume, with some reflections on the reasons for the failure of the unions to respond adequately to this offensive by capital. Noting that, historically, unionization advances in waves, Goldfield suggests that the present decline is rooted "ultimately" in the weaknesses of labour in the last (1930-50) upsurge; in particular, the stifling of rank-and-file democracy by the CIO leadership, and their failure to establish a real base in the south. There surely is much truth in this argument. At the same time, however, the emphasis on the nature of, and choices made by, the CIO leadership, seems too idealist and discontinuous in its view of history to be the whole story. For these choices were made in concrete historical circumstances of which the existing AFL unions, and indeed the American working class as a whole, were a part. They were made, moreover, in a country which was in the process of becoming the hegemonic imperialist power. It would seem that, ultimately, the decline of the US labour movement cannot be understood apart from first, the whole historical development of the American working class and second, from the particular place of the United States in the international capitalist economy.

Be that as it may, Goldfield's critique of conventional accounts of the decline in union density is a persuasive one, insofar as theoretical divergencies can be resolved on empirical grounds. And notwithstanding the limited discussion of the actual response of American unions, his own argument is compelling, and an important corrective to those who reify the legal framework itself, as if the state were somehow autonomous from civil society.

Donald Swartz
Carleton University

Paul Buhle, *Marxism in the United States: From 1870 to the Present Day* (London: Verso, 1987).

PAUL BUHLE'S NEW BOOK has several different titles and subtitles on it. If read according to the implications of that on the front cover, *Marxism in the USA from 1870 to the Present*, one is likely to become confused and frustrated. This is by no means a straightforward introduction to the history of the influence of Marxist thought over the past 110 years. Indeed, most of my undergraduates who read the book for one of my courses could hardly comprehend it.

However, if read from the perspective of the subtitle that appears inside the book, *Remapping the History of the American Left*, one is confronted with a remarkable and provocative challenge to most previous ways of theorizing this experience. In short, the heart of the book is a series of seven essay-interventions into numerous facets of leftwing thought and activity.

The result is a work that stands as the most comprehensive and ambitious work of the school of "New Historians of American Communism," a heterogeneous group mostly influenced by the experience of the New Left of the 1960s. Their complaint is that earlier histories gave too much weight to official pronouncements, the role played by the Communist Party leadership, and Soviet domination of Party policy. Their project is to retell the "story" of US Communism by emphasizing the role played by the rank-and-file which, as active agents, had an impact far richer, more diverse, and more substantial than previously recognized.

Marxism in the United States extends this methodology in many new ways. First, Buhle covers not only the communist movement in its influential period but numerous leftwing movements before and after. Second, Buhle sets aside the traditional chronology and categories for organizing the study of the US Left, which are usually around key dates (1914, 1919, 1929, 1939), or decades (the 1930s,

the 1950s), or areas of primary influence (labour, Afro-Americans, intellectuals). Buhle's essays are thematic, shifting focus among alternative primary categories such as immigrants, culture, Leninism, and post-Leninism.

The third area of expansion is the manner in which Buhle tries to de-center the traditional constructs of "Marxists" that we have received. He achieves this not by excluding well-known figures but by reducing the focus on them and giving more attention to matters such as the work of non-English language publications and groups, the religious roots of indigenous radicalism, and issues of popular culture.

The fact that Buhle is a proud and unabashed veteran of the New Left, with its special focus on racism and, later, sexism, assists enormously in his ability to review this terrain with a fresh eye. As a heterodox follower of many of the ideas of the brilliant West Indian C.L.R. James (James receives four-and-a-half solid pages of analysis in the book; Earl Browder receives two paragraphs), however, Buhle tends to emphasize race more than gender, and, in this regard, restricts himself too much to Afro-Americans. In the 1930s period, material is absent about the very important involvements of the Left in Chicano strikes on the West Coast and in the South West, and in Japanese-American struggles against deportation and Filipino union organizing on the West Coast. In the 1960s period, material on people of colour other than African-Americans, while present, is still sparse.

The most impressive feature of the book to me is the way in which Buhle tries to tell the story "whole." By putting Marxism and Communism in a larger setting, and by showing the diversity and interconnections of the Left experience, he effectively disintegrates the old mythology that Marxism and Communism were "foreign" parasites on an indigenous radicalism that really wasn't all that radical.

I am especially appreciative of this effort because I write as someone who spent 15 years researching and publishing

about the Left in the belief that, due to the horrors of the Stalin regime, the central tradition of the US Left has to stand apart from the Communist Party. It was only in the early 1980s that I concluded that this could not be done because the Communist Party *was* central, and the other traditions were too narrow to constitute an independent foundation. Buhle's ability to range back and forth among almost all of the Left currents, praising and criticizing as he sees fit, is a model for the integrated conception of the Left tradition on which we need to build. Buhle also has a fantastic preface where he acknowledges his own membership in this tradition of diverse left-wing ancestors — even if, like members of a large and quarrelsome family, they have fought with and vilified each other brutally.

Nevertheless, as in the case of any fresh challenge to traditional methods, new answers to old problems bring about new questions. Frankly, while I fully support Buhle's expansion and enrichment of the terrain, I do not find a convincing over-all methodology in this book. The weaknesses of the methodology are illustrated by Buhle's maxim that "Marxism is as Marxism does." (19) This is admirably non-sectarian, but who is to determine whether something is "Marxism" so as to decide whether or not to embrace its accomplishments? Sidney Hook claims to be a Marxist, but I fail to see his pro-Reaganism as a Marxist project.

Without straightforward criteria for judgments and evaluation, I frequently feel that Buhle has not employed a well-worked out strategy in the way he divides up his material (such as the decision to halt "Rise of the Culture Critique" in 1940), and to then move to a chapter called "Somewhere Beyond Leninism, 1940-50"), nor in his selection of figures and events on which to focus.

This results in some incoherence, imbalance, infelicitous cramming, and other problems that hurt the book a bit from the point of view of its use as a scholarly reference. Occasionally there are even factual inaccuracies, such as the state-

ment that "left intellectuals Albert Maltz, Lillian Hellman, Clifford Odets, John Howard Lawson and Donald Ogden Stewart ... could be counted among Popular Front sympathizers." (179) All of these had a period of Party membership, some briefly and Lawson for his entire life; moreover, even when these were "out" or not public members, most remained ideologically Communist for some years. This false impression may not have occurred if the chapter had been organized more conventionally with subsections on "Communist Writers" and "Fellow-Traveling Writers."

Although Buhle has tremendous credentials as an "insider" in regard to the Left, he can sometimes be glib and make arcane references. For example, in his Conclusion Buhle refers knowingly to "Socialist Workers Party leaders who declare Trotskyism to be a theory of Latin American revolution." (262) But all documentation points to the opposite: the SWP leadership concluded in 1983 that Castroism, not Trotskyism, was the appropriate theory of Latin American revolution, and repudiated in print Trotsky's argument for combining bourgeois-democratic and socialist demands.

Two other minor gripes: (1) The index is very superficial; (2) Too often Buhle does not give the name of the source of an opinion or quotation, which limits the reader's ability to evaluate.

Finally, one of the most intriguing aspects of this important book is that, while effectively repudiating mechanical Marxism, Buhle moves in the direction of a spiritualistic personal testament. In fact, at the outset he announces that the book "began as a reassessment of US Marxism from the wealth of new historical evidence available," but ended as "an installment in collective autobiography." (4) This does not undermine the book's value, but it should underscore the fact that many of Buhle's choices about which events and individuals on which to focus are determined by very strong personal responses.

Moreover, while the emergence of

Liberation Theology requires all of us to rethink our attitudes toward the politics of religion, the consequences for Buhle seem to be an attitude much too uncritical in his new evaluation of religious elements in the US radical tradition. The apparent influence of Liberation Theology also results in a disturbing concluding paragraph where he identifies those of us in the Red Tradition as "God's own fools." By this he means that, while we have been made fools of by the unexpected ironies of history, we have also acquired "glimmers of wisdom" which, "along with an undying revolutionary faith, have allowed all types and generations of radicals to keep a light in the window." (274)

While I am a proponent of the notion that those on the Left must create a culture of humanity that binds us together and that preserves and advances our culture, our story, and our vision, in contrast to the culture, story, and vision of the forces of domination and exploitation, I simply draw back from the word "faith." It seems to me that repudiating "faith" of any kind is what a remapping of the Left is all about. What is required instead is the constant rethinking and reworking of data and ideas so as to approximate as closely as is possible what has happened in the past and what we may expect in the future.

"Faith" in anything — countries, leaders, even the international working class, if one does not have a foundation in scientific inquiry — gets in the way of the critical consciousness required for such an undertaking, just as does a chronic skepticism that will accept no working hypotheses. Of course, what makes left-wing scholarship so exciting today is the presence of diverse voices, such as the unusually impressive and distinctive one of Buhle. But my own conclusion would be simply that it is in our own best collective self-interest to understand the forces shaping our lives and to continually project new strategies for human self-emancipation.

Alan Wald
University of Michigan

Philip S. Foner, *May Day. A Short History of the International Worker's Holiday, 1886-1986* (New York: International Publishers 1986).

C'EST À L'OCCASION du centième anniversaire de la célébration du 1er mai comme étant la fête internationale des travailleurs que Philip Foner publia cette courte Histoire (184 p.). Professeur émérite à la Lincoln University de Pensylvanie, âgé de 77 ans, Foner a notamment publié les ouvrages suivants qui démontrent une grande connaissance de l'histoire du mouvement ouvrier américain et international: *History of the Labor Movement in the United States* (1947, tome 1; 1955, tome 2), *American Labor Songs of the Nineteenth Century* (1975), *Autobiographies of the Haymarket Martyrs* (1975), *Clara Zetkin: Selected Writings* (1984), *A History of Cuba and its Relations with the United States* (1963), *Karl Liebknecht and the United States* (1978), *Organized Labor and the Black Workers, 1619-1981* (1981).

Le livre met en évidence la longue lutte pour imposer le 1er mai comme le jour de la Fête des travailleurs, à partir de ses origines soit le mouvement pour la réduction des heures de travail, revendication fort légitime. Dans ce contexte, il nous présente à grands traits la réalité du 19ème siècle: activisme des Chevaliers du Travail, des militants socialistes, marxistes, anarchistes et formation des premiers syndicats de métiers. Les incidents du 1er mai 1886, à Chicago, et leur valeur symbolique sont aujourd'hui bien connus, tout comme la lutte qui suivit pour sauver les 8 dirigeants qui furent finalement exécutés. La lutte pour la réduction de la journée de travail fut cependant poursuivie dès 1888 par l'AFL, alors que le congrès de l'Internationale socialiste de 1889 décidait, sur la proposition de Raymond Lavigne, un délégué français, que le 1er mai 1890 (date choisie par l'AFL) une grande démonstration internationale sera organisée de manière à ce que les ouvriers de tous les pays demandent simultanément de fixer à huit

heures la journée de travail et de mettre en application les autres résolutions du congrès de Paris.

A partir de là, l'auteur nous présente sa version des événements, mettant particulièrement en évidence la contribution des communistes. International Publishers, l'éditeur, est d'ailleurs identifié au Parti communiste américain. Cela conduit à une sur-estimation de l'importance des manifestations annuelles dans certains pays (Hongrie, Pologne, Cuba, etc.). L'auteur met en évidence chacun des mots d'ordre communistes depuis 1919 sans se demander si ceux-ci ont un lien réel avec les préoccupations des travailleurs. Après quoi, il s'étonne du petit nombre de participants aux manifestations annuelles organisées aux États-Unis. Tous ceux et toutes celles qui ont participé aux manifestations du 1er mai à Montréal seront sans doute surpris d'apprendre que cette tradition fut reprise non pas à l'invitation des centrales syndicales en 1968, mais bien sous le leadership du Parti Communiste du Québec (p. 149) et qu'une photo illustrant le défilé de 1975 met bien en évidence ... la bannière du P.C.Q. (p. 5).

Il est regrettable que ce centième anniversaire n'ait pas permis à Monsieur Foner de réfléchir sur ce qui a empêché le Parti communiste d'exercer un leadership effectif au sein des travailleurs et l'a conduit à n'être qu'un appareil à reproduire des mots d'ordre. Il aurait aussi pu s'intéresser à la véritable culture ouvrière, celle qui mérite d'être célébrée.

Claude Larivière

Gary R. Mormino and George E. Pozzetta, *The Immigrant World of Ybor City: Italians and Their Latin Neighbors in Tampa, 1880-1980* (Urbana and Chicago: Illinois Press, 1987).

HISTORIANS INTERESTED in class, culture, and community will welcome this account of Italian- and Spanish-speaking immigrants in Tampa. Written by two ac-

complished immigration scholars, this is a richly detailed study of a cigar-making community distinguished by a decidedly leftist culture, highly volatile labour relations, and a vibrant associational life. The authors draw on a wide range of archival and oral sources, and they shift smoothly from analytic discourse to vivid narrative prose.

The Italian arrival in Tampa coincided with the city's emergence after 1890 as a leading cigar-making centre. Drawn to the job opportunities of an expanding city, most of the Italians hailed from Santo Stefano Quisquina, Sicily. In Tampa, they encountered a Latin radical culture. This encounter, and the emergence of Italian radicalism in Tampa, constitutes a central theme of the book. Indeed, while recent historical studies have uncovered instances of Italian immigrant militancy, Mormino and Pozzetta document the emergence of a vibrant radical movement among Italian immigrants. The authors detail Italian participation in leftist mutual-aid societies, theatrical troupes, and debating clubs. They highlight the role of radical emigrés whose influence in unionization drives was far greater than their numbers in the community. And they attribute the absence of fascist organizations in the 1930s to the immense popularity of anti-clericalism and radicalism in Ybor City.

Tampa's radical culture had Cuban and Spanish roots. The city's cigar factories harboured a flourishing work culture marked by pre-industrial work rhythms and artisanal control of production. Its elite workforce was dominated by Cuban and Spanish immigrants. (The latter had first migrated to Cuba, where they had worked alongside Cubans in the Havana-based cigar industry.) Cuba's *barrio* life had been transplanted to the streets and clubs of Ybor City; the radical culture of Cuba's cigar shops reappeared in Tampa's factories.

Labour specialists will be particularly interested in the account of labour and radical protest that gripped Ybor City before 1935, and how Italians were drawn

into the fray. The cigar-maker's defiant culture was manifested in the figure of the *lector* (the man who read radical and other texts to workers in the factories). Early labour activity was spontaneous; predictably, wildcat strikes were triggered by some perceived slight to established custom. The "weight-scales strike" of 1899 marked an early turning point as Cubans, now rejoicing in the revolution, turned to union organization. They created a popular union, *La Resistencia*, and in 1901 launched a general strike. The massive evictions, violence, and vigilante activities that followed set the pattern for subsequent struggles. The strike's collapse marked the end of *La Resistencia* and the beginning both of the rise of the Cigar-Makers International Union (CMIU) and a string of labour defeats. It was during a second general strike in 1910 that Italian participation became critical. A few years earlier Italian workers had engaged in strike-breaking. Now they emerged as the backbone of the strike and were the last to return to work. This, the authors claim, permanently removed any stigma regarding the Italians' identification as strike breakers and ensured them a prominent position in the CMIU.

Why did Italians exhibit such a high level of class-consciousness? The authors stress several factors. First, Italian workers, they argue, greatly benefitted from the quality of the Spanish and Cuban leadership, as well as from their own Italian leaders. Second, although the majority of Italian newcomers were obviously influenced by the ideological and organizational ferment into which they stepped, they were not completely unfamiliar with radicalism. Many of them had been affected by the *fasci* (agrarian workers' leagues) and socialist movements of turn-of-the-century Sicily. Indeed, Santo Stefano had witnessed the emergence of a local socialist figure, Lorenzo Panepinto, whose assassination elevated him to the status of a hero. Exploitation in Tampa's work-places, the presence of effective radical teachers, and the vicious

nativist backlash against strikers made Panepinto's radical teachings particularly relevant. Even among non-socialists, the authors add, Tampa's Latin radicals struck a chord with former peasants resentful of greedy landlords and a self-serving clergy.

Yet, Italian participation in Ybor City's labour movement was only of short duration. Beginning in the 1920s Italians abandoned the cigar factories and their reputation as ardent unionists for what the authors describe as "the greater security and stability" that came from property ownership and small business. By the 1930s, Italians were concentrated in small enterprises and in non-cigar trades. Meantime, mechanization and management strategies in cigar-making were seriously undermining the position of Spanish-speaking cigar-workers. The widening gap between them and Italians was evident during the 1930s and 1940s, when second-generation Italians exhibited much higher levels of education and greater concentrations in white-collar jobs.

While this analysis suggests why Italians might prefer self-employment over factory work, it does not fully explain why, given the particular history of Ybor City, Tampa's Italians apparently found it so easy to abandon the labour movement and radicalism. The authors insist that as late as the 1950s Ybor City retained "the heart beat" of a Latin community. This glosses over the fact that by 1931, the time of the last general strike, Italians had not only left the cigar factories but had joined the anti-strike voices in the community. Did this severely strain relations among former comrades? Where there permanent repercussions?

Mormino and Pozzetta do consider gender. A discussion of the masculine character of Ybor City's associational life notes how men rushed from the family dinner table each night to join friends at the card-table or at a debate. They also uncover a history of women attending lectures given by prominent American and Latin radicals, participating in and initiating

ing strikes, and playing *bolita* (numbers game). Oral testimonies of women discussing street life and other themes not strictly defined as women's issues also enable us to view these women not only as workers and wives/mothers, but also as participants in a wider community. Some intriguing remarks about radical women leave us wanting to know more. Did they articulate a feminist critique? Did the press or the *lector* discuss gender issues? Current scholarship tends to assume that North American women launched a more sustained critique of the male left than did their radical ethnic sisters, who are seen as victims of more deeply-entrenched patriarchal cultures. Until we know more about the latter, the story remains incomplete. Finally, the book documents the unusually heavy incidence of industrial employment among Italian women in Tampa. Surprisingly, the majority of them were not single daughters, but married women. (Most of them worked in the cigar factories as strippers, removing the hard stem from the tobacco leaves.) This pattern contrasts sharply with the low levels of Italian female employment recorded for other American cities. Rather than account for these divergent employment patterns a partial answer lies within the structure of the local economy the authors assert a familiar argument, saying that women laboured to sustain the family economy. For those women with lengthy work careers and radical backgrounds, it would be fruitful to go beyond this analysis and explore in detail how such experiences affected them and their families.

This book both fills a void in our knowledge of immigrants in the Deep South and contributes significantly to the literature on Italian immigrants. It shows how studies that integrate the best insights and methodologies of each of the sub-fields of ethnic, labour, and women's history will yield impressive results. Finally, it is truly a pleasure to read such an eloquently written book.

Franca Iacovetta
University of Guelph

A.T. Lane, *Solidarity or Survival: American Labor and European Immigrants, 1830-1924* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press 1987).

IN THIS VOLUME, A.T. Lane examines the response of American labour to the great immigration of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. By American labour he means the skilled workingmen from Northern and Western Europe who had acculturated to the United States. As the title suggests, Lane attempts to study American labour opinion regarding the new immigration inside the context of mutually exclusive categories, "solidarity" and "survival." Generally, American labour believed in the ideal of solidarity with the European immigrant worker until the first decade of this century and then drifted toward survival, that is, reducing the number of European workers who entered the United States to compete for jobs. The purpose of this book is to understand why this was the case.

Lane believes that the seeds of American labour's xenophobia are to be found in the period between the 1837 depression and the Civil War. American workers, who were imbued with eighteenth-century craft traditions of hospitality, asylum, and natural rights, had to deal with the reality of competition from foreigners. Even though they did not advocate restriction, American labourers were generally sympathetic to the Know-Nothing movement, especially because Irish Catholics were identified so strongly with the breakdown of traditional crafts and with the forces of economic modernization. In other words, they were perceived as pawns in the capitalists' struggle to break the craftsman.

From chapter 3 to the end of the book, Lane describes the development of labour's endorsement of restriction, first through its support of contract labour laws, then the literacy test, and finally the quota system. Despite declining real wages and the advance of capital-intensive industry during the 1860s, American labour did not seek to restrict immigra-

tion. Rather, American labour bodies attempted to keep their European counterparts informed of the employment situation in the United States. Because of their tradition of solidarity, labour bodies saw the culprit of their woes as the advance of capitalism, and they used moral suasion on foreign coworkers rather than legislation to control the labour supply in the country.

Yet, a couple of decades later, the Knights of Labor, in the face of a growing Southern and Eastern European immigration, supported the 1885 Alien Contract Labor Law. According to Lane, the Knights felt that this measure might effectively reduce induced (contracted) labour, skilled or unskilled, from Europe. Hence they did not part with their ideals of solidarity and condone restriction.

Between 1885 and 1897, and under the aegis of AFL leaders, labour moved toward a restrictionist policy. In the latter year the Federation adopted the literacy test as a cornerstone of immigration policy. Hence undesirable immigrants, rather than employers who coerced immigrants with contracts, became the targets of this programme. However, support from the grass roots was, on the whole, lukewarm, and indeed the question of immigration restriction did not appear on the AFL agenda for another decade.

What happened, then, between 1880 and 1914 that the labour movement came to support unequivocally immigration restriction? Why after 1905 did the AFL encourage enthusiastically a literacy test (finally passed by Congress in 1917)? Lane observes that the lukewarm reception of the rank-and-file to a literacy test, in 1897, "required the experience of another decade to break this traditional loyalty among union members." At the same time, the traditional value of asylum for Europe's outcasts was forgotten. As an explanation, however, Lane suggests that labour became concerned with the enormous impact of the vast new immigration from Southern and Eastern Europe in the first decade of this century. Labour worried out the threat to American ideals

(oddly enough just as they were parting with some of them) that these immigrants, many of them illiterate, posed. At the same time, they associated the new immigrants with economic modernization: the continuing saga of deskilling, the rise of mass production, and scientific management. Labour therefore turned restrictionist and "solidarity [was] eclipsed by the instinct for survival." (184)

In the post-war period, labour protested forcefully the continuing flow of immigration, using arguments of economic competition from, and the unassimilability of, the immigrants. The spectre of more serious unemployment especially guided labour's hostile reaction to immigration and to its almost unanimous support for the quota system.

Lane does a truly commendable job in a study long overdue in labour history. He cannot be faulted for depending so strongly on official positions of the NLU, the Knights of Labor, and the AFL, because, as he points out, this study represents a beginning and much more research is required. Besides, in chapter 7 and elsewhere, Lane goes to great pains to show how representative or not official opinion was of the grass roots of the labour movement. This reviewer had more difficulty with one of the author's conclusions, that is, that the long time it took for labour to endorse a quota system "is evidence of the tenacity of solidarity." (211) Certainly, from Lane's evidence, one would have to conclude that by 1907, labour had abandoned solidarity. Was it not ultimately the dramatic growth of Southern and Eastern European immigration in precisely this period, rather than the decline of eighteenth century ideals that ultimately led labour to abandon solidarity and worry about survival?

John E. Zucchi
McGill University

Patricia Zavella, *Women's Work and Chicano Families, Cannery Workers of the Santa Clara Valley* (New York: Cornell University Press 1987).

IN UNDERTAKING A CASE study of Chicana (Mexican-American women) cannery workers, Zavella draws our attention to some serious omissions in American studies of the Chicano working class as well as in the socialist-feminist approach to women in the labour force. Thus, while those who study the Chicano labour force are sensitive to the interrelationship between racism and class exploitation, they generally ignore sexism. Conversely, while feminists explore the relationship between class and gender, they often ignore racism, a serious failure Angela Davis documented some years ago. In addition, many feminist analyses are further weakened because they ignore the relationship between women's paid labour and their work in the home. They concentrate on one aspect of women's lives and ignore the other. Zavella, adopting a socialist feminist perspective, attempts to address all of these weaknesses and gaps in her study of seasonally-employed Chicana labourers in the fruit and vegetable canning industry of the Santa Clara Valley in California.

Curiously, however, while she opens her account with a critique of various theoretical approaches (including neoclassical economic theories, labour-market segmentation theory, the functionalist "machismo" model in American sociology and anthropology, acculturation theory, as well as the various socialist-feminist explanations of why women's wages lag so far behind those of men), she does not apply her theoretical critique to her findings. Indeed, after having identified and rejected various theoretical approaches, her own analysis of Chicana cannery workers could be used to confirm some of the most traditional views.

Thus, in some ways, what this book fails to address becomes one of its most interesting contributions. Why would a trained anthropologist who constructs

"actor-oriented" descriptions in the manner advocated by Clifford Geertz (1973); who takes an activist stance in her capacity as researcher and attempts to help the women she studies in their union struggles; and who wants to develop a socialist-feminist sensitivity to racism as well as sexism and class exploitation, present findings that could be used to support the argument that women only work for "pin" money? Her failure to deal directly with the contradictory nature of her findings and theoretical perspective may have something to do with her methodological approach. She obviously agonized a great deal about her relationship (as a Chicana anthropologist not from the community chosen for study) with the women she came to know, who shared information with her which they might not have given to someone not of their own race and gender. She discusses in some detail the problems she encountered in becoming a recipient of privileged information, as well as the advantages of being Chicana.

However, in presenting women's perceptions, often in their own words, she forgets to step back and construct a context that takes into account structured inequality along the dimensions of class, race, and gender. We are left with a curiously personalized account of these women's lives, with no explanation offered as to how or why they have developed middle-class aspirations in their home lives, so contrary to the reality of their marginal, working-class jobs. The fact that their jobs are seasonal and therefore their wage labour is interrupted at regular intervals, is not a sufficient reason (indeed, whether or not it is a causal factor in attitude formation needs considerable discussion).

A further explanation for Zavella's failure to develop a theoretical explanation of her findings may lie in the form she adopts for presenting her case study. The chapters are devoted to the various issues she has identified as lacking detailed study in more traditional accounts, but she fails to bring them together in a fashion that overcomes the fragmented

approaches she deplures.

Thus, she opens the case study with a brief history of the canning industry and the ethnic, racial, and gender composition of its labour forces at various points in time. "Between 1930 and 1950 the Santa Clara Valley became the most important center of production of canned goods in the United States." (44) Serious labour shortages developed during and after World War II. The post-war period was also the time of a massive influx of Mexican Americans into the "Valley of the Heart's Delight," and Chicanas found employment in the canneries. Many grew up in migrant farm worker families, and regarded employment in the canneries as an advance over work in the fields. Cannery workers developed networks and by the time Zavella studied them in the late 1970s, some families could boast of three generations of Chicana labourers. However, the "Valley of the Heart's Delight" was transformed into "Silicon Valley" after the canning industry went into a major decline in the late 1970s, and was superseded by the electronics industry. Six years after completion of the study, only five of the twenty-four informants were still employed in cannery work, and of the five, four had had to relocate from the valley to keep their cannery jobs.

The bulk of the remainder of the second chapter is devoted to the various union battles for jurisdiction over cannery workers. Zavella severely criticizes the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, a union which has dominated this industry. She argues that it recreated within the union the sexist and racist structures prevailing in the canneries, and that it has done very little to address the types of discrimination and issues important to the Chicana labour force. These concerns have been taken up by militant locals. Chicano (men and women) labourers have led a two-pronged attack against the dominant union leadership (composed of white men) and the employer. Zavella herself became a campaign coordinator to elect a specific slate of workers to union office. In addition, much of her informa-

tion was given her by activist lawyers fighting various court cases on behalf of Chicano cannery workers.

This raises an extremely interesting and important methodological question. While Marxian and feminist analysts are increasingly adopting an activist stance in relation to the people they study, there is as yet little discussion on what this does to the perceptions of the researcher. Because Zavella adopts a fairly traditional style of presentation, one wonders to what degree her active union involvement has influenced her analysis of the Teamsters. Once again, she could have contributed a great deal to the debate on the relationship between researcher and researched, but leaves us with only a slight glimpse of her own involvement and no discussion of how that involvement affected her understanding of the situation of Chicana labourers.

The third chapter gives a profile of the family situations of her major informants, and is largely descriptive. This is followed by a chapter on "work culture," and the importance to the women of friendships made in the work place. The next chapter, in many ways the most problematic, deals with the impact of the women's seasonal jobs on their families. Zavella notes that, contrary to many research findings, household tasks did not become more equally shared when women entered the labour force. Both the women and their husbands retained the view that child care and housework are "women's work." While the men may have contributed more time, perceptions remained unchanged. Although women's wage work is seasonal, their annual earnings (cannery income combined with various state benefits) contribute substantially to family income, helping them to raise their standard of living.

While the domestic division of work did not change substantially, working wives did have a greater voice in decisions on how family income was to be spent. Families with small children often used women's wages for the children; for example, for their education. It is interest-

ing to note here that child care was a problem for Chicana cannery workers (where family composition mirrors the nuclear family model). Many working mothers hired undocumented Mexican women to care for their children. While Zavella notes the concern the mothers expressed about the quality of care given their children by these women, she does not discuss the fact that seasonal Chicana cannery workers, themselves exploited in a number of ways, are in turn exploiting other women who are in an even more vulnerable position.

Once the children were grown, women tended to work to meet specific goals, such as the purchase of a colour television or new drapes. One woman totally remodelled her kitchen. Another had been to Hawaii three times with her husband and was planning an extended cruise with two other couples, where the women were also cannery workers. (134-5) This is precisely the argument employers give to justify paying women low wages. Unfortunately, Zavella has come full circle here leading us back to the very theories she would have us reject. In her conclusion, she seems to blame women for their marginal status. "Women's family obligations and their commitments to a traditional family ideology made them prime participants in occupational segregation within the canning industry. Struggles with husbands also pressured women to seek temporary jobs." (168) By focusing so extensively on personal accounts, Zavella places too much emphasis on the ability of these women to change their own situation, and ignores wider economic, societal and cultural constraints within which these women form perceptions, make decisions and choices, and act. This is a most disturbing conclusion for one committed to a "socialist feminist framework." (170) It points to the need to radically re-think not only the implications of carrying out research committed to helping the people one studies, but also to develop new theoretical perspectives that take into account people's attitudes, goals, hopes and aspirations *within* the

context of the constraints that shape them.

Alicja Muszynski
University of Regina

Wayne Lewchuk, *American Technology and the British Vehicle Industry* (New York: Cambridge University press 1987).

THE AUTOMOBILE and the industry that manufactures this machine has held a continuing fascination for many historians, especially economic, business, and labour historians intrigued by the impact of Henry Ford's technique of mass production. For obvious reasons, much attention has been given to the American industry, but historians have also been contrasting the American experience with that of auto manufacturing abroad. Wayne Lewchuk's book is one of these comparative studies.

Lewchuk set himself an ambitious task, examining how management and labour in the British automobile industry adopted and adapted mass production technology in the twentieth century. Given what we know about the transfer of technology, it is not surprising that Lewchuk discovers British auto makers altering Ford's system to fit their own circumstances. But his perspective is interesting, for it is that of neither the labour nor the business historian. Instead, he examines the interaction of labour and management, arguing that the crucial issue in the adoption of the new technology was control of the effort bargain. The key difference, he tells us, between the American British experiences with the assembly line was the ability of American manufacturers to convert labour time into labour effort. Because the British auto makers could not and did not force this issue, a very different pattern of labour/management relations appeared in Britain's auto industry. Central in explaining this situation, Lewchuk says, are institutions, which have often been left out of economic models. It was the institutions, which have often been left out of eco-

nomic models. It was the institutions surrounding labour and management in Britain that explained both the inability of British industry to set the effort bargain and the resulting differences in stalling and managing the new technology of mass production in the British auto industry, differences that lasted from the 1920s through the 1960s.

Like many economic historians, Lewchuk is concerned with placing this argument in the form of a model that illuminates economic theory. I will not attempt to explain in detail the economic model of technical change he develops, for while it may be the main point of interest for economists and economic historians, it is material to which this reviewer cannot do justice. Moreover, this reviewer finds the main importance of the book in the empirical data Lewchuk develops about labour and managerial responses to technological change in the British auto industry. Of interest to labour historians, however, is one feature of the model — Lewchuk's recognition that labour is not a passive force in the process of technological change. This point, which labour historians accept as a cardinal principle, appears in the model through the inclusion of game theory. Thus Lewchuk argues that labour and management should be seen as actors influenced by perceptions of the strategy likely to be used by others.

Having laid out the theoretical groundwork, Lewchuk proceeds to a lengthy setting of the necessary historical background. He discusses, first, the development of mass production technologies in the auto industry in the United States. He then examines, from a general perspective, British efforts to implement technological changes that affected the effort bargain before mass production technology was introduced into England. Interestingly, Lewchuk finds that British manufacturers were generally unwilling to challenge labour on issues of managerial control before World War I; indeed, British industrialists rejected Taylorism and scientific management because these

methods, they believed, failed to consider the human aspects of worker motivation. British managers also rejected raising wages as a way of increasing worker productivity. Not surprisingly, British managers made little headway in gaining control of the work floor. In the end, they blamed labour for the general decline of British industry, even as they accepted certain social traditions that limited their ability to strengthen management authority.

This background discussion consumes about half the book, and from it one learns that the introduction of mass production technology in the British auto industry was shaped by several basic factors. First, labour retained significant authority over events on the shop floor. Second, conservative British managers were more unwilling than they were unable to change this situation. As a result, British management accomplished only an incomplete transfer of authority from skilled labour to management even as they introduced mass production procedures. This meant that workers and labour institutions played a large role in running British automobile plants.

Lewchuk applies this general picture to the British auto industry in three chapters that examine the development of labour/management reaction to mass-production from 1896 through 1914, 1914 through 1930, and 1930 through 1984. Lewchuk sketches these developments in various British companies. And the case is well made, for his research in the manuscript records of firms, unions, and trade associations and in the technical and engineering press is meticulous. After demonstrating that British manufacturers initially were not that far behind American producers in terms of technical sophistication, he turns to the British experience with mass production. He begins with a discussion of the successful introduction of full-blown American-style Fordism, showing that the Americans brought over by Ford to open a plant in Manchester proceeded to break the unions and install the traditional American system of complete managerial control over work place

procedures, and then kept the union out until 1944. The contrast with this experience is clear, for British management, Lewchuk tells us in case after case, took a different view of what workers could be made to do, and thereby accepted "limits to its authority." (160) The result was the use, by management, of labour institutions as a coordinator of the work place and the work pace. Most importantly, piece work and bonuses were standard practice in the British auto industry well into the post-war period.

Significantly, British auto makers consistently made a profit from the lower levels of labour effort that this system produced. Only the international changes in the auto industry that began in the 1960s exposed the weakness of British management. In the end, the lower productivity in British auto plants brought the collapse of the British motor vehicle industry. Lewchuk concludes that neither labour nor management alone can be blamed; rather this outcome stems from players [here is where game theory fits] trying to make decisions based on imperfect information in a market society.

This is a good book, but it suggests to this reviewer how sharp the disciplinary boundaries within history have become. As a historian of technology, this reviewer found that the model building exercise of the economist added little to this work as a historical study. However, even if this point is dismissed as a matter of prejudice, it is also worth noting that many of Lewchuk's conclusions are not startling, except for the attempt to include them in the model. For example, the author stresses the importance of the institutional context in understanding technological change. Yet this is hardly new to labour historians and historians of technology; indeed, Lewchuk should have expanded his definition of the institutional context to include a broader picture of British society beyond the factory. In the end, it seems possible to reduce Lewchuk's argument to the following stark contrast — American auto makers had no unions to hinder them while con-

servative British producers chose not to push hard against the unions they inherited. From this perspective, Lewchuk's study proceeds in a fairly ponderous way to document an ambitious outcome. Finally, it is too bad that in spite of the lengthy stage-setting here, no introduction to the British auto industry is provided. Instead, Lewchuk assumes that the reader recognizes the names of the firms and knows something about their history and their products.

In spite of these points, it should be understood that Lewchuk has produced an interesting study that highlights the importance of understanding the interaction of labour and management in the process of technological change. Also of value is the comparative framework, an approach that is increasingly popular, not to mention valuable, in studies of business and technology. For example, the British auto industry serves as a fascinating case for testing Alfred Chandler's thesis that technological change is the driving factor behind managerial change. Finally, it is interesting to observe not only the differences between labour's role in Britain and the United States, but also the outcome. It is thoroughly ironic, especially from the perspective of historian David Noble, that British auto workers, who retained much more control of the workplace during the age of mass production, were the first to suffer the consequences of changing competition in the auto industry. It is even more ironic, however, that British workers have been joined in their difficulties by American workers, who never exercised any measure of control over technology in their factories. In the final analysis, management bears a significant responsibility for the problems in both countries' auto industries. Now all we need is a study of the Japanese auto industry that permits a comparison of their different style of labour/management relations and institutions with those in England and the United States.

Bruce E. Seely
Michigan Technological University

Roger A. Bruns, *The Damndest Radical: The Life and World of Ben Reitman, Chicago's Celebrated Social Reformer, Hobo King, and Whorehouse Physician* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press 1987).

BEN REITMAN was a puzzle to his friends and colleagues. Emma Goldman's lover and manager for years, he regularly denounced the anarchist movement for its tactics and vision. Spokesman for the forgotten and oppressed, he was often regarded by them as an aristocrat; devoted to personal liberty, he flirted with Mussolini's fascism; confronted daily with the ugly realities of capitalism, he preferred palliative to radical surgery; constantly in the midst of radical politics, he was unable to grasp its theory or essence. And unlike most migrant workers, the "King of the Hoboes" was able to remove himself from the day-to-day class struggle and eke out a reasonably comfortable existence as a medical practitioner. Far from being the damndest radical, he was the quintessential liberal.

It is this inability to transcend a free-wheeling liberalism in the face of experience, culture, and education that is so puzzling. A biography of Reitman could be expected to shed some light on the connections of liberals and radicals, on the revolutionary potential of the so-called lumpenproletariat, on the way in which revolutionaries and liberals are made. On another level, the reader could hope to see interesting material on Reitman's relationship with Emma Goldman, a story that has been written from only the famous anarchist's point of view.

Unfortunately, this popular biography does not look at any of these issues. Indeed, it hardly looks at Reitman, for the book spends nearly as much time on subjects such as Goldman, Margaret Sanger, and Hobohemia. An understanding of these people and places is important, but Bruns gives anecdotes instead of analysis; the overviews are sketchy, almost casual asides that are not properly woven into the text. Instead, they stand out as

digressions largely culled from secondary sources, and they tell us nothing new. Nor do they shed much light on Reitman. When Bruns returns to his subject, he provides only a narrative of his life. Much of this information can already be gleaned from the works on and by Emma Goldman, or from Nels Anderson's books on hoboes. While Bruns has done us the favour of compiling this information in one volume, he has little new to add save details of time and place. We learn the dates of Reitman's birth and death, but gain little insight into his character — more is found in Alice Wexler's and Candace Falk's biographies of Goldman.

In this breezy volume, as in his first book, *Knights of the Road*, the author helps continue the image of the hobo as a character in American mythology. The direct descendant of eagle-eyed frontiersmen and laconic cowboys, immortalized in Chaplin's tramp, the hobo is the modern industrial version of the independent drifter. An integral part of society, he nonetheless remains untouched by it. Uncorrupted by crass materialism, freed of domestic fetters, proud and independent, untainted by "foreign" ideologies, the loner reasserts American values of democracy and individuality through his example and honest, productive toil. Such is the folklore, and its purpose is self-evident. While Bruns is aware of much of the real world of the migrant workers, of the terrible conditions and naked exploitation, he fails to come to grips with its class nature. His romantic view of life on the road ultimately reinforces the notion of the jolly bum, while the narrative of Reitman's life suggests that middle-class reform was the only appropriate response. *The Damndest Radical* is damned disappointing.

Mark Leier
Memorial University of Newfoundland

David Rosner and Gerald Markowitz, eds., *Dying for Work: Workers' Safety and Health in Twentieth-Century America* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press 1987).

THE STUDY OF OCCUPATIONAL health and safety is emerging full-force from a variety of locales. First, the labour movement has made the demand for safer and healthier workplaces a priority on its agenda for the past ten-to-fifteen years. Second, the larger environmental movement has highlighted and pressed the connection between what comes out of the factory and what ends up in our lakes. Both of these groups and their organizations have benefited from a renewed interest and an accelerating number of reports in this area by a third force: medical and research scientists. Finally, social scientists are currently infusing traditional investigations of "working conditions" with new questions and methodologies that notify their readers that struggles around occupational health and safety help illuminate the essence of an economic system that trades both health and safety for profits.

This last point is a central message of the thirteen essays collected by David Rosner and Gerald Markowitz. Indeed, in their introductory essay, Rosner and Markowitz make this point explicitly. Occupational health and safety history, they write, "illuminates the tensions among and within the scientific, economic, and political spheres in American society. In its most basic form, the struggle between labor and capital to control the means of production has set the context within which safety and health programs and policies have developed." We witness this tension, for example, in the essay by Alan Derickson on the founding and operation of a miners' union hospital in the Coeur d'Alene area of northern Idaho. In the face of an increasing number of severe and fatal accidents, Coeur d'Alene miners demanded the establishment of a union-controlled hospital. Over the years they had become deeply suspicious of the medical plans and facilities of the mine own-

ers, especially the practice of referring injured workers to company doctors who seemed much too ready to either dismiss or minimize their injuries and health complaints. When the mine owners insisted on continuing with this system, the miners went out on strike and ultimately won their demand. According to Derickson, the miners prevailed because of a long history of mutual-assistance programs which "fostered not only greater solidarity with their own ranks but also deep sympathy in the community." Moreover, the establishment of a union-controlled hospital was a victory that was replicated by more than twenty communities across the United States and Canada through the 1890s and 1900s.

Yet, as many of the other essays in this volume demonstrate, the overwhelming majority of American workers were left largely to their own devices in combatting and smoothing out the killing edges of new industrial technologies and practices. In her powerful chapter on radium poisoning in the watch dial industry in the 1920s, Angela Nugent describes the vulnerability of the female workforce of the United States Radium Corporation as they watched nine of their co-workers die within two years from "illnesses marked by severe anemia, lesions on their gums, and necrosis of the jaw." At the same time, the patterns of sickness prevalent among cotton mill workers that came to be known as bysinosis or brown lung went unacknowledged by cotton mill owners and union official alike until after World War II. And, finally, in an article on asbestos, David Kotelchuck shows how the health of workers in that industry was customarily violated as company officials and medical researchers either ignored or buried reports linking asbestos to disease. At the outset of the article Kotelchuck asks the question: "What did asbestos companies know about [asbestos-related] diseases and when did they know it?" By the end of the article he has supplied the answers: they knew plenty and they did nothing!

The blatant and criminal disregard of

company officials for the health and safety of their workforces is another theme that permeates the majority of the articles collected in this volume. Yet, these men were not alone. In fact, they were often supported by a growing coterie of research and medical scientists covetous of making the study of workplace health their exclusive prerogative. This process of the "professionalization" of occupational health and safety under the banner of industrial hygiene is well-illustrated in three articles on lead. In their article, Rosner and Markowitz show how the introduction of lead into gasoline in the 1920s was met with widespread concern for the health of workers in the industry and for the wider community. This concern was brought to a climax in October 1924 when five workers at a Standard Oil plant in New Jersey died and 3 more showed signs of neurological disorder because of lead poisoning. As a response to this disaster, a number of large municipalities, including New York City and Philadelphia, temporarily banned the sale of leaded gas. In their counter-attack, the gas and oil industries charged that the accidents were the responsibility of the workers. Company officials stated flatly that the men had been warned of the dangers — they knew the risks and were willing to take them. As Rosner and Markowitz argue in their introductory chapter, this tactic of blaming the workers was part of the new safety movement of the late 1910s and early 1920s that included a narrowing of the "problem as one of safety rather than health," as well as viewing "professionals, rather than workers or reformers, as the prime source of change...."

To overcome the opposition to lead in gasoline, industry officials brought out their trump card: lead was a "gift of god" and its use was essential if America was to experience real and sustained industrial progress. To bolster and legitimize this position, the companies enlisted the services of a host of willing research and medical scientists — both in universities and in private institutes — to provide

them with studies that demonstrated both the safety and the absolute necessity of leaded gasoline. This union between industry and science — consummated time and again in this and in other industries — is the focus of William Graebner's article on the processes that contributed to making the "scientific" view of lead hegemonic. "At bottom," Graebner states, "the failure of the 'system' of knowledge occurred less because the corporate sector did what was natural and inevitable than because scientific and medical professionals who could reasonably have been expected to provide an alternative did not do so." As a number of writers have pointed out in different contexts, the independence of the research and the "objectivity" of the research itself is potentially compromised when commissioned and carried out under corporate auspices. Hence, Graebner's biting conclusion on the role of company physicians as "scientific managers with medical degrees."

The last of the chapters on lead adds a further critical dimension to the history of health and safety: protective legislation. In this instance, Ruth Heifetz outlines the work of the Women's Bureau, a federally-sponsored agency mandated to look after the interests of women workers. Established in 1920, the Women's Bureau pushed for special provisions for women, including the eight hour day, no night work, "an adequate wage without discrimination based on sex or race," guards on dangerous machinery, rest rooms, dressing rooms, and the like. An international phenomenon, the demand for special protection for women was based, in part, on a concern that exposure to toxic substances would damage their reproductive organs. As Heifetz points out, however, this was not the opinion of the Women's Bureau or of Alice B. Hamilton, an industrial hygienist who became known for her "studies of workers exposed to lead, mercury, and common solvents like benzene (benzol)." Indeed, Hamilton used the results of her investigations to call for protective legislation for both sexes, not just for women. She

therefore fundamentally rejected the statement of the Standard Oil spokesman who, in reference to the poisoning of workers mentioned above, claimed that the men understood and accepted that they were working in a "man's undertaking." (One moment in the ongoing process of fusing masculinity with risk-taking.) Later in the 1930s the Women's Bureau, now attached to the Department of Labor, echoed Hamilton's words, recommending that safety standards be made applicable to all workers. Interestingly, however, the Women's Bureau did stipulate that such standards should apply *especially* to women. This was not due to an acceptance of women as the "weaker sex;" rather, it was based "on the full recognition of the double burden that most women bear in the workplace and in the home."

The three articles on the dangers of lead contain, in varying degrees, each of the themes under discussion: the power of large corporations to set the health and safety agenda, the handmaidens-to-industry role played by health professionals, and the vulnerability of workers, particularly women as they were most likely to be unorganized and/or regarded as insignificant by the unions to which they belonged. All of the chapters touched on this far, however, beg a further question: what was the role of the state in these issues and struggles?

As with most other issues relating to labour, occupational health and safety laws came under the purview and jurisdiction of the state legislatures. Consequently, as in Canada, the statutes that were passed relating to health and safety in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were aimed at redressing workers' grievances regarding, among other problems, employer's liability programs — schemes that ostensibly had been put in place to attenuate the economic hardships of injured employees, but which, according to Robert Asher, smacked of paternalism and contradictions that revealed their true purpose as maximizing the bottom line. Because of

worker struggles that took place on the shopfloor, in the courts, and in the state legislatures, however, such programs were either greatly modified or completely eliminated with the passage of workmen's compensation laws. Again, however, the parallel with Canada is almost exact; while compensation laws constituted a victory for workers, that is, they now were assured of financial assistance without having to pursue the expensive, time-consuming, and hostile process of litigation, employers had a cheap form of injury insurance that, ironically, shifted the focus of attention away from the workplace to the machinations of applying for and receiving compensation. In short, compensation laws did not prove to be an incentive to clean up the workplace — either then or now.

An additional article by the editors situates the contemporary role of the U.S. federal state in the area of occupational health and safety in an historical context. In this instance, Rosner and Markowitz locate the current divisions between the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), which is charged with policing and enforcing the 1970 Occupational Health and Safety Act, and the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH), which is mandated to establish chemical, dust, and toxic exposure standards, in domains claimed and carved up in the 1930s by the federal Department of Labor and the Public Health Service respectively. Then, as now, the source of the friction lay in the differing orientations of the departments of labour and the public health service: officials in labour saw themselves as advocates for greater workers' health and safety, while public health personnel viewed workplace injuries and illness as problems to be solved through research. According to Rosner and Markowitz, the Department of Labor lost this struggle over how to approach and solve workplace health and safety issues to the Public Health Service, with the "separation of technical and advocacy functions" proving to be "one of the lasting legacies" of

this defeat.

As the above outlines of the articles indicate, this is an important book. The editors, along with their contributors, have marshalled an impressive array of information in an area of study which most researchers have either ignored or prefer to make circles around because of the difficult, if not outright depressing, content. This collection of articles, then, makes a significant contribution to a field of study that is crucial to a fuller understanding of the social relations of production within capitalist societies. This is not to say that the articles in the book are equally strong. Indeed, a few of the chapters are short on evidence and the author's conclusions should, therefore, be more speculative and nuanced. Relatedly, many of the chapters could have been strengthened by informing empirical observations and conclusions with theoretical considerations.

Ultimately, however, these are relatively minor quarrels with a book that largely delivers what the editors promise in the introduction. Moreover, the articles, particularly those of the editors, help setup issues and questions for further discussion. In their article on lead in gasoline, they point to the chasm between scientific uncertainty and safety, and ask the question: "What is the level of acceptable risk that society [is] willing to assume for industrial progress?" With reference to the role of the state, Rosner and Markowitz pose a number of critical questions. "At what point is it the responsibility of ... government agencies to act?" "Does progressive reform depend on the police power of the state or on voluntary cooperation?" "Should the government provide workers and the public with information about the dangerous conditions they face?"

The articles in this book supply some answers to these questions. Many others are posed and go unanswered; but, this is a healthy result of good research. It is hoped that this book is just a harbinger of things to come both at the level of research and advocacy. As Anthony Bale

writes in his chapter: "Concealed in the commodities that capital creates are acts of homicide produced in the conditions which capital creates to produce those commodities. The discourse around workplace injuries and illnesses contains within itself the potential for a critique of capitalist relations of production as murderous in essence." Revealing this essence and developing this critique is the work that lays before us. In so doing, we can no longer afford or countenance the veiled "neutrality" of medical and research experts so well-exposed in this book. Occupational health and safety are about life and death. They demand that the researchers/writer take a stand on the issues under review.

Robert H. Storey
McMaster University

Altina L. Waller, *Feud: Hatfields, McCoy's and Social Change in Appalachia, 1860-1900* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press 1988).

FEUD IS AN EVOCATIVE example of what one might call the "new rural history." Altina Waller's work is deeply influenced by modern working-class history, conscious of the fit of even the most remote rural areas into late nineteenth-century American capitalist development, and at the same time deeply sympathetic to the plain people of the southern mountain country. Her book gains immediacy by the variety and depth of the data she uses, and through the presentation of a powerful collection of photographs of both people and landscapes, a collection which vividly contrasts the plainly dressed country folks and their log cabins to their contemporaries, the corseted and well-dressed high-Victorian town dwellers and their gingerbread houses.

Along with the infamous "Jukes's," the Hatfields and McCoy's became stereotypical American primitives when the Northeastern press grabbed hold of their dispute during the last 25 years of the

nineteenth century. Here, as the cultural evolutionism of the modernizers insisted they be, were the savage feudists of the backwoods, fit only to be destroyed by the forces of progress. Interestingly enough, the Hatfields and McCoys became prominent not when they fought but when their struggles reached the Supreme Court. Indeed for the most part they battled it out in the courts rather than in the woods. The feud led to a total of twelve deaths in the years 1878-1890, a modest enough figure for the era of Haymarket and Cour d'Alene.

Waller depicts the Hatfields and the McCoys as both victims and participants in the social revolution unleashed by the coming of industrial capitalism to Appalachia, where it attained particularly brutal forms during the twentieth century, of ugliness and poverty for the people and fabulous profits for the land speculators and the railroad and coal operators. The late nineteenth-century component of this consolidation, Waller's focus, was the transformation of land into a capitalist monopoly *before* the onset of industrialization, *before* the dominance of railroads and mines, and the displacement of yeomen into the roles of marginal wage labourers.

During the 1870s, in the still remote Tug Fork country on the West Virginia-Kentucky border, "Devil Anse" Hatfield was an ambitious, illiterate small landowner who broke the conventions of his traditional hunting, fishing, and trading society by entering into the timber business, floating rafts of logs downstream for sale in the outside economy. Though he used the courts rather than his guns, Devil Anse was a hard-bitten character who rode roughshod over such neighbours as Daniel McCoy, a particularly foolish and lazy man, who lost lands to Hatfield in the courts. According to Waller, in the context of Tug Fork society, Devil Anse was the modernizer and Daniel McCoy the traditionalist. This may be to understate the degree to which "traditionalists" were on the hunt for cash wherever they could get it: their contact with the market econ-

omy may have been marginal, but they were glad for it. I doubt if even the McCoys were averse to profit or that they were deeply in love with a subsistence life. Indeed, the differences in personality between Devil Anse and Daniel McCoy may have accounted for their social roles more than did their varying intensity of contact with the outside society. At this point, Waller's model is a bit strained.

In this small pond, Devil Anse was a big fish. After 1880, however, he never won another lawsuit, losing at least nineteen by 1900. During these years, outside land companies, from New York, Philadelphia and Boston, employed the merchants and lawyers of the developing towns of Logan, West Virginia and Pikeville, Kentucky to amass land for them. These townsmen set themselves against Devil Anse in order to wrest away his land. Entrepreneur in his own valley, Devil Anse was to the townsmen an exploitable bumpkin standing in their road to wealth.

Using the hapless McCoys as their cat's-paws, this small town elite attacked the Hatfields. Finally understanding that he was bound to lose his land in court, pushed to the wall, Devil Anse took to arms. Ironically, at this point the Hatfields began to refer to themselves as Regulators — as defenders of traditional values against outside forces, while the McCoys, the true traditionalists, served as unwitting agents of those forces. The shooting was inconclusive in itself, but over time Devil Anse was compelled to sell out to a Philadelphia land company in order to settle his debts. The Hatfields won nothing of lasting value either. The land companies swept all before them.

Beyond displacing men like Devil Anse from the land, depicting him and his like as atavistic primitives forwarded the interests of the land monopolists on the cultural front as well. Painting the feudists as savages justified getting rid of them to most Americans. "Pacifying" them was useful as well as part of the effort to attract new sources of capital. And viewed through this lens, the outside

interests could depict themselves as the agents of civilization rather than as greedy invaders.

The grandest irony for Waller is that it was the commercial and industrial capitalists who violently destroyed the Tug Fork community and not the Hatfields and McCoys, who were the ones fixed with the blame. Devil Anse fought only out of desperation — the land monopolists were the aggressors.

The new regime was an especially brutal one. The owners were few, and the workers were many and poor. Supported by the state government and the local elites, the owners employed goons who kept the coal fields unorganized until the countervailing power of the federal government was brought to bear under the NIRA of 1933. Industrial war in the region came to a climax in 1920, in the Matewan Massacre, during which the local sheriff, Sid Hatfield, managed to kill seven private detectives, hired guns of the coal operators. This Hatfield and his wife were gunned down a year later by vengeful detectives.

Although some Hatfields defied the new order, more accommodated themselves to it. In 1913, Henry D. Hatfield was elected the Republican governor of West Virginia. His daughter later married a President of U.S. Steel. In 1911, Devil Anse, nemesis of all that was new, underwent a religious conversion, a kind of acceptance if not a capitulation.

Altina Waller tells a vivid story, marred by annoying repetitiousness and awkward organization. She has done exhaustive research and she maintains a clear sense of the wider significance of her subjects. Industrial capitalism proved especially red of tooth and claw in Appalachia, as had been the developments which "opened up" the region. Tug Fork makes an excellent local example of social change in this region; *Feud* also serves as a parable of the destructiveness inherent in the great social and economic transformation of rural America. The Hatfields and McCoys were actors, eager actors, as well as victims, and although Wal-

ler stresses their victimization, she never quite turns them into noble but tragic folk heroes. Her tendency to do so, understandable given Appalachian experience, and her efforts to resist that romanticism, lend an interesting internal tension to her telling of this American Gothic tale.

Michael Fellman
Simon Fraser University

Elizabeth Roberts, *Women's Work 1840-1940* (London: Macmillan 1988).

THIS IS A SLIM volume (85 pp.) in the British Economic History Society's series "Studies in Economic and Social History," which surveys fields of recent debate for interested readers rather than for specialists. They are intended to be balanced and critical summaries rather than works of original scholarship and tend to have narrow focuses: in Roberts's case, working-class women's work in Britain between 1840 and 1940. She justifies the dates on the ground that by 1840 the industrial revolution, and women's work role in it, were well established while the outbreak of World War II ushered in a new era in women's lives and work.

For anyone who has kept up, even minimally, with the progress of women's studies in the areas of domestic and market work, there is little here that one would find new, provocative, or exciting. If anything, Roberts has managed to gloss over some of the more contentious issues in favour of a broad consensual summary.

What were these consensual judgments? The first is perhaps the most seminal to any understanding of women's work, and this relates to women's role in the family rather than in the labour market. "Women had a reproductive rather than productive role and as this reproductive work was unpaid society regarded it as having no economic value." (12) Indeed, female participation in the labour market was considered a regrettable and undesirable development (necessitated, it should be said, by poverty) and quite con-

trary to the 'domestic ideology' that developed parallel to the self-regulating labour market.

Men were to be concerned with the public sphere of the labour market and money-making. Women were to be involved in the private sphere of the home, dependent on their husbands for financial support, and certainly not expected to earn on their own account. (15)

Of course, for the majority, labour market work was, at the same time, domestic work, first and foremost as domestic servants, but also the taking in of lodgers, doing washing, selling home-baked goods, and other forms of "the merging of the public and private spheres," often on a part time basis. (17) The part time, seasonal nature of their work makes the accurate enumeration of women's economic participation in nineteenth-century Britain an impossible task leading to an underestimation of its economic importance.

One interesting debate that Roberts refers to concerns the origin and purpose of the (living) family wage. Was it "a strategy adopted by both men and women against exploitation by the capitalist system," or a male supremacy strategy "coming directly from men's determination to maintain their privileges over women." (25)

Much of the body of this book is devoted to summarizing the recent quantitative work that has been done on the subject, with particular attention to the participation of married women and including analyses of specific occupation groups where women were disproportionately represented. Her conclusion, that the work of working-class, married women has been unjustly slighted in much social and economic history, comes as no surprise. Her contribution is a modest attempt to suggest the magnitude and importance of women's work, "full or part-time, paid or unpaid, at home or in the community" in the British economy of the time. (54)

Roberts's other major concern is with female wages and working conditions

over the period, which showed only modest improvement despite the spate of legislation designed to protect women in the mines, factories, and shops. In part, this was due to the failure of legislation to invade the home where the majority of women worked. In part, it was due to contradictory male attitudes towards working women. Men appreciated the incomes supplied by their wives but they also feared the competition from lower-paid women.

They thus faced the classic dilemma of all male workers. If women were forced, by men, to take the lowest paid positions, there was the constant danger of their undercutting men's wages. But if women's wages were raised was that not tantamount to admitting that they did an equal job alongside the men? This dilemma was not, of course, solved within the period 1840-1940 although it had been clearly visible as early as 1840. (59)

Roberts also notes that, contrary to popular belief, World War I was not a liberating force for women despite its temporary effect on the employment of women in non-traditional jobs. By 1921, female participation in gainful employment had dropped to 30.8 per cent from 32.3 per cent a decade earlier (68); though as she points out in her concluding chapter, the range of job opportunities for women widened considerably during the interwar period. The fact remained that the fundamental domestic ideology, that a (married) women's place was in the home, was paramount not only among men, employers, and legislators, but among working-class women as well.

This book is a handy, concise, and easily accessible survey of the state of scholarship on working-class women's work in Britain from 1840 to 1940. It also contains a good, up-to-date working bibliography (with some annotation). It has weaknesses — for instance, little reference to the debate concerning the relative importance of class or gender in the economic suppression of women, no reference to the work of R.E. Pahl who surely can not be ignored in any discussion of

women's work in the informal economy — but it succeeds as a general introduction for the non-specialist to an important newer area of social and economic history.

Paul Phillips
University of Manitoba

Patricia Romero, *E. Sylvia Pankhurst: Portrait of a Radical* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press 1987).

THE PANKHURST FAMILY HOLDS out a variety of touchstones along the spectrum of modern British politics and feminism. In Manchester in the late nineteenth-century, with women's suffrage neither a fashionable nor respectable cause, Richard Pankhurst incorporated equal rights for women in his campaign for municipal socialism. Emmeline and Christabel struck a happy balance between wartime patriotism, a bourgeois consciousness, and a part-time militant lobby for women's suffrage. Sylvia, for her part, forged a union between women's suffrage, pacifism, and revolutionary socialism, which she defined and applied with direct reference to the material impoverishment of the East London working-class. But as fate would have it for the Left, Sylvia is the most problematic and ambiguous member of the Pankhurst family. George Bernard Shaw described her as an "idiot genius." Lenin, after debating with her in the Seventh Session of the Congress of Soviets, accused her of "infantile disorder" and "extremism." And most recently, Patricia Romero, Sylvia's new biographer, characterizes her as "self-centred, opinionated, immature, obsessive, highly strung, and single-minded." (xii) But if uncompromising resolve and "extremism" are not virtues in themselves, they would become virtues in Sylvia's hands, for she engaged her forceful personality and autocratic temper (a Pankhurst trait) to give focus and direction to her campaign for the economic, political and cultural emancipation of working-class women.

Sylvia's feminism and socialism were inspired, according to Romero, by the example of Richard, who steeped his family in the "who's who" of late nineteenth-century British socialism. Family friends and acquaintances included Tom Mann, Annie Besant, H.M. Hyndman, Robert Blatchford, John Burns, Eleanor Marx, and Keir Hardie. In light of this common education of the Pankhursts, it is curious that much of the scholarship on the women's suffrage movement should designate Sylvia as the ideological mutation, when as Romero shows, it was Emmeline and Christabel who fell victim to bourgeois tarnish, objecting to participation by working-class women in WSPU rallies on the grounds that Parliament would be more attentive to a "feminine bourgeoisie" than to a "feminine proletariat." (43-4) Sylvia, however, remained true to the family compact of socialism-pacifism, standing firm against the bourgeois and capitalist posture of her sister and mother. Although obliged by the WSPU to operate her East London Federation of Suffragettes without the benefit of middle-class money and endorsement, Sylvia's campaign flourished in its proletarian mould, if forced outside the mainstream of "respectable" pressure groups. This suited Sylvia. A national profile meant less to her than an East End campaign for women's suffrage and the destruction of "a world controlled by male capitalists." (93) While the suffragettes of middle-class constituency became submerged in the war effort, Sylvia followed her pacifist course, exploiting the "capitalist and imperialist greed" of war to pivot from "suffragette to feminist," demanding equal pay for women, female membership in the TUC, and improved working conditions in East End sweated industries. After the war, still unwelcome in the Labour Party because of her pacifism, Sylvia fell into embrace with Bolshevism, altogether cashiering her faith in parliamentary democracy. A feminist before all else, she argued that communism and the soviet would "liberate mothers from their present economic enslavement and

drudging." (141) Women would have their own soviets and thus independent control over their workplace. On revolutionary strategy, however, Sylvia fell out with Lenin, whose short-term plans for Britain were for a unified Left to work in conjunction with "bourgeois parliamentarianism." Never one to compromise, Sylvia found herself expelled from the very Communist Party of Great Britain that she had worked to create. Undaunted as ever, Sylvia turned her hand towards anti-fascism, which in turn led to her last and most eccentric campaign, the recovery of the imperial throng of Ethiopia for 'His Imperial Majesty' Haile Sellasie.

This is a well-presented and well-researched biography, drawing heavily upon Sylvia's private correspondence, her published writings, and the author's interviews with many of her subject's political associates, friend and foe alike. As a biographer must do, Romero ranges over the course of Sylvia's life, but her quest for an even narrative pace causes important questions to pass unanswered. Sylvia's views on feminist issues, for example, are too hastily summarized as "paradoxical" (287), and her working relations with women, about which little is said in this volume, are merely obscured by the statement that Sylvia gave "the impression that being a woman was more an accessory than a private fact of her life." (287) Too often the impression is given that Sylvia was a blind activist, hopscotching incoherently from campaign to campaign without an obvious feminist or socialist agenda. Inconsistency itself, after all, is a subject worthy of exploration in the career of one who endeavoured to reconcile socialism and proletarian feminism in a public consciousness which accepted neither.

Ian Dyck
Simon Fraser University

Stephen F. Kelly, *Idle Hands, Clenched Fists: The Depression in a Shipyard Town* (Nottingham, England: Spokesman 1987).

IN THIS ANOREXIC VOLUME, more a pamphlet than a book, Stephen F. Kelly reconstructs the mass demonstrations of the Birkenhead unemployed in August and September of 1932. Those events culminated in four days of rioting, extensive police violence, the arrest and imprisonment of several local activists for the unemployed, and eventually, acrimonious exchanges in the House of Commons. At the outset Kelly acknowledges that the events at Birkenhead were not of great historical significance. Indeed, they had no discernible effect upon national policy toward the unemployed. Nevertheless, Kelly insists the Birkenhead events are worth recounting since "they reflected for the first time ... the strength of reaction to continued unemployment." Writing for a non-academic audience, Kelly reminds the reader that rather than being an alien phenomena, violence has periodically served as the means by which British people challenged unjust laws or repressive measures of the government of the day. In this vein, Kelly makes an explicit and feasible parallel between the events at Birkenhead and the violent outbreaks by alienated male youths in many cities during 1981 and 1985. And much like Stanley Baldwin, Margaret Thatcher seems to have escaped with relatively little blame from large segments of the British public.

Birkenhead, situated across from Liverpool on the River Mersey, was a city of about 150,000 in 1932. Like elsewhere on Merseyside, Birkenhead's economy was largely dependent on shipbuilding and maritime commerce. Throughout the 1920s all of Merseyside suffered from high unemployment. The Great Depression, however, ushered in a time with especially harsh consequences. By September of 1932, 17,000 Birkenhead residents, equivalent to one in three of the workforce, were officially unemployed. A survey taken that year by a local news-

paper ascertained that at least 15 per cent of the city's families lived below the poverty line.

If anything, Kelly understates the tragic nature of the often wasted lives of the long-term unemployed. For them, life centered around trips to the Labour Exchange or the offices of the Public Assistance Committee, authorities charged with the unenviable task of administering relief. There, claimants experienced what was possibly the most demeaning and squalid aspect of the exercise of state power, the Means Test. Even indigent families were commonly forced to sell furniture or prized possessions before benefit was allowed. Similarly, claimants were required to prove that they were eagerly seeking work, all too often when no work of any sort was available.

The author relies largely on press accounts to reconstruct the events of 1932. The impetus for the first demonstration originated from a meeting of the local branch of the Communist Party in July. It was held under the auspices of the 1,000 member-strong Birkenhead chapter of the communist-controlled National Unemployed Workers' Movement. Ably led by an unemployed foundry worker and ardent activist, Joe Rawlings, on 3 August nearly 2,000 people marched from Birkenhead's fine Victorian park to the town hall. There, a petition which called for an end to means testing, an increase in benefit as well as the creation of a new locally funded work scheme, was presented to the Mayor. Surprised by the extent of the support they had received and determined to increase pressure on the local officials, Rawlings and other leaders called for a second demonstration on the seventh of September, the day their petition was to be presented to the town council. When the second large demonstration met only with intransigence on the part of local government, a third and a fourth demonstration, drawing ever greater crowds, were held within a few days. It was during the last demonstration, when more than 15,000 people marched to the offices of the Public As-

sistance Committee, that frayed nerves and great frustrations finally gave way to violence. Kelly convincingly places much of the blame for the disturbances on the often unprovoked violence of the police. After four days, with reinforcements of police from cities as far away as Birmingham, the fierce street fighting, termed by *The Birkenhead News* "the communistic reign of terror," was finally brought to an end. Significantly, within days the Birkenhead town council reversed their earlier position. Benefit for single men and women was increased 25 per cent, £170,000 was committed to a local work scheme and promises were made to lobby the national government against the Means Test.

While Kelly's story will be of some interest to those with an interest in social policy during the inter-war period, *Idle Hands, Clenched Fists* remains an insubstantial work. Long passages on subjects such as the history of public disorder in Birkenhead or the life history of Joe Rawlings are padding, offering little to an understanding of the dynamics which led to violent protest in 1932. Other subjects of considerable relevance, such as the NUWM organized hunger marches in the Lancashire-Cheshire area are integrated poorly with the book's main theme. At the same time, the author's explanation of State policy toward the unemployed is grievously thin, even for the casual reader. Moreover, no attempt is made to compare the events at Birkenhead with protests made in other areas of Britain. Unfortunately, even the plausible relevance which the struggles of Birkenhead's unemployed have for those who suffer the same fate in Britain today is little developed.

Richard J. Soderlund
University of Maryland

Peter Weiler, *British Labour and the Cold War* (Stanford: Stanford University Press 1988).

HISTORICAL WRITING ON THE Cold War, until the 1970s, was mostly limited to one or another aspect of Soviet-American relations. It is a point made by the author of this excellent book. The debate between traditionalists and revisionists among American historians began in the early 1960s and continued until the end of the next decade when the revisionist arguments became somewhat less vigorous. The core of the argument was the extent to which the generally accepted view of the years following the war, that the Soviet Union was inherently expansionist and working towards world domination, omitted analysis of the aggressive role of the United States itself. The British presence in world politics was largely ignored, and it has only been the relaxation of the 50-year ban on access to government papers — brought down to 30 years and operative for most categories from 1972 — that has permitted research into the foreign policy of the Labour governments of 1945-1951: the years when the Cold War was incorporated into world politics. British writing in the past decade or so, almost without exception, has validated British foreign policy. There are a few authors who have not accepted a justificatory role, notably Chrisopher Thorne in *Allies of a Kind* (1978), but there has been no major critical appraisal corresponding with that of American historians. The accepted texts include Rothwell's *Britain and the Cold War 1941-1947* (1982), an extended, uncritical study of Foreign Office papers, and the third volume of Alan Bullock's massive trilogy: *Ernest Bevin, Foreign Secretary 1945-1951* (1983). Only in the most recent years have there begun to appear a number of periodical articles that question certain aspects of British policy, but there has appeared no large-scale critique until this present volume by Dr. Weiler.

What the British government papers have revealed was the continuity of policy

after 1945 with that of the coalition government headed by Winston Churchill. They have confirmed not only that the personnel of the Foreign Office remained unchanged — that was known, of course — but that their traditional anti-Sovietism and anti-communism were central to all their political attitudes; and linked with this was their insistence that Britain remain a world power alongside the USA and the USSR. It was the Empire that allowed Britain to continue to play a world role, and it was the Soviet Union which alone threatened the maintenance of the Empire. If the British moved out, Russia would move in. Provide a vacuum, said the Foreign Office on innumerable occasions, and the Soviets will fill it. There were, of course, cross currents of interests and qualifying factors. Britain's pre-war imperial interests were now especially important for their dollar-earning capacity. West Africa and Malaya were among the most important, and there were also some areas of quite serious conflict with the United States. By the end of 1947, however, American dollars were being provided, or promised, in sufficient quantities to override conflicting interests, on the assumption, of course, that the central dynamics of American policies round the globe were not seriously hindered.

Although Dr. Weiler is mainly concerned with the response of the British trade union movement to the Cold War — that is what 'Labour' in the title of his book refers to — his background research into the general foreign policy of the Labour government, and their relations with the United States, has been extraordinarily thorough and wide-ranging. And what he has achieved is to insert a new dimension into Cold War historiography. Labour movements, in any period of history, are usually treated almost as separate entities; separate, that is, from decision making in most or all parts of society. What Dr. Weiler has done is to underline the importance of the working-class movements in Europe at the end of the war, to emphasise the impact of the war

upon their post-war thinking and practice, and to highlight the urgent need for the capitalist class in each country to find ways of curbing and containing the now greatly enhanced aspirations of the ordinary masses.

The centre of Cold War politics on a world scale was the World Federation of Trade unions, established in February 1945, with only the American Federation of Labor, of the major labour organizations, standing aside. The British Trades Union Congress, led by Walter Citrine, with Ernest Bevin in the background, was a reluctant adherent, and when the WFTU split in January 1949, it was the British TUC and the American AFL which were the main agents responsible. Both the British and the Americans had close and continuous contacts with their respective Foreign Offices. The AFL was malevolent and bitterly hostile to any co-operation with the Soviet Union; the TUC was devious, and as anti-Soviet as the Foreign Office itself. It is a remarkable story that Dr. Weiler tells, and it offers new perspectives for historians of the working-class movements in their own countries as well as new material for those concerned with diplomatic history. No one before Dr. Weiler had documented so fully and so carefully the two-faced role that Citrine played in these years. He was, in international affairs, an agent of the British Foreign Office, and he was supported by a small group within the TUC bureaucracy whose activities remained unknown to most of the General Council of the TUC, and certainly not outside in the movement at large.

The British TUC not only played a central part in the calculated break-up of the WFTU, but it also acted as a further arm of the Foreign Office in a number of sensitive areas outside Britain where the political situation was becoming difficult for either imperial or business interests, or both. In two well-documented chapters Dr. Weiler explains how the trade union movements of Greece and Western Germany were 'directed' into safe, non-communist ways. In Greece, where the British

had initiated the first military intervention in occupied Europe, it was the TUC which naturally undertook the work of disrupting the Greek trade union movement and destroying the considerable radical/communist groups. In Germany it was largely the Americans, through the AFL, who were the guides to the processes of 're-structuring.'

The third part of this volume has two chapters: the first, an analysis of ways in which political/public opinion was manipulated in Britain in the interests of the Anglo-American strategy of anti-communism and anti-sovietism on a world scale. 'Manufacturing Consensus' is the title Dr. Weiler gives to this chapter, and he provides in careful detail an account of the lies, half-truths, and misinformation that was the stock in trade of the various organizations and groups within and without the Foreign Office itself. And his final chapter is a case study of the 1949 London Dock Strike, in which the manufactured consensus operated in a manner wholly satisfactory to its directors in Whitehall.

Dr. Weiler is fully aware of what he describes as "Soviet truculence and genuine dictatorial actions," and his volume is in no sense at all an apologia for anyone. It is a very careful and well written analysis of a highly complicated period in world politics, and no one who comes after will be able to ignore the sophisticated handling of a great variety of materials, and the new light that he has directed upon the motivations and the actions of those involved in the making of British foreign policy under Attlee and Bevin. No one, either, will ever be able to believe again the simple story of the Cold War that has passed for historical truth these last 40 years. The British Labour Government had a major responsibility for the division of the world in the post-war years, and what we now know from Dr. Weiler is the contribution made by certain of the leaders of the British labour movement. It is a story of duplicity and deceit that is still befuddling the minds of millions.

John Saville
University of Hull, England

Kenneth O. Morgan, *Labour People: Leaders and Lieutenants, Hardie to Kinnock* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 1987).

THIS BOOK PRESENTS a collection of essays on 30 key figures in the Labour Party from 1900 until the present. Several of these essays originated as book reviews in the *Times Literary Supplement* or *New Society*, but they have been revised and extended, with pertinent additions, to produce a series of mini-biographies illustrating the diversity of the Labour Party and its changing style of leadership. Beginning with the founding fathers of the Party, the book then explores a number of key politicians, planners, and intellectuals of the Depression years, before dealing extensively with the central personalities of the Labour Party in its years of power. It ends with some vignettes of Labour contemporaries including the last two leaders of the NUM and the last three leaders of the Party.

It is in many respects a highly personal selection, as the author readily admits. Kenneth Morgan began his career as a historian of modern Wales, and being a Welshman himself his countrymen feature prominently in the portrait gallery. Less space is accorded to the intellectuals in the Party than might be expected. Blatchford, Tawney, Strachey, and Crosland are omitted, for example. Rather more is given to the planners, the union bosses, and the apparatchiks, reflecting Morgan's own interest in Labour in power. Party leaders and deputies necessarily receive full coverage, not simply because they might reflect some of the central moods and tendencies within the movement, but because the Labour Party has always revered the cult of personality. "More than any other party," Morgan controversially asserts, "it has praised famous men ... and has perpetuated their imperishable memory." (2) Given the Tory reverence for Disraeli and Churchill this seems a quite dubious claim.

Morgan's mélange might seem idiosyncratic, but there is a political message

behind it. Completed in the wake of the Fulham by-election of 1986, when Labour's fortunes seemed so promising, the book is designed to stimulate discussion of how the Labour Party might become the "essential voice of anti-Tory opposition" (341) once again. To Morgan this is largely a question of recapturing the ideological consensus which, combining individual freedom with "social fairness," (16) has in his view remained basically unchanged since 1945. Above all it means renouncing Labour sectarianism and projecting the Party as a progressive team ably fit to chart Britain away from the stormy waters of Thatcherism and the whirlpools of the Alliance.

How far Morgan's polemical introduction coheres with the essays that follow is a most important point. Certainly Morgan hoped that the legacy of the past might provide a guide to the future, although the presentism of this position sometimes jars with the historical records. Be that as it may, Morgan's own assessment of what is creative in Labour Party history does emerge from the erudition and polish that characterize these essays. Without a doubt he admires the home-grown, ideologically heterodox socialism of the Labour Party and the quiet engagement of ideas with different regional experiences and traditions. He is fairly scathing about the Webbs' austere model of a huge state-run bureaucracy and believes the Fabian influence upon the party to be exaggerated, waning dramatically in the 1930s. In his view the planners of that era, those whose work bore fruit through the New Fabian Research Bureau, modulated their collectivism with a welcome moralism and nationalism and forged a creative fusion between democratic socialism and Keynesian demand-management. In this way they avoided the dangers of Orwell's "beehive state" just as Laski did in his fertile combination of socialism and liberty, with its emphasis upon localism, devolution, and regional and personal accountability.

Morgan believes the planners to be far

more significant in the making of the Welfare State than the progressivism of World War II, a position at odds with historians like Arthur Marwick. He also sees the Labour government of 1945-51 as neither intellectually bankrupt, nor overly dependent upon liberals such as Beveridge and Keynes. And he admires the teamwork and dedication of its leading members. His portraits illustrate the ideological and social diversity of the group, from the genteel Edwardian radicalism of Attlee and Viscount Addison, the Hampstead, middle-class intellectual milieu of Gaitskell, to the grittier proletarian world from which Bevin, Morrison, and Nye Bevan emerged. Pride of place is given to Bevan who is not cast as a fiery intransigent of the left, but as a tough-minded politician who knew when and where to consolidate and compromise: in sum, a "radical, but flexible, minister." (210) His resignation in 1951 was a principled one, Morgan argues, for the health cuts could have been avoided by slight modifications in the defence budget. As for the subsequent feud between left and right, this is attributed to Attlee's declining leadership (144) and Gaitskell's belligerence. (226) Even the famous row over Clause 4 of the Party constitution could have been avoided, he claims, for no one really wanted to nationalize the whole economy.

Morgan's account of Labour's feuds during the 1950s is interpretatively significant because he wishes to absolve Bevan of the charge of sectarianism and to distance him from the leftists of the 1980s. Scargill is excoriated for his Stalinist dogmatism and confrontationalist postures; Benn is depicted as a gadfly whose crusades have electorally embarrassed the Party and opened it to Trotskyist entryism. By contrast, men as ideologically diverse as Callaghan and Foot are admired because they always placed a high premium on Party loyalty, upon pulling together. Morgan here reveals his broad church preferences. He admires professionalism, pragmatism, and non-factionous diversity. Above all, he reveres

politicians who are able to combine the exigencies of power without losing the pulse of the movement in the constituencies. For these reasons he has little time for Wilson, who manipulated the party to produce a highly personalized style of "prime ministerial governments," and a good deal more time for Hattersley and Kinnock. Both have nurtured their roots in the post-1945 working-class communities of Sheffield and South Wales and wish to align Labour's aspiration with these more affluent, home-owning communities as well as with the hard-hit minority on public welfare.

The trouble with Morgan's analysis is the assumption that the Labour Party can somehow recreate the 1945 consensus. But that consensus dissolved as the British manufacturing economy went into structural decline. For a variety of reasons the social alliance between the organized working class and the professional classes upon which Labour's electoral viability rested has fallen apart and no new style of charismatic leadership is likely to regenerate it. Morgan's solution presumes forms of deference and brokerage that no longer have much purchase. This fatally flaws the overriding theme of the book. While he has provocatively questioned some of the cherished clichés about Labour Party development and cast new light on labour's professional expertise and political experience in power, he cannot really address, in the terms he has set, the reasons why the Labour Party remains in crisis. That would require a deeper sociological analysis and one that addresses, more fully than here, the organizational structures of the Party.

Nicholas Rogers
York University

Roger Fletcher, ed., *Bernstein to Brandt: A Short History of German Social Democracy* (London and Baltimore: Edward Arnold 1987).

1988 MARKS THE 125TH anniversary of the founding of Ferdinand Lassalle's "All-German Workers' Association" which, after merging with Marxist and other labour groups, grew into the Social Democratic Party of Germany (SPD). The justifiably proud history of Germany's oldest continuous political movement, which by World War I was also its largest parliamentary party and the most impressive socialist organization in the world, will be the subject of numerous publications, conferences, and other commemorative events at home and abroad. It is therefore particularly appropriate that Roger Fletcher, the author of a well-received study of the phenomenon of pre-1914 German socialist imperialism entitled *Revisionism and Empire* (1984), has gathered together contributions from more than twenty historians — half of them from the Federal Republic, the remainder largely British — to provide an up-to-date survey of the SPD's often turbulent course from the mid-nineteenth century to the resignation of Willy Brandt from the party chairmanship in 1987.

To be sure, several one-volume accounts of German Social Democracy written in English already exist, the most recent being W.L. Guttsman's fine *The German Social Democratic Party, 1875-1933: From Ghetto to Government* (1981). Fletcher maintains that a collaborative treatment of the topic offers the advantages over the effort of a single author of presenting both a wide range of methodological approaches as well as the specialized expertise of individual scholars of differing generations and both genders in the field. (3-4) Thus, separate contributors to the book deal not only with the institutional development of the SPD but also with broader and more fundamental socio-economic aspects of the German working-class experience. In this regard four essays are devoted to the role

of women in the party and in everyday life as wage workers and homemakers, the latter until at least the 1970s thought to be their "natural" station even by the bulk of Social Democrats who have always been the relatively most enlightened political grouping in Germany on the "women question." Also adequately represented are the "Free" — as distinct from the Catholic and liberal — Trade Unions, the close allies of the SPD throughout their joint history until 1933, when, under the devastating impact of the Depression that culminated in the appointment of Hitler as German chancellor, organized labour moved to sever its ties with democratic socialism in a vain attempt to reach a *modus vivendi* with the emerging Nazi dictatorship. One chapter in each of the three main sections of the book (on the pre-war, World War I, and Weimar periods respectively) traces the relations between unions and party, which generally had the effect of helping divert the movement's revolutionary ideology and rhetoric into practical, moderate and evolutionary channels. (In the years since 1945, which are very thinly covered, West Germany has had a unified and non-partisan union structure, although the majority of its members and especially their leaders are SPD supporters).

The negative side of a volume by a multiplicity of writers, of course, is a certain amount of distracting repetition of factual information along with an unevenness in the quality and variations in emphasis among the different contributions. Perhaps the most rewarding articles are those which either combine theoretical sophistication with analytical — rather than purely narrative — exposition, or else adopt a critical stance toward a movement that is all too easily mythologized, especially on celebratory occasions. Among the former type, Ute Daniel demonstrates persuasively the manner in which the behaviour of mainly working-class women in defying wartime food-rationing regulations served to undermine the authority of the militarized Wilhelmine state that had to condone such illegal-

ity, thereby creating a necessary pre-condition for the "so-called November Revolution" of 1918-19. (89-95) Geoff Eley's succinct dissection of Social Democracy's crucial part in the origins and course of that complex event is a model of balanced historiography. But his forthright conclusion seems equally incontrovertible: "The real tragedy was the SPD's excessively legalistic, stolidly unimaginative and wholly conservative understanding of what a democratically ordered polity could be." (73) Measured by their own standards, party and unions alike squandered the unprecedented opportunity furnished by the Workers' and Soldiers' Councils to establish a viable democracy equipped to withstand the subsequent onslaught of Nazism. The harshest verdict on the precise responsibility of German socialism for that ultimate calamity is delivered by Peter Stachura (156-57), who expressly contradicts the views of Detlef Lehnert and Klaus Schoenhoven that "it would be a mistake to place the major blame for the failure of Weimar democracy on the SPD and the Free Trade Unions." (123) Yet even Stachura, who roundly condemns the sectarianism, complacency, and misplaced optimism of their ageing leadership, concedes that all other German parties — not least of all the rival working-class Communists with their bizarre attacks upon the "social fascists," as adherents of the SPD were called — are far more open to criticism. "In its failure to appreciate fully the inherent fragility and vulnerability of the republic lies the real culpability of the SPD." (165)

Among other noteworthy pieces are Dick Geary's on workers' culture in Imperial Germany; Karen Hagemann, who looks at SPD women during the Weimar Republic, and no fewer than three (by the editor himself, Susanne Miller and Heinrich A. Winkler) that treat the long career of Eduard Bernstein, the chief formulator of revisionism in the turn-of-the-century movement. As the untiring advocate as well of an extension of Social Democracy's electoral base to include

middle-class, white-collar, farmer and other categories of voters, who would enable it to break out of an otherwise self-imposed permanent minority status and become truly a "people's party" (*Volkspartei*) with an indisputable claim to govern the country, Bernstein's thought and policies comprise the central point of the book. This focus may surprise a few readers, in the light of Bernstein's political marginality for the three decades prior to his death in obscurity late in 1932. Some might prefer instead that such neglected themes as the internationalism of the SPD, its underground resistance against Nazi totalitarianism, and the remarkable biography of Willy Brandt, the other exemplary Social Democrat mentioned in the book's title, receive more systematic attention. Neil Elder's sketch of contemporary European democratic socialism would have been improved by concentrating upon the SPD's important ties with these movements in Portugal, Spain, and Central America — or else replaced entirely by suitable statistical tables on the party's national and regional voting results, size, occupational composition, and the like which as the volume stands must be tediously extracted from the text. Nevertheless, as Eugene Kamenka rightly concludes, this book succeeds in making clear the substantial accomplishments of Social Democracy on behalf of the working population of Germany and its sympathizers everywhere, for whom the humanity, integrity, and loyal dedication of Eduard Bernstein furnish a fitting symbol.

Lawrence D. Stokes
Dalhousie University

Dan La Botz, *The Crisis of Mexican Labor* (New York: Praeger 1988).

THIS BOOK BEGAN AS A series of articles published in *Changes* and the *Mexico City News*. La Botz calls the collection a "synthetic history based primarily on secondary sources" and says its purpose is to analyze "the current situation of the Mexican labor movement." (xiii)

Orienting the analysis is La Botz's wish to see the triumph of "socialism from below" which he defines as "revolutionary opposition to both capitalism and the bureaucratic community party, to both social democracy and Stalinism." (xiv) His approach is to run through twentieth-century Mexico to locate instances in which working people organized themselves to achieve improved working conditions, benefits, and wages and, perhaps most importantly, an independent *political* expression of their views.

The last is crucially important because the main theme of the politics of labour in twentieth-century Mexico is the repeated failure of workers' organizations to remain independent of the state. From Luis Morones to Vicente Lombardo Toledano to Fidel Velázquez to Joaquín Hernández Galicia, labour 'leaders' supported the state and its dominant party, the Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI) or one of its predecessors, and thus they furthered their own careers instead of representing the concerns of workers. From the first this pattern of dependence was set when in 1915 the Casa del Obrero Mundial made the tragic decision to accept a few crumbs from Alvaro Obregón in exchange for providing "Red Battalions" to help defeat the peasant armies of Emiliano Zapata and Francisco Villa.

The key moment when the co-optation of labour became institutionalized came during the administration of Lázaro Cárdenas and La Botz is at pains to demystify the real role of this admired populist who remains in the inner circle of the revolutionary pantheon. By nationalizing the foreign oil companies in 1938

Cárdenas "won the battle against imperialism" (6), La Botz says, but the progressiveness of this step confused workers into putting their "faith in the state, rather than in themselves." (75) It seems to justify their deferring to a Bonapartist regime that would regularly subordinate the needs of labour to the demands of capital. Through nationalization, a populist style, and the restructuring of the national party to include labour and peasants, Cárdenas created the style and the mechanisms whereby the state would control the politics of labour through nationalist rhetoric and monopoly of the 'revolutionary' tradition while at the same time portraying itself as honest broker between the interests of labour and capital. In fact he and his successors would use the newly created "state capitalist sector ... to subsidize the developing private capitalist sector" instead of to ensure that workers benefited equitably from it. (79)

When labour leaders could not be coopted with bribes, position, and patronage, the government imposed puppet leaders, called *charros* or "cowboys" (after the sartorial style preferred by the first of these, Jesús Díaz León, appointed by the government in 1948 to head the feisty railroad workers). Or, if the rank and file rejected their *charros*, the use of police, paramilitary goons — sometimes posing as an alternate faction within a given union — and the arrest and imprisonment of grass-roots organizers sufficed to tame workers' organizations bent on becoming independent of the state. Little had changed from the days of Porfirio Díaz when the choice was "bread or the club."

Through this story history La Botz remains optimistic when, as far as I can see, there is little reason for optimism. True enough it is heartening to see that independent voices from the rank-and-file continue to emerge and speak for independence and reform. Of these, for example, La Botz cites the "democratic rank and file caucuses" now forming within important unions (steelworkers, textile workers, petroleum workers) which he

thinks hold some hope for reform (and possibly reconquest of union leadership) from within. The current crisis, not only of Mexican labour but of the entire Mexican political economy, could, in La Botz's view, be the opening for "the workers of Mexico and the world [to] create a new model of the economy based not on capitalism but on democratic communism."

Given the history that La Botz himself has sketched I take this prognosis as unrealistic. Witness, for example, an incident that occurred shortly after La Botz finished his book. On 10 January 1989, Carlos Salinas de Gortari ordered the arrest and imprisonment of Joaquín Hernández Galicia, the boss of the Mexican Oil Workers' Union, together with 35 of his associates. It was a brilliant stroke and a popular one, for the corrupt mafia-like empire of Hernández gave Salinas the perfect pretext to portray the move as reformist and a victory for the workers. In fact the real reason was political: Hernández had grown too powerful, too independent of the state, and too openly supportive of Salinas' opponent in the contested election of 1988, Cuauhtémoc Cárdenas. Hernández will now be replaced by a *charro* who will cooperate rather than oppose the government.

It is La Botz's personal commitment to a better world rather than the patterns that he describes that leads him to end on an optimistic note. Others will draw a more pessimistic prognosis. Either way we have here a serviceable introduction to an underdeveloped and neglected aspect of Mexican history.

Richard Boyer
Simon Fraser University

Lourdes Beneria and Martha Roldan, *The Crossroads of Class and Gender: Industrial Homework, Subcontracting, and Household Dynamics in Mexico City* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press 1987).

homework and household dynamics in Mexico City is explored in this volume in empiricist terms. What is the evidence? How was it collected? What does it show? Lourdes Beneria and Martha Roldan analyze the situation of a group of women in the early 1980s to find out the interaction between economic processes and social relations, and the effect of gender on labour relations and class, through the productive and reproductive sphere.

While rejecting the role of the detached observer, the authors stress the interdisciplinary nature of their study combining economic, sociological, and anthropological perspectives. Their theoretical framework includes literature on women and development, the theorization of household, class analysis, and the rejection of dualistic thinking as shown by their finding that homework must not be viewed as part of the informal sector, for the pristine reason that there is no such formal/informal division. Their study clearly demonstrates how homework production is directly integrated with the formal sector through subcontracting links: what is produced at the household level is a fragment of a final output finished and sold in the formal sector. The corollary to this is that women represent the cheapest source of labour in Mexico City. They constitute an unlimited labour reserve as a result of their primary concentration in housekeeping and childcare.

Beneria and Roldan also indicate the social rather than biological origin of gender. Their basic objective is to understand why, how, under what conditions, and with what consequences women are incorporated into paid production, in a moment of transition from a period of growth to one of crisis in Mexico's development. The usual techniques (questionnaires, interview guides, formal and informal interviews) for standard quantitative analysis are employed to gather data on non-garment homework. But the authors emphasize the nature of the sample as purposive instead of random, given that the universe of homeworkers in Mexico City is not known. They recognize that it is difficult

THE POLITICAL ECONOMY of industrial

to make generalizations from the study, yet insist that their sample is representative.

While looking at industrial subcontracting, they find two types of arrangements: one contracts out production without providing raw materials, and another provides raw materials and other inputs. Both modes — horizontal and vertical — end up in the same search for cheap labour. Beneria and Roldan ask to what extent there is a gendering of jobs and occupations and, if so, how does it take place? Is there deskilling in the process of substituting women for men? What are the firms' motives for hiring women? How are women's lower wages justified? What type of characteristics differentiate women and men as workers? The authors also show how the socially acquired gender traits are used by firms for their own purposes. They conclude that cultural and gender socialization in Mexico has resulted in a higher incidence of drunkenness among men. But there is no historical evidence to back this assertion. Therefore, little attention is paid to the social costs of gender dichotomization that impinges on men's lives as much as on women's lives. The authors do not explore what kinds of social relations structured and changed gender categories specifically in Mexico City, and how these socially constructed activities and attributes ascribed to women or men are historically mutable.

The focus shifts, then, to the economic aspects of homework and its linkages with the larger economy. The analysis is based on interviews with 140 women. In order to ascertain the links between class, gender, and work trajectories of the women sampled, Beneria and Roldan look at the various milestones of their subjects' life history along gender lines according to phases of the family life-cycle. On theoretical grounds the authors acknowledge that the working women interviewed are not passive bearers of class and gender relations, thus distancing their analysis from a deterministic mode. However, it is difficult to evaluate this assertion because the reader does

not get to know how the ways in which women earn money at home are altering the form and meaning of the home and community, breaking down the separation of "work" and life."

Beneria and Roldan stress that the notion of household/family "is atemporal and functional," yet their definition of household is "a set of people that share a living space and a budget, usually, although not necessarily, on the basis of kinship relations." They use the word "decomposition" (112) to analyze the mixture of ideology (maternal altruism) and rational calculation of wives' contribution to the common fund, but due to the lack of social theory backing their work (employing a word such as "deconstruction" would be implausible) this is not thoroughly interpreted. Because they separate analytically wives' earnings (those who contribute to a "pool" or those who keep them as allowances) they find that the quality and viability of class reproduction at the household level appears to be connected to women's strategies and forms of subordination as gender.

All in all, this well-argued case study of homework and subcontracting of maquila production in Mexico City tackles issues of class and consciousness, industrial restructuring, development, feminist gender theory, income distribution, production and reproduction, and patriarchy. The range of subjects is encompassing. The analysis is intelligent and careful. However, the work is clearly inscribed in classical social science and the effort to incorporate hermeneutical understanding and reflexive methodology is awkward and stiff. There is too much emphasis on statistics; too little on interpretation. The claim of an anthropological methodology is not sustained by the literature reviewed. Some definitions are lacking in scope and profundity.

The metaphoric context of women's activity is overlooked, and the historical dimension of concepts such as household is ignored. Family and household are ambivalent concepts, and this produces a certain sluggishness of the analytical un-

derstanding. Family definition encompasses all those that live in the same house, under a family head, whether relatives or not. But today's normative family is nuclear, and this seems to be linked to the industrial revolution, and especially to the spatial separation between production of goods and reproduction of labour. The break between the outside, public world, and the private family world constitutes one of the main features of capitalism and the work force. But, can this conceptualization be generally applied to Mexican women, without discussion of specific historical and spatial circumstances?

On the whole, *The Crossroads of Class and Gender* is a substantial study. But the reader should not expect what is promised at the outset; the marriage between social science and hermeneutics through a more responsive rather than quantitative method is never realized.

Mireya Folch-Serra
Queen's University

Ronaldo Munck with Ricardo Falcón and Bernardo Galitelli, *Argentina: From Anarchism to Peronism* (London: Zed Books 1987).

BASED PRIMARILY ON SECONDARY sources, and largely narrative in approach, this book provides English readers with a comprehensive survey of the Argentine labour movement from its beginnings to the present day. The book is the collaborative effort of three Argentine scholars, who divide their separate tasks chronologically. Ricardo Falcón wrote chapters One through Five, which focus on the origins of the Argentine labour movement and carry its story up to the great anarchist-led general strikes of the first decade of the twentieth century. Bernardo Galitelli was responsible for chapters Six through Nine, which cover the years 1910 through 1930. This period witnessed an extraordinary mobilization of Argentine workers under anarchist, so-

cialist, and especially, syndicalist leadership, which, as elsewhere in the world, peaked at the end of World War I. In the following decade the Argentine labour movement virtually collapsed, victim of government and paramilitary repression, internal contradictions, and ideological division and confusion, as new political forces, especially the embryonic communist party, competed for influence in the labour movement. The remainder of the book, chapters Ten through Seventeen, which in length comprise well over half of the volume, was written by Ronaldo Munck, a sociologist based at the University of Ulster. Munck's period, from 1930 to 1985, is appropriately considered an analytical unit, focused as it is on the antecedents, consolidation, and persistence of Peronism, a movement that sharply distinguished Argentine labour history from that of the other national labour movements of the hemisphere.

Peronism has presented scholars and activists, Argentine and foreign alike, with extremely interesting — and difficult to resolve — theoretical, interpretive, and political issues. Viewed by the orthodox left and by liberals since the 1940s as a right-wing, corporativist, even fascist movement, Peronism, whose main support has always come from organized labour, is also manifestly popular, nationalist, and profoundly reformist. Following the collapse of the first government of Perón (1946-1955), Peronism, and the labour movement it largely controlled, remained a major force in Argentine economic life and politics, the main obstacle to the neo-liberal economic project, and the often repressive and anti-democratic political designs of Argentina's various civilian and military governments.

Munck's survey of this whole fascinating period, like those of his co-authors, provides a useful chronology of events, and a survey of the literature and of the various debates between scholars that appear at crucial junctures within it. The authors, sympathetic to labour's struggles, and versed in the standard debates in Latin American and labour studies (the

virtues and faults of dependency theory, the question of labour aristocracies, etc.) seek throughout to steer a balanced course free of sectarian party and ideological polemics. Such a position has certain advantages (for example, the reader is exposed to all sides of these controversies), and is certainly understandable given the historical lack of consensus in Argentine society and the often bitter and destructive rivalries between Peronists and other tendencies in the Argentine labour movement. But the authors' present a history largely devoid of new interpretive or conceptual insight. That characteristic, coupled with the lack of new historical information drawn from primary research, will make the book disappointing to specialists in Argentine history and Latin American labour studies. However, as a general survey of the subject, especially designed for the English reader (there is a glossary of Spanish terms and a selected bibliography in English), and as testimony to the efforts of contemporary Argentine scholars to leave behind the polemics of the past and create a history useful to the democratic project of the future, this book has much to recommend it.

Charles Bergquist
Duke University

Robert Vicat Turrell, *Capital and Labour on the Kimberley Diamond Fields 1871-1890* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1987).

THE INITIAL EXPLOITATION of the Kimberley diamond fields in the 1870s and the subsequent gold finds of the Witwatersrand Reef in 1886, transformed the political economy of South Africa. This mineral revolution disrupted patterns of rural accumulation, provided the launching pad for capitalist penetration and built the foundation for the Prussian-style industrialism of the inter-war years. Robert Turrell investigates the first phase of this transformation, restricting himself to Kimberley diamond fields, in an at-

tempt to show how, out of the near-anarchy of the competing claims of diggers, share-maniacs, share-workers (diggers that did not own these claims), and labourers, the virtual hegemony of monopoly mining capital (De Beers) emerged.

It used to be thought that recourse to migrant labour was a capitalist imperative; full proletarianisation (and accompanying political rights) would make labour more costly, whereas migrant labour would ensure that the social costs of reproduction would be borne by the Africans themselves. In essence, migrancy equalled cheap labour power. Turrell shows, using the work of other southern Africanists, "that migrant labour was not forced upon Africans by colonial capitalists," rather it was the outcome of the struggle of mining capitalists and elders over African labour power. (24-5) In the first phase of capitalist penetration, he also notes that Africans who worked on the mines "certainly had a greater command over the sale of their labour than diggers had over its purchase." (31) This, perhaps, is the new conventional wisdom; Turrell goes one step further and argues that introduction of the closed compound system was an attempt to secure control over the relatively independent labour force and eradicate over-capitalisation, not (as previously thought) a means of preventing illicit diamond-buying or diamond theft. "Controls in the compounds were of even greater significance when production was monopolised by one leviathan company like De Beers Consolidated Mines. Not only did this facilitate control over the labour supply, but it also minimised African organization against exploitation in the mines." (173)

Using much new material from the pens of the capitalists themselves (especially the Standard Bank Archives), Turrell has managed to produce one of the most thorough expositions of the structural imperatives of mining capital in the two decades following the finds. Along the way, he demolishes many of the conventional interpretations of South African

history; not only does he lay to rest the myth of the origins of the closed compound system (chapter 8), but he shows that the Black Flag Revolt of 1875 neither hindered metropolitan accumulation nor reduced Africans to mere labourers (chapter 4), and that the duel between Rhodes and Barnato was not really a victory for the former or a loss for the latter (chapter 10), for "if anyone laughed all the way to the bank at the time it was Barnato Brothers." (227)

While Turrell has pieced together the most detailed account of Kimberley capital to date (*vide* also the statistical information in the ten appendices), the pieces do not seem to make a whole. Eight of the ten chapters have conclusions, but the book does not. Much of the material has already appeared in article form so the analytical framework is fragmentary, with analysis confined to discrete events and processes on a chapter-by-chapter basis. No overall problematic, and little discussion of theoretical implications, are visible. While there is much here on "class in itself" and implicit morsels of "class for itself," little is made of it. In the preface, for instance, the author confesses that he has written "little about worker's consciousness, or experience, or resistance....I simply could not find enough evidence to support historical knowledge of this nature." (xiii) The question of the proletarianization of labour receives short shrift and is reduced to speculation: "...it is probable that only a minority of mine workers....were fully proletarianised between 1870 and 1900." (165)

Throughout the book, Turrell uses materialist terminology loosely and misleadingly: the state is personified, class is described, and a section entitled "The primitive accumulation of Cecil Rhodes" (82-7) merely shows how the arch-imperialist-capitalist made a healthy profit from an underhand deal on a mine-pumping contract. One could argue that Rhodes was "accumulating" in a "primitive" way, but this makes a mockery of Marx's conceptualization of the whole set of social relations engendered by the initial expro-

priation of the masses.

The book is also geared to a specialist audience; those with little knowledge of South Africa will be annoyed by the author's presumptions and lack of explanation of events and terms. Nevertheless, there is little doubt that *Capital and Labour* represents a major advance in our knowledge of Kimberley capitalism. Yet meticulous research under the "magnifying glass" of history does not of itself sharpen our focus. The book cries out for what most of us expect of an undergraduate essay: a strong thesis statement and a conclusion. The parts are good, but the whole does not equal the sum of them.

Christopher P. Youé
Memorial University of Newfoundland

Roy Porter and Mikulás Teich, eds., *Revolution in History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1986).

AS ROY PORTER INDICATES in his contribution to this volume, prior to the eighteenth century the word "revolution" implied cyclical repetition. It was the *philosophes* of the French Enlightenment who redefined the term to mean a decisive historical rupture inaugurating a new and different period of development. The present collection aims to indicate how applicable this modern concept of revolution is to a range of historical problems. It includes essays by fifteen distinguished scholars from North America, the United Kingdom, and Central Europe, whose contributions cover a range of topics from M.I. Finley's "Revolution in Antiquity" to V.G. Kiernan's "Revolution and Imperialism" and Joseph Needham's piece on traditional Chinese culture. Indeed, the striking thing about the book is the very limited space allotted to the sorts of social and political upheaval historians usually associated with the notion of revolution — an omission only partly compensated for by Eric Hobsbawm's very fine opening piece on the general problem of revolution.

Hobsbawm's essay would have made the perfect introduction to a book devoted to what he calls "the 'great revolutions' e.g. the French, Russian and Chinese...." (5) Hobsbawm points out that such revolutions involve the overthrow of a specific old regime within the context of macro-historical change such as the transition from feudalism to capitalism or the crisis of the capitalist world which has been with us since before World War I. From this perspective, he questions the common distinction between triggering factors and long term causes of revolution, arguing that, though revolutions are never simply the inevitable consequence of general structural factors, systems in crisis tend to produce precipitating factors or revolutionary situations. Hobsbawm also takes up the neglected problem of determining when revolutions end. He argues that this is easier for the pre-twentieth-century "Liberal" revolutions, which clearly end with the establishment of a political order ensuring capitalist hegemony, than it is for twentieth-century "post-liberal" upheavals which, for a variety of reasons, have taken longer to generate a stable post-revolutionary system. Throughout the discussion issues such as the role of revolutionary organizations, the relations between intention and outcome, and the problem of revolutionary classes are lucidly handled. Closely argued, always constructively critical of existing approaches, and enormously learned, Hobsbawm's essay will be useful to any student of modern revolution.

Aside from Hobsbawm's article, there are only two contributions that deal with modern revolutions as we usually think of them. Written from a Marxist perspective, Arnost Klíma's "The Bourgeois Revolution of 1848-9 in Central Europe" concludes that, despite the triumph of reaction in the political realm, 1848 was a bourgeois success, sweeping away the agrarian and juridical remnants of feudalism, establishing civil rights, and opening the way to subsequent capitalist development. Curiously, Klíma overesti-

mates the role of industrial workers in the revolutionary upheaval, ignoring the crucial importance of artisanal radicalism. T. Hajdu's "Socialist Revolution in Central Europe, 1917-1921" emphasizes the complexity of the "Red Years" in Central Europe, noting the overlapping and often contradictory coexistence of pacifist, peasant, nationalist, and socialist strands. He tends, however, to ignore the class nature of pacifism. He also implies that the German and Austrian social democrats were genuinely interested in socialist transformation, barely acknowledging their contribution to strengthening the very state he blames for radical defeats and ignoring their failure to develop a radical agrarian policy that might have undermined the peasant conservatism to which he attributes socialist electoral weakness. "Revolutions," he concludes, "do not last long. People get tired, the more so after a long and bloody war: the prophets of 'permanent revolution' remain alone and disarmed." (117) In light of the Chinese and Vietnamese experiences, this entirely begs the question.

The collection includes three pieces bearing on the problem of capitalist development and the industrial revolution. Akos Paulinyi argues vigorously that between 1750 and 1850 Britain saw a genuine technological revolution based on the use of "working-machines" in material shaping which opened the possibility of producing machines with machines. William N. Parker, while agreeing that Marx was correct about the importance of agricultural transformation to capitalist accumulation, thinks that prior to 1900, the pace of agricultural change was too slow to be considered revolutionary. Instead, he insists on the importance of the industrial revolution with its inventors and entrepreneurs as a genuine historical break and the real basis for expanded agricultural productivity. Then there is Alan Macfarlane's article on English socio-economic development which argues that characteristically modern approaches to private property, law, politics, marriage and the family, and economic activity

were all present in the late Middle Ages. Macfarlane concludes that there were no revolutionary breaks in early modern English history and that historians should adopt a view which "allows us the flexibility to admit that by a strange paradox things can both remain the same and also change." (162) It is, no doubt, salutary to be reminded that continuity is important, but one is bound to be skeptical of an account of English historical development which attributes no fundamental importance to the Seventeenth Century Revolution in the genesis of English capitalist society.

There are a several interesting pieces on cultural and intellectual questions, including those by Elizabeth Eisenstein on printing, Ernst Wangermann on music, Ronald Paulson on art, Roy Porter on the scientific revolution and Mikulás Teich on the twentieth-century scientific technical revolution. Labour historians will be most interested, however in Peter Burke's account of the historiography of popular culture, which discusses the work of both English Marxists and French *Annalistes*, arguing that syntheses of these approaches are increasingly common. He thinks that it is now possible to write a general history of western popular culture, but concludes that there have not been any intentional, radical breaks which would justify speaking of a revolution in popular culture.

In the end, this volume will understandably disappoint those for whom "revolution" implies the historically decisive "great revolutions" with their *sans-culottes* and Soviets and Long Marches. Yet the book has its value, suggesting as it does the myriad ways the notion of revolution has penetrated a number of fields, the problems involved in using the term, and the reasons various scholars have accepted or rejected it as a fruitful concept.

Mark A. Gabbert
University of Manitoba

Guillermo J. Grenier, *Inhuman Relations: Quality Circles and Anti-Unionism in American Industry* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press 1988).

THIS BOOK GOES AGAINST a flood of literature extolling the democratic and productivity virtues of "quality circles," the widespread management innovation based on small groups of workers and managers who meet regularly to discuss ways of improving the quality of services and products and reducing that "we" and "they" mentality in labour-management relations. Instead of lauding the putative merits of this innovation, the author describes the way managers used quality circles to defeat an Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers' organizing drive at a small (288 employee) medical suture plant in New Mexico owned by Johnson and Johnson.

An ironic strength of this book lies in the author's self-portrait as a naive graduate student who believed at the outset of his research that quality circles were "pro-worker." As the confidant of the plant social psychologist (that is "union buster" and instructor in "the art of industrial manipulation") in charge of the quality circle program, Grenier soon became an insider in the anti-union campaign. Still, it took seven months before he began to question the purpose of his graduate thesis on "Teams in an Anti-Union Strategy." The rationalizations he used to sustain such naivete in the face of so much evidence over such a length of time are difficult to imagine; nevertheless, the result is a welcome relief from the numerous superficial studies of quality circles used to illustrate *a priori* convictions about the merits of this form of workplace organization.

Grenier pays considerable attention to the ways management exercised control over the quality circle teams through the team leaders (supervisors) and trained facilitators. Guided by these management personnel, workers helped to screen new workers to ensure that those who were accepted could "work with others in a

small group." The team members also evaluated each other's job performance according to management's criteria: the quality and quantity of production, rates of absenteeism, and the extent to which each worker supported the team (defined as "commitment to company philosophy"). Participation in the quality circles meant that workers helped to hire, discipline, promote, and fire each other, with management making the rules and having the power to ratify or veto worker decisions. In effect, the quality circles fostered work-group conformity based on peer pressures attuned to management's productivity norms.

During the period of study, however, the primary function of the quality circles was less to enforce these productivity norms than to bolster management's anti-union campaign. Quality circle facilitators identified union sympathizers and tried either to sway them or to encourage fellow workers to provide grounds for firing them. By using the criterion of "commitment to company philosophy" to deny pay raises to pro-union workers, facilitators made the teams an arena for intimidating pro-union workers. They also made the teams a "perpetual captive audience" to "socialize the workforce into accepting the anti-union message."

While *Inhuman Relations* makes it clear that management used the quality circles as an anti-union tool, it is not clear that the tool was necessary. Since Johnson and Johnson has never lost an anti-union campaign, were the quality circles necessary to the eventual result (the union lost 141 to 71)? The result can be explained on other grounds: the union erred in making wages the main issue where the workers were already among the highest paid in the area, the campaign was held during the 1982-3 recession among workers who were economically vulnerable (two-thirds were Hispanic, three-quarters were female, half were single parents), the US National Labor Relations Board was openly anti-labour, and New Mexico is not strong union territory.

Moreover, management appears to

have been trying to kill two birds with one stone. Apparently this led to tension between the ideology of cooperation embodied in the quality circles and the reality of conflicting interests made manifest in the anti-union campaign. For instance, team facilitators spoke openly of their power "to fire anybody." While this may have intimidated union sympathizers, it must also have belied the notion of equality on which the "team" was supposed to be based. As an illustration of the trade-off which sometimes takes place between the twin goals of production and control, plant managers disbanded a successful productivity-oriented team because it was pro-union. The social psychologist himself embodied such tensions. Although he prided himself on being able to control the workers with his "good-guy" approach in the quality circles, in the context of his anti-union campaign he betrayed such "contempt for and fear of workers" that he became a figure of ridicule. Had *Inhuman Relations* developed the implications of tensions such as these, the result might have been a useful appreciation of contradictions which arise inside quality circles when they exist in an openly anti-union setting.

In an epilogue Grenier does warn against the tendency to see quality circles as solely manipulative and coercive. Such groups tend to "develop their own dynamics" including their own leaders and followers and "internally derived criteria of excellence." To the extent these dynamics develop, the author warns that quality circles in unorganized plants may become a barrier to "solutions designed by union bureaucrats." Unions will need to educate and involve rank-and-file members "in the attainment of true quality of work life." Otherwise, managers will imprint a vision of work relations in which unions are at best ineffective or at worst the "primary cause of all problems in American industry." He advises union organizers to point out the difference between genuine and pseudo decision-making and to encourage workers to demand changes that will "unveil the limited power allowed by

management and the different interests involved in making true improvements in the quality of work life." If union organizers are to succeed, the author believes that they will need to identify the leadership of each quality circle as a prerequisite for organizing every circle in the workplace into the union.

Clearly written, devoid of academic jargon, and built around a strong narrative structure, *Inhuman Relations* provides the best critical study we have of management's use of quality circles as an anti-union tool in a non-union workplace.

Donald M. Wells
McMaster University

P.K. Edwards and Hugh Scullion, *The Social Organization of Industrial Conflict: Control and Resistance in the Workplace* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell 1985).

L'OEUVRE DES SOCIOLOGUES BRITANNIQUES P.K. Edwards et Hugh Scullion a été produite dans le cadre d'études sur les relations industrielles à l'Université de Warwick en Angleterre. Cette étude porte sur les types de conflit industriel ayant eu lieu dans sept usines anglaises de 1978 à 1980; ces usines se regroupent dans trois industries différentes: le textile, la métallurgie et le plastique.

Le but des auteurs était de démontrer que le comportement collectif des personnes (ouvriers et contremaîtres) impliquées dans un conflit de travail peut être expliqué par la forme de contrôle établie par les patrons face aux ouvriers et ce, dans chacun des cas étudiés. Selon eux, les taux d'incidence de réactions négatives des ouvriers — abandon d'emploi, absentéisme, sabotage, grève, etc. — ne sont pas le résultat d'usines trop grandes, de travail trop monotone ou d'autres explications habituellement données dans ces circonstances, mais seraient plutôt fonction du genre de rapport établi historiquement entre classes sociales à l'intérieur de chaque usine et même jusqu'à l'intérieur de chaque at-

lier d'usine.

Pour prouver leur hypothèse, Edwards et Scullion ont utilisé une grande variété de sources: archives de compagnies, entrevues structurées et non structurées avec des ouvriers, des contremaîtres et des délégués syndicaux, études de cas particuliers, questionnaires. Ils ont diversifié au maximum leur choix d'usines: grandes et petites, anciennes et nouvelles, d'industries différentes, impliquant des travailleurs masculins et féminins, britanniques d'origine et étrangers d'origine, dirigées par des patrons utilisant des méthodes de contrôle fort différentes (autocratique, paternaliste, bureaucratique, sophistiquée) — tout pour démontrer que leurs résultats ne sont pas le fruit d'un hasard quelconque.

L'ouvrage commence par une longue discussion sur les différentes définitions de conflit industriel, en insistant sur les points suivants: (1) il n'y a pas de lien nécessaire entre une activité (telle l'absentéisme) et sa motivation conflictuelle, (2) la perception du phénomène — de la part de toutes les personnes impliquées, contremaîtres et gestionnaires compris — est aussi importante que le phénomène lui-même, (3) le conflit implique les patrons aussi bien que les ouvriers, (4) la forme concrète du conflit (grève, abandon d'emploi, etc.) doit être traitée ensemble avec les formes larvées du conflit (conflit "institutionnalisé" ou structurel), et enfin, (5) il faut enquêter sur les liens entre les niveaux de conflit (influence du conflit concret sur le conflit larvé, et vice versa).

Les auteurs considèrent au départ que l'explication marxiste du conflit semble être la meilleure, en définissant le conflit comme une lutte entre employeurs et employés autour des conditions régissant la vente de la puissance de travail. Mais ils rejettent l'interprétation radicale de cette explication marxiste, qui met tout l'accent sur la légitimité du conflit car, selon eux, la coopération entre classes sociales est tout aussi légitime comme objet d'analyse que ne l'est le conflit. En d'autres termes, l'absence de conflit se

produit aussi souvent que le conflit et mérite tout autant d'être expliquée scientifiquement.

Les résultats de cette recherche sont aussi intéressants et bien argumentés que le processus de recherche. Ajoutons tout de suite que tous les résultats qui suivent sont en contradiction avec le point de vue de plusieurs autres sociologues britanniques. (1) Il y a très peu de liens entre accidents et conflits de travail. (2) Il n'y a aucun lien entre paternalisme et engagement des ouvriers envers leurs employeurs. (3) Le contrôle quotidien du procès de travail (nombre d'ouvriers par atelier, temps effectif de travail, etc.) est aussi important pour les niveaux de profit que le contrôle des grèves et autres conflits majeurs. (4) Un nombre élevé de délégués syndicaux par ouvrier n'est pas suffisant pour permettre aux ouvriers de prendre le contrôle au point de production. (5) Les ouvriers britanniques acceptent très facilement la nécessité de travailler et ne s'engagent que difficilement dans des conflits inutiles. (6) L'activité conflictuelle varie selon plusieurs "facteurs" et non seulement selon les niveaux d'habileté ou de la nature névralgique du travail accompli. (7) Les niveaux du moral des ouvriers et les degrés de contrôle ne sont pas directement reliés. (8) Le nombre de grèves par année ou par décennie n'est pas un bon indice du niveau de conflits en présence. (9) Les ouvriers et la gestion "interagissent"; ce n'est pas juste les ouvriers qui réagissent aux initiatives des patrons. (10) La structure interne de l'atelier (formes d'interaction entre employeurs et employés) influence le comportement conflictuel et est à son tour influencée par l'évolution de ce comportement. (11) La paix industrielle n'est pas la même chose que l'absence de conflit.

Plusieurs de ces "résultats" peuvent nous sembler évidents à l'extrême: avait-on vraiment besoin d'un sociologue pour déterminer cela? Il reste que les premiers chercheurs britanniques dans le domaine des relations industrielles, tel Eric Trist de l'Institut Tavistock et d'autres

"ingénieurs sociaux" des années 1950, étaient si intéressés à imposer leurs théories de contrôle social qu'ils ont apparemment oublié de poser leurs questions avec suffisamment de soin. Edwards et Scullion lancent la même critique aux chercheurs radicaux des années 1960 et 1970: tout comme leurs prédécesseurs pro-patronaux, les radicaux ont laissé leurs idéaux-types préférés influencer les résultats.

Les auteurs se défendent bien, cependant, de soutenir l'idée selon laquelle la réalité empirique de chaque usine aurait comme effet d'interdire aux chercheurs quelque catégorisation que ce soit. Pour eux, la réalité se situe plutôt dans l'interaction même des différentes stratégies — patronales, syndicales et individuelles rencontrées dans un atelier donné. Un employeur peut donc utiliser la même stratégie de contrôle dans deux usines très similaires, à deux kilomètres l'une de l'autre, employant des forces ouvrières fort similaires, et arriver à des résultats totalement différents. La forme et le niveau de conflit dépendent donc de l'histoire particulière de chaque atelier et rend très difficile les conclusions basées sur des hypothèses trop simplistes. Il en résulte que la catégorisation se situe au niveau de l'interaction et non de l'action.

Voilà donc une étude empirique fort utile, bien documentée et argumentée avec beaucoup de rigueur, ni trop proche du point de vue des patrons, ni trop proche du point de vue des syndicats. C'est un excellent exemple de ce qu'a à offrir la troisième vague de relations industrielles en Grande-Bretagne, plus scientifique que ses prédécesseurs. Comme les auteurs le soulignent eux-mêmes, les résultats de leur recherche ne sont peut-être pas universels et la situation peut bien changer à l'avenir, même dans les usines étudiées. Il reste que désormais la voie est tracée, et la recherche devrait toujours être menée de cette façon.

Kevin Henley

Ray Marshall, *Unheard Voices: Labour and Economics Policy in a Competitive World* (New York: Basic Books 1987).

THIS BOOK PURPORTS to offer a solution to America's decline as a world economic power. To counter this drift, Marshall argues, greater workers' participation, both in management and in economic policy-making, is required. The models for such an approach are Japan and West Germany, whose economic success relative to America is attributed by Marshall to their greater attention to, and involvement of, "human resources," and their use of consensual economic policy-making machinery.

There is nothing new in this book, and there is much that is confused or based on mistaken assumptions. Yet the book has interest because its author, who was President Carter's Secretary of Labour from 1977-81, sees his ideas as the liberal alternative to the neo-conservatives' "...naïve commitment to the ghost of Adam Smith." (272)

Marshall starts by describing America's relative economic decline. He cites standard evidence on American's declining productivity growth; declining shares of world output and trade; declining profit levels; and widening trade deficit. These he attributes to changes in the world economy: "Two universal imperatives — internationalization and technological change — are transforming the American and world economies." (37) American business, especially manufacturing, is no longer able to compete, and neither Reaganism nor Keynesianism offer a solution.

There is a fundamental problem with this section of the book. The attribution of America's decline to world-wide "trends" is ultimately descriptive. It is abstracted from any explanation of underlying causes. We are offered no insight into the internal dynamic of capitalism, of which the trends described are mere expressions. This lack of theoretical context, and reliance on empirically observable "trends," probably explains the

methodological flaw in Marshall's identification of a solution. Why are worker participation and consensual economic policy-making seen as solutions to America's economic decline? Because Japan and Germany use these methods, and their economic performance has outstripped America's in recent years. This kind of abstracted empiricism and unsubstantiated attribution of causality is unlikely to yield real solutions.

Equally unsatisfactory are Marshall's comments on the need for greater worker participation in management. He acknowledges that participatory schemes like QWL have traditionally been used in American as union-busting or union-avoidance techniques, and that this trend accelerated in the late 1960s and 1970s, as union power weakened, and "human resource" consultants became more aggressive and more successful in selling their anti-union gimmicks. (137-8) Having identified this common anti-union usage of "participatory" management methods, Marshall asserts that his ideas on participation are different. But he offers no evidence. He cites examples of participatory schemes engaged in by the United Auto Workers and Communications Workers of America, about which he later asserts: "Unlike the 'gimmicky' QWL programs designed to thwart unions or merely to increase productivity for management's benefit, this more serious effort involved a long-term change in management style based on a philosophy of trust and respect for employees." (154) He adds that "the Union is involved as equal partner from planning through implementation and evaluation." (160) Students of management ideas and workers might be forgiven for asking, "Where have I heard that one before?" The schemes he extols are warmed-over versions of QWL. Interestingly, Marshall cites none of the literature which is critical of these "more serious," "post-QWL" schemes.

Marshall's treatment of Japanese management is worse. He makes several statements which take the following

form: "*It is commonly believed that traditional American management and Industrial Relations systems have been rendered obsolete by the so-called Japanese management system ... which ... emphasizes worker participation ...*" (19), or "*Many American companies have become convinced....*" (92) (my emphases). A veritable industry has been created around simplistic misinterpretations of Japan's supposedly participatory management methods, and the application of the "lessons" to America. Marshall has jumped on that bandwagon. Again, he refers to none of the literature which is critical of Japanese management, and he offers some interpretations which, to be charitable, are naive. For example, he makes no reference to the crushing of the 1953 strike at Toyota, a significant cause of the "success" of Japanese management, but says instead: "While management offered very limited opposition to the radical union leaders, *there emerged* (my emphasis) a more moderate union leadership with a stronger interest in labor-management cooperation and productivity." (118) And he refers completely uncritically to union leader — but no friend of workers — Ichiro Shioji, about whose lavish lifestyle and devoted services to management's interests much has been written.

Marshall's advocacy of "...consensus mechanisms for public policy-making" is the second half of his two-part solution to America's productivity woes. This section of the book uncritically extols the virtues of corporatist policy-making structures and indicative planning (though he uses neither of these terms). Despite his claims about the need to involve labour in policy-making, he occasionally gives his purpose away, as when he laments the fact that in the 1970s "the United States had no consensus-based mechanisms to achieve the required reductions in real income...." (46) As was the case with his advocacy of participatory, and particularly, Japanese management, Marshall advocates the use of consensus mechanisms for policy-making for

no deeper reasons than that such mechanisms are used in Western Europe, especially Austria and Germany, and in Japan, and those countries have recently been economically more successful than America. And like his analysis of participatory management, his treatment of consensus-based policy-making structures makes no reference whatever to any of the existing critical literature.

Overall, this is a disappointing book. The ideas are old, and indiscriminately borrowed. They are put forward as solutions to America's real economic problems solely because they have been used — or in the case of participatory and Japanese management, because Marshall mistakenly thinks they have been used — in countries whose economic performance has been strong in recent years. Though Marshall purports to want to advance the interests of labour, his solutions would not do so.

Nevertheless, an economic strategy aimed at incorporating the labour movement, both on the shop floor and at the policy-making level, has an established pedigree among proposed solutions to the crisis of capitalism. We may see some version of this strategy resurrected after the death of Reaganism, dressed up as the humane liberal alternative to the extremism of its predecessor. This book, however, makes very clear the flimsy foundations on which such a strategy would rest.

Jim Silver
University of Winnipeg

Chris DeBresson, Margaret Lowe Benston and Jesse Vorst, eds., *Work & New Technologies: Other Perspectives* (Toronto: Between the Lines 1987).

WORK & NEW TECHNOLOGIES is the third annual put out by the Society for Socialist Studies. It is a compilation of papers presented at the annual meetings of the SSS and like all anthologies there is some difficulty in presenting a review of the book's contents, given that not every

piece therein can be dealt with. More substantively, however, this particular work is fraught with other difficulties which I find most disappointing given my long-time membership in the SSS.

The biggest problem with the book as a whole (which simply reflects the major problem with most of the individual articles) is that it assumes that the reader is well aware of the debates surrounding Braverman's book *Labour and Monopoly Capital* while at the same time *Work & New Technologies* ignores more recent contributions in debates about the labour process (see for instance Paul Thompson's book *The Nature of Work: An Introduction to Debates on the Labour Process*, published some five years ago).

Most (but certainly not all) of the presentations are overly brief, thus limited in scope and bereft of creative ideas. While some papers do contain some insights these are rarely developed, leaving new entrants to this field at a loss and experienced "veterans" yawning. Take, for instance, D'Arcy Martin's leadoff piece which discusses worker-oriented research or Bentson, *et al.*'s third essay on community-based research. Both papers are very sketchy and would neither convince the unconverted as to the validity of their points nor offer anything of importance to long-time socialists. In addition, six-page articles like that by Hansen ("The Focus of Union Research on Technological Change") reinforce the blandness and inability to inform. Hansen refers to Noble's work but fails to provide enough discussion of it to get anyone excited or interested in any argument that Noble is trying to make or in any point that Hansen sees as important. (Indeed, it is safe to say that these pieces are so brief that this reviewer has some difficulty in summarizing them beyond stating the paper's title).

Jim Petersen's critique of "nationalization" in his "The Shop Floor" is so sketchy and naive that it comes across more like neo-conservative rhetoric than radical analysis. His argument to replace nationalization with "self-management"

is undeveloped and unsubstantiated. His conception of "self-management" as "improving the quality of working life by eliminating managers" means nothing because he does not specify how this would be accomplished at regional or national levels; whether or not it could be done within capitalism or at least within a market economy; whether incomes would remain unequally distributed or not (and if not, how equalization would occur without one of the major causes of inequality — private ownership of income generating property — being nationalized). These are important issues interweaving the macro and micro aspects of democratizing economic institutions and politics. Petersen does not even make reference to them much less address them head on and that is irresponsible in a socialist forum especially in a piece which criticizes nationalization.

As I have stated most of the papers are sketchy and ambiguous but certainly not all of them. Dubuc's article ("Technical Choices, Social Choices") is somewhat better in that there is an attempt to provide the reader with some background in the debate on the labour process. Nonetheless, he still leaves the reader with only a rough map to cover complex and detailed territory, failing, for example, to be clear as to what "determinism" really is and who, in his view, really falls into its trap. DeBresson ("The Ambivalence of Marx's Legacy on Technological Change") makes many of the same errors. For instance, he baldly states that "Marx had no theory of technology" which to me is nonsense, but it at least needs substantial documentation by DeBresson. His admission that he is forced to rely on the work of Rubel (11) simply confirms his naivete in the area of Marxism and even Marxology. One of the few interesting articles is Max Nemni's "Nationalism, socialism et démocratie" because it avoids the vagueness and ambiguities of most of the other articles even though Nemni's argument itself is not unproblematical in certain ways.

In summary, there is unfortunately

not much worth reading in this particular annual and it saddens me to see the SSS series being saddled with having to sell this book and being tarnished with its poverty. The person interested in entering (and even developing) this area would be much further ahead reading the Thompson book referred to above.

Paul Stevenson
University of Winnipeg

Kenneth H. Ostrander, *The Legal Structure of Collective Bargaining in Education* (New York: Greenwood Press 1987).

OSTRANDER HAS WRITTEN another book on the subject of collective bargaining. This one provides the context and the legalities of collective bargaining in education for his intended audience of prospective teachers and aspiring educational administrators.

Both the beauty of the book and, consequently, its limitations are that it is written for a relatively uninitiated group of people. Teacher-training institutes rarely introduce the topic of collective bargaining in teacher preparation courses. Furthermore, graduate courses in educational administration do not require the students to learn about the collective bargaining process. The result, as Ostrander points out, is that most educators, not only teachers but also educational managers, have limited knowledge of the collective bargaining process; consequently the training for collective bargaining is left up to unions who end up as the better negotiators; and educational managers tend to view the unions in an adversarial role rather than in a relationship which is mutually rewarding. It appears quite clear, then, that there is a need and a market for this book.

The book is written as a textbook for students — extensive footnotes accompany each chapter; references are quite current; and an annotated bibliography is provided. Moreover, the book is replete with many education-specific and topical

examples. These examples not only clarify the points that the author is attempting to make, but help to present a balanced perspective on the concerns of both union and management.

Chapter one defines what is meant by collective bargaining: individuals have a constitutional right to form a collectivity; but the right to bargain, as a group, must be legislated. The history of collective bargaining practices in education in the United States is then presented.

Chapter two brings two main issues to the forefront. One, it highlights the fact that three, not just two, parties are involved in collective bargaining. The third is the public whose interests and safety must neither be jeopardized nor impeded. Second, the statutes have created a duty for both parties to bargain in good faith (without intimidation or coercion, and with decisions made in a convenient, expeditious, and impartial manner). Also the statutes limit the bargaining by defining the scope of bargaining, *what* the employer may bargain, and defining the bargaining unit itself, *with whom* the employer may bargain.

Chapter three differentiates the two types of activities of the public employment relations agencies — the regulatory and service activities. The regulatory actions constitute rule-making powers (ruling over disputes of membership, allegations of unfair labour practices, and disputes over the scope of the bargaining, and certifying the exclusive bargaining agency) and a monitoring function (to ensure that the elections for the formation of a bargaining unit are fair). And the service activities consist of trying to resolve the dispute through mediation and, if that fails, then attempting to locate a fact-finder acceptable to both parties.

Chapter four describes the impasse procedures: mediation first, then fact-finding assistance, then an illegal strike, then interest arbitration. While elucidating the roles of the mediator and the fact-finder, the text reveals the external sources of pressure on the two parties to reach an agreement. An important obser-

vation, however, is that the parties themselves may be internally divided by factional groups. Consequently, intra-group agreement must be established prior to inter-group consensus.

Chapter five discusses the bargaining rights of school administrators in the United States. Generally, middle management, such as principals and assistant principals, has been given the right to bargain; however, upper management, such as superintendents and directors, has been denied the right to bargain collectively.

Chapter six comments on the legal status of strikes. There exists no constitutional right to strike; where the right to strike has been granted, it is limited or bound by conditions. Once an injunction to stop a strike has been issued, the offending party can be cited for either civil or criminal contempt.

Chapter seven expands on the public's involvement in the collective bargaining process or, more specifically, in the case of an impasse between parties. First the media informs the public of the situation; then the public responds according to its own self-interests; the public will start to exert pressure on the parties, thus affecting the power relationship and consequently the negotiations between the parties. The author notes that, while public involvement at the impasse stage is not very successful, it does open up the collective bargaining process by making it less private.

The final chapter discusses grievance arbitration, the last step in the grievance procedure. What is useful here is the list of general principles that both parties should follow prior to a punitive action being taken — such as obey first, grieve later; consider an employee's past performance; give warning; document the (unambiguous) policy; provide an opportunity to improve one's conduct/performance; ensure that the treatment is equitable, the procedures are fair, and the penalty is reasonable. The responsibilities of these professional negotiators are then outlined.

A suggestion for improvement would be the inclusion of an introductory chapter explaining the components of the collective bargaining process, accompanied by a restructuring of the chapters to reinforce this process. But, despite its early references to the history of collective bargaining in the United States, this book is recommended for a Canadian audience as well. Furthermore, it could be used as the textbook for a first course in collective bargaining, not for teachers, but for aspiring educational managers. The examples given could easily become the bases of case studies and classroom discussion. In all, the book has great potential, in terms of both need and market. And it is well written and educational.

Ruth Rees
Queen's University

Carmen Sirianni, ed., *Worker Participation and the Politics of Reform* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press 1987).

THIS COLLECTION OF ESSAYS examines workers' participation in Japan, the United States, Western Europe, Eastern Europe, China, the Caribbean, and Latin America. The sources and forms of participatory conceptions, purposes, and applications in these countries diverge greatly, as do the authors' emphases. What unites this diversity is the authors' location of participation in the macro-context of economic and political power.

Three articles focus on participation and technology. Della Rocca's is a tedious description (via the examination of contract clauses) of how Italian unions deal with technological change (not very effectively). Howard and Schneider discuss three modes of introducing technology. The most common in the United States entails jamming new equipment down workers' throats with no concern for its human impacts. An emergent form anticipates workers' reactions to new technology via participatory forums, but they have no real power to determine its

deployment or uses. For example, participation did little at AT&T to protect members of the Communication Workers of America from the degrading effects of new equipment. Negotiation through collective bargaining is the fairest means of implementing technology, but the authors had to turn to Scandinavia for examples. As Andrew Martin reveals, unions in Sweden are now concerned with more than the effects of technology. He describes an experimental project in which skilled workers and academicians collaborated in developing a computer-based process that would utilize rather than degrade workers' skills. The project demonstrated both the possibilities for and obstacles to worker involvement in the *design* of technology. The concentration of R&D resources in private firms necessitates public support of such efforts, but even in Sweden the government is neither inclined nor equipped to provide the required funds.

Robert Cole explains how the differential diffusion rate of participatory programs in Japan, Sweden, and the United States depends more on macro-political processes than on enterprise activities. He also maintains that participation enhances management power in Japan and the United States, whereas in Sweden unions use it to advance workers' interests.

In West Germany, Christopher Allen observes, legislated co-determination and works councils have constrained rather than enhanced the power of workers and unions. Unions negotiate for wages and benefits but have little presence on the shop floor. Works councils (which are not under union control) handle matters ordinarily dealt with by unions in Canada, but the councils' scope and degree of power are quite limited.

George Ross analyzes the organizational-intellectual bases and trajectory of workers' control (*autogestion*) movements in modern France. In the uprising of 1968 and on into the early 1970s, *autogestion* was a vital, galvanizing force among radical intellectuals, the student movement, and the CFDT union. Despite

the integration of the language of *autogestion* into the programs of most left wing organizations, including the SP and the CP, by the 1980s the concept and the reforms it inspired were either moribund or unrecognizable reflections of the radical core of the earlier vision. For example, the SP's insipid restructuring of industrial relations and its policies of deregulation and decentralization (which more closely resemble market than anarcho-syndicalist ideals) institutionalized *autogestion* in an emasculated, sanitized form. "*Autogestion*," Ross writes, "was like a bee that had flown noisily about the French political left after May-June 1968 until, after stinging everyone in sight, it died."

Two essays depict striking differences in self-management in Eastern Europe. In the 1950s Yugoslavia went much further than Hungary has in the 1980s in decentralizing economic decision making and extending workers' power. It would be interesting to now how self-management figures in the recent Yugoslavian convulsions, but Ellen Comisso's article predates these events. Henry Norr provides an excellent account of Solidarity's position on self-management. In its original Twenty-One Demands, self-management was not mentioned. A year later it became a central demand, as the union called for enterprises to operate under the authority of their workforces. This demand originated among young technicians and engineers who viewed self-management as an efficient *means* of transcending the crisis of the Policy economy. Solidarity's retreat from self-management was the result of several factors. Compromises with the state left the union divided; the membership concluded the workers' control was not the solution to Poland's severe economic problems; self-management was simply too threatening to the Party, which closed ranks against the demand. The upshot was 1981 legislation establishing workers' councils, but subsequent amendments gutted the councils' power. Only a handful of councils now operate in any independent or effective manner, but the idea of self-

management remains popular among the Polish people.

Jeanne Wilson examines workers' participation in China since 1978 (when Deng Xiaoping came to power). Participation is viewed (from the top) as a means of increasing efficiency through enlisting workers' commitment to enterprise goals. In 1980 works councils (independent of the Party) and other enterprise participatory structures were introduced, but these changes (most of which conflict with Maoist ideals) were watered down by traditional forces in the CCP. Unions continue to operate not as independent workers' organizations but as a link between the Party and the proletariat, and the works councils operate as consultative bodies only. Management power has been strengthened at the expense of local Party Cadres, but the former remains subordinate to central authorities. These reforms are seen as consistent with the Party's goal of combining central planning with some reliance on market mechanisms. The Deng regime also has introduced piecework and bonus systems, withdrawn employment security guarantees, widened wage differentials and eliminated price subsidies.

Evelyn Huber Stephens compares government-instituted participatory programs in Jamaica (under Manley), Chile (under Allende), and Peru (under the 1968 Revolutionary Government of the Armed Forces). These programs differed greatly, but it was economic crises, generated largely by dependency relations, that weakened support for the governments, strengthened the right wing opposition and ultimately led to the shelving of reforms in each country.

While participation takes a wide variety of forms and for workers has both cooptative and empowering effects, these essays convey one overpowering message: the road to genuine workers' control is strewn with formidable obstructions and detours placed there by people and organizations who use the idea for their own ends and by those whose authority and privileges are threatened by the ex-

tension of popular power.

James Rinehart
University of Western Ontario

Bonnie M. McCay and James M. Acheson, eds., *The Question of the Commons: The Culture and Ecology of Communal Resources* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press 1987).

PERSONS INTERESTED in labour history are typically interested in what might more precisely be called the history of the relations of labouring persons to employers (and, in that connection, also the relations among labourers themselves). Persons with ONLY that sort of interest will find next to nothing for them in this book. Most of the monetarily rewarded work activities alluded to by the various contributors would have to be classified under that rather oxymoronic rubric: self-employment. However, as it happens most persons interested in labour history, no matter how narrowly conceived, generally also have a serious, albeit often vague, interest in property relations, and in that respect this collection of essays is indeed well worth perusing. For example, socialists interested in environmental questions definitely should consider some of the arguments about community presented in it, as should anthropologists and sociologists at large, even economists.

Unlike most collections of essays by diverse authors this one has a real unity, both of style and of theme. The former, no mean achievement, helps maintain the reader's attention, the latter the reader's interest. Essentially, all seventeen essays are written as responses to Garrett Hardin's famous (even notorious) essay, "The Tragedy of the Commons" (which first appeared in *Science* in 1968, and which argued, among other things, that in the absence of the institution of private property, human beings are bound to overexploit their environment.) Commoners should have been, and must

henceforth be, coerced into conserving. Hardin wished to raise the issue of how we might set about regulating the use of the seas, and other currently open-access natural resources. While he was surely correct in denying the possibility of a merely technical "fix" to any in this class of what we could call "resource problems," there are a great many ways in which one might criticize his overall argument. It is also the case that his thesis recommended itself to many uncritical persons (including policy-makers) looking for shortcuts in social explanation (both historical and contemporary). Most of the contributors to this volume were clearly motivated by a desire to counter (with detailed empirical evidence) the many staggeringly, naive applications of Hardin's thesis to supposed cases of commons-caused devastation. The sheer wealth of case studies in this book is remarkable and so is their variety. It emerges that while private ownership of land can go along with interest in sustainable methods of exploiting resources, it is clearly in itself neither necessary nor adequate. Some of the essays gathered here discuss the many cases where commons were or are exploited without immediate disaster ensuing, because other kinds of more or less complex social institutions for conservation were in place. At the other end, one essay treats of a case where private (kin-based) property rights in the environment went hand in hand with the explicitly social and seemingly benign custom of generous gift-giving, which fairly quickly exhausted the local resource in question. It thus also implicitly emerges that ownership is perhaps not really the issue at all, but such ramifications are not developed in the volume.

To the readers of this journal the general value of this book may then be to underscore the extreme poverty of prevalent modern conceptions of property. Most Western contemporaries consider only two sorts of property: either absolute and personal, or indiscriminately common. This pair of alternatives is both inadequate to reality and a needlessly con-

fining policy straitjacket, especially in the short-term. Socialists, who have every real interest in knowing better, have done little this century to undermine it and much to foster its continued acceptance, with their tendency to shift abruptly from pillory of the former alternative to adoration of the latter. Historians of the Middle Ages easily and naturally come to know how many different "intermediate" degrees of property have been conceived, and some of them even ask why, but they are rarely listened to. Persons ignorant of the breadth of the relevant range of forms of property, but for whatever reason unwilling to read Medieval history, can have their eyes opened by the "mid-range" contemporary examples described in this book. Arguably, it is something everyone should know about. Certainly, nobody can come away from the volume willing to venture simple generalizations about the ecological implications of commons again, or indeed of other forms of property for that matter. Before returning to the missing theme hinted at above there is one rather mechanical shortcoming in the book which should be mentioned.

There is not space here to summarize all the pieces and it would be invidious to single some out since all are good and some excellent. It is surely fair, however, to criticize the editors. Their own individual contributions are striking but their joint introduction is not. It would be a great shame if any hasty, prospective student were to take the well-known shortcut of reading the introduction only. This one provides summaries of all the pieces, but these are too schematic even to arrest the reader, and give no hint of the rich flavour of the actual pieces. It might have been more useful to cut the introduction drastically and try to procure the right to include Hardin's piece within the covers. Hardin's naiveté in matters sociological and historical would have been even more strikingly set off there and yet the pertinence of his question nonetheless usefully reiterated. For the question remains to be tackled adequately.

There seems, to this reviewer at any

rate, to be a kind of logical fallacy at work in the literature to which this volume contributes. The concern about resources is surely over how to sustain a steady and adequate flow of goods from them into the indefinite future. It should be patent that a rearrangement in this disposition as property can in no way alter the quantity of resources. What does matter, above all, is the socially instituted time-horizon of the community of users. If this is short, then truly nothing can avail. If, however, it can be made to recede continuously and indefinitely, then everything becomes easy. Again, the Medievalists ought to be able to advise. They are familiar with groups dedicated for whatever motives to permanence, apparently as a goal in itself. If we really care about conserving the bases of our lives we must think far beyond conceptions of property.

Colin A.M. Duncan
Queen's University

Hart Cantelon, Robert Hollands, Alan Metcalfe, Alan Tomlinson, *Leisure, Sport and Working Class Cultures* (Toronto: Garamond Press 1988).

THE PRESENTATIONS THAT make up this book were delivered originally in 1983 at a workshop at Queen's University's centre for Leisure Studies. Rationale for their publication in this present form is the "considerable demand for Centre publications in recent years" (9) and this compilation is the first of a planned series that examines the triumvirate of leisure, sport, and culture. Given the dearth of research and the relative absence of theoretical focus in the area, this tetrad of papers and their accompanying introduction are a laudable addition to the field.

The introduction to the papers is supplied by two of the contributors, Hart Cantelon and Robert Hollands, and should be considered as mandatory reading prior to tackling the body of the text. For it is in this section that the authors, in part, have usurped this reviewer's respon-

sibility by effectively placing the papers in perspective and providing a brief but integrated discussion of common issues and themes. The prefatory remarks are invaluable as the papers have, at a first and individual reading, little in common either chronologically or geographically. Holland's paper questions the "conventional wisdom of leisure research" (17) and suggests an alternative approach that takes into account the active role of capitalism in the formation of the concepts of work and leisure. Tomlinson examines working-class sport and leisure during the inter-war years in Colne, an industrial town in Lancashire. Metcalfe uses Montreal and the Northeast coalfields of England in the nineteenth-century as the backdrop from which to draw his "insights." Cantelon's focus is the decade 1920 to 1929 and the effects of the Leninist/Proletkul'tist cultural debates upon Soviet working-class sport. Full justice to the complexity of these topics cannot be given within the confines of this format, especially since two of the writers have taken to heart the "informal" nature of the presentations and supplied interesting anecdotal material that is only marginally relevant to their topics. Nevertheless, it is necessary to appreciate the diversity of topics dealt with in this book. Obviously, they transcend historical content and find their foci in the common theoretical strands that string them together.

Once again the introduction is of benefit as it identifies and briefly discusses the theoretical commonalities. Most apparent is the pall of dissatisfaction with the established historical methods that hangs over these papers. Explicit in Holland's work and implicit in the others is the need to "reconceptualize" leisure, work, and culture. By way of achieving this objective it is suggested that emphasis should be placed on the significance of local culture as the influencing intermediary between capital accumulation and its effect upon sport and leisure. Thus, it is established that leisure activity and the form and function of sport are neither "free floating idealist entities"

(13) nor the inevitable by- or end-products of a specific economic system, but are "expressions of particular historical social relations." (13) Finally, in a suggestion that has implications beyond the topics of sport and leisure, the book underscores the theoretical imperative to which further historical studies of the working-class be subjected. Only when informed theory is rigorously applied can the intelligibility of working-class history be attained.

It is particularly difficult to criticize any aspect of this book, as the study of sport and leisure in working-class life is essentially in its embryonic stage, and the quality of literature and research should be evaluated in the context of existing studies. However, if there is a flaw it is in the previously mentioned diversity of topics. While realizing that the compilers had only a limited number of papers on topics to chose from, the lack of Canadian con-

tent is perplexing. Over ten years ago Metcalfe commented that sport and social stratification had received little attention from Canadian historians and the statement is as valid today as it was then. Perhaps this collection will induce a response.

In conclusion, I make reference to the back cover where it is belligerently stated that "this book fires a shot at the theoretical bastions that this society has erected around the concepts of sport and leisure." The accuracy and the degree of damage the shot inflicts remain to be seen. But the calibre of this book should not be judged solely on the destruction it causes but also on the creation and building of an alternative theoretical foundation — one that can be added to by subsequent issues in this series. I look forward to their publication.

C.A. Tony Joyce
Queen's University