

Reviews / Comptes Rendus

Volume 16, 1985

URI : <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/llt16rv01>

[Aller au sommaire du numéro](#)

Éditeur(s)

Canadian Committee on Labour History

ISSN

0700-3862 (imprimé)

1911-4842 (numérique)

[Découvrir la revue](#)

Citer ce compte rendu

(1985). Compte rendu de [Reviews / Comptes Rendus]. *Labour/Le Travailleur*, 16, 271–360.

REVIEWS / COMPTES RENDUS

- David G. Alexander, *Atlantic Canada and Confederation: Essays in Canadian Political Economy*
by Puzzival Copes / 271
- John Mellor, *The Company Store: James Bryson McLachlan and the Cape Breton Coal Miners 1900-1925*
by Del Muise / 272
- Michael Lynk and Sue Calhoun, *The Lockeport Lockout: An Untold Story in Nova Scotia's Labour History*
by Nolan Reilly / 275
- Richard Jones, *Duplessis and the Union Nationale Administration*
by Allen Seager / 276
- Jean-Pierre Charland, *Histoire de l'enseignement technique et professionnel*
by Roger Magnuson / 277
- Yvan Fortier, *Menuisier charpentier. Un artisan du bois à l'ère industrielle*
by Robert Nahuel / 279
- Jean Bourassa, *Le travailleur minier, la culture et le savoir ouvrier: quatre analyses de cas*
by Daniel Le Blanc / 281
- Thomas E. Flanagan, *Riel and the Rebellion of 1885 Reconsidered*
by Ron Bourgeault / 282
- Howard Palmer, *Patterns of Prejudice: A History of Nativism in Alberta*
by Julian Sher / 285
- Lynne Bowen, *Boss Whistle: The Coal Miners of Vancouver Island Remember*
by Patricia E. Roy / 287
- Patricia Marchak, *Green Gold: The Forest Industry in British Columbia*
by Stephen Gray / 288
- J.L. Granatstein, J. Ahella, D. Bercuson, R.C. Brown, and H.B. Neatby, *Twentieth Century Canada*
by Susan Mann Trofimenkoff / 291
- Marion Royce, *Eunice Dyke: Health Care Pioneer*
by Wendy Mitchinson / 292
- Jonathan Prude, *The Coming of Industrial Order: Town and Factory Life in Rural Massachusetts, 1810-1860*
by Eric G. Nellis / 293
- Michael B. Katz, *Poverty and Policy in American History*
by Richard Schneirov / 296
- Hartmut Keil and John B. Jentz, eds., *German Workers in Industrial Chicago, 1850-1910: A Comparative Perspective*
by Olivier Zunz / 298
- Roy Rosenzweig, *Eight Hours for What We Will: Workers and Leisure in an Industrial City, 1870-1920*
by Walter Licht / 299
- Dorothy Schwieder, *Black Diamonds: Life and Work in Iowa's Coal Mining Communities, 1895-1925*
by André G. Kuczewski / 302

- Ronald D. Eller, *Miners, Millhands and Mountaineers. Industrialization of the Appalachian South, 1880-1930*
by Peter Gottlieb / 302
- Mansel G. Blackford, *A Portrait Cast in Steel: Buckeye International and Columbus, 1881-1908*
by John N. Ingham / 304
- Mark Naison, *Communists in Harlem During the Depression*
by Bruce Nelson / 306
- Michael J. McDonald and John Muldowny, *TVA and the Dispossessed: The Resettlement of Population in the Norris Dam Area*
by Geoffrey S. Smith / 308
- Ronald W. Schatz, *The Electrical Workers: A History of Labor at General Electric and Westinghouse 1923-60*
by Laurel Sefton MacDowell / 31
- Mark McColloch, *White Collar Workers in Transition: The Boom Years, 1940-1970*
by Graham S. Lowe / 312
- Jeanne Stellman and Mary Sue Henfin, *Office Work Can Be Dangerous to Your Health*
by Cathy Walker / 315
- Iain MacLean, *The Legend of Red Clydeside*
by V.G. Kiernan / 317
- Charles Docherty, *Steel and Steelworkers: The Sons of Vulcan*
by Craig Heron / 319
- Paul Whiteley, *The Labour Party in Crisis*
by Richard Marsden / 320
- Samuel Clark and James S. Donnelly, Jr., eds., *Irish Peasants: Violence and Political Unrest, 1780-1914*
by Glenn J. Lockwood / 323
- T.W. Moody-Davitt and Irish Revolution, 1846-82
by D.H. Akenson / 324
- W.W. Daniel and Neil Millward, *Workplace Industrial Relations in Britain: The DE/PSI/SSRC Survey*
by Jacques Bélanger / 325
- Duncan Gallie, *Social Inequality and Class Radicalism in France and Britain*
by Julian Tanner / 327
- Michel Billis, *Socialistes et pacifistes — l'intenable dilemme des socialistes français (1933-1939)*
by Yves Lequin / 329
- Erich Fromm, *The Working Class in Weimar Germany: A Psychological and Sociological Study*
by Geoff Eley / 333
- Eve Rosenhaft, *Beating the Fascists? The German Communists and Political Violence 1929-1933*
by Martin Kitchen / 335
- Ivaar Oxaal, *Black Intellectuals and the Dilemmas of Race and Class in Trinidad*
by Mary Turner / 337
- Rob Stevens, *Classes of Contemporary Japan*
by Donald Von Eschen / 338
- E.L. Wheelwright and Ken Buckley, eds., *Essays in the Political Economy of Australian Capitalism*
by Philip McMichael / 340
- Mary O'Brien, *The Politics of Reproduction*
by Wally Secombe / 343
- Deirdre Beddoe, *Discovering Women's History: A Practical Manual*
by Joy Part / 346
- Olive Banks, *Faces of Feminism: A Study of Feminism as a Social Movement*
by Rosemarie Schade / 347
- Lela B. Costin, *Two Sisters for Social Justice: A Biography of Grace and Edith Abbott*
by Susan E. Houston / 349
- Marjorie Ferguson, *Forever Feminine: Women's Magazines and the Cult of Femininity*
by Mary Vjmond / 351
- Michael Geerken and Walter R. Gove, *At Home and at Work: The Family's Allocation of Labor*
by Louise A. Tilly / 352
- Tom Bottomore, et al., eds., *A Dictionary of Marxist Thought*
by Thomas Rutman / 354
- Michael Burawoy and Theda Skocpol, eds., *Marxist Inquiries: Studies of Labor, Class and States*
by Paul Stevenson / 357

REVIEWS/COMPTES RENDUS*

David G. Alexander, *Atlantic Canada and Confederation: Essays in Canadian Political Economy*, compiled by Eric W. Sager, Lewis R. Fischer, and Stuart O. Pierson (Toronto: University of Toronto Press 1983).

DURING THE THIRTEEN years that he lived and worked in Newfoundland, David Alexander earned the affection and esteem of a wide circle of academic friends throughout Atlantic Canada. After his untimely death in 1980, three of his colleagues, in tribute, compiled this selection of nine essays from his pen.

Well versed in historical analysis, Alexander was an accomplished scholar, whose work carried a distinctive personal stamp. It was socially conscious and sensitive to the contemporary economic, social, and cultural fallout from the past. The impact both of the environment in which he worked and of that in which he had grown up and studied, were also mirrored in his writing.

Alexander (like this reviewer) was born in small-town British Columbia to a middle-class family, acquired his BA and MA degrees at universities on the west coast of North America, went for his PHD to the London School of Economics, and then accepted a teaching appointment at Memorial University of Newfoundland. In the sensitive social environment of an economically disadvantaged province, financially dependent, historically separate,

and culturally distinct, the suspect outsider — the “come-from-away” — is under psychological pressure to demonstrate an appreciation of local concerns and a commitment to the regional interest. Alexander's apparent sympathies and inclinations, reinforced by student experience in the radical 1960s, permitted him to meet expectations in this regard without difficulty.

The most important single concern in Alexander's writing was with the means of defending and sustaining the integrity and viability of the economically endangered cultures and societies of Atlantic Canada. In his analysis he was at his scholarly best as a historian. Drawing on the certainties of the past, he exercised sensitive and mature judgement in assessing the record of the region's potential and performance. This is exemplified in essays such as “Development and Dependence in Newfoundland, 1880-1970” and “Economic Growth in the Atlantic Region, 1880 to 1940,” that are included in this book. The historical evidence persuaded him that Atlantic Canada had a certain economic base in the talents of its people and in its resources — particularly those of the sea.

Alexander's writing on contemporary developments revealed greater uncertainty. And where the regional interest was concerned he did not always escape the influence of a cramped local perspective. For instance, his essay on “The Political Economy of Fishing in Newfoundland” in part reflects local complaints alleging Ottawa's unwillingness to support the inshore fishery, and reluctance

* The Table of Contents for Reviews is on pages 4 & 5.

to defend Canada's external fishing interests, which this reviewer finds difficult to reconcile with ascertainable facts and circumstances.

Intellectually, Alexander recognized the recurring argument that the Atlantic region's population had outgrown its resource base and that out-migration was too low to correct the imbalance, so that dependence on federal transfer payments marked the inevitable path to shabby dignity for the kept provinces of the Atlantic seaboard. He was neither able to disprove nor willing to accept this economic interpretation of the fate of the region, with its implicit choice between a diminished population and permanent welfare status. He searched for alternative or additional explanations of the cruel decline in the region's fortunes. In some measure he found them in the failure of commercial institutions and the perversity of political choices — including, of course, the national policy that has favoured a manufacturing base in central Canada. With respect to current problems he questioned the arguments of resource inadequacy in Atlantic Canada, seeking encouragement in the success of other resource-dependent regions such as Iceland. But comparability was in doubt and his research efforts did not reach a stage where he could test the region's capacity to replicate the record of success achieved elsewhere. When fate cut short his time, he was still searching for the elusive solutions to the economic conundrums facing the Atlantic provinces.

While he was much concerned with defence of the region to which he had become attached, Alexander's integrity required him to reject regional chauvinism. He never cast doubt on his Canadian identity nor did he abandon his wider intellectual interests. His writing demonstrated a continuing concern for the Canadian condition. He vigorously defended the pan-Canadian ideals of regional integrity and cultural diversity in a meaningful confederation that gener-

ously shared economic benefits through a strong and dedicated federal government.

Politically, Alexander was a confirmed democratic socialist. Though the experiences of his student days had left him disillusioned with the radical left, he held on to elements of the Marxist paradigm. In his article on "The Erosion of Social Democracy in Canada," he pleaded for a return to class analysis and pursuit of public enterprise, which he felt could draw the political focus away from excessive preoccupation with region and ethnicity. Projecting from his ideas, one might have anticipated an important contribution to the exploration of a Canadian economic democracy and a new social contract. Had we been granted the benefit of his talents for some more years, it is likely that David Alexander's continuing intellectual contributions to this country would have earned a recognition spreading from Atlantic Canada across our land to his native British Columbia.

Parzival Copes
Simon Fraser University

John Mellor, *The Company Store: James Bryson McLachlan and the Cape Breton Coal Miners, 1900-1925* (Toronto: Doubleday 1983).

UPPER CANADIAN MAGAZINE and newspaper editors used to send reporters to the nethermost reaches of Canada in search of colourful material to titillate their Toronto readers. Cape Breton saw a fair number, most of whom painted the pictures their readers most wanted to believe regarding backward Maritime society, especially the terrible conditions prevailing in the coal towns. The heightened drama of almost continuous labour strife — violence never far from the surface, according to their accounts — kept Cape Bretoners before central Canadian readers for a good part of the 1920s. Horror stories of shameful conditions in

the coal towns evoked sympathy and relief efforts of one sort or another, yet no real commitment to changing the miners' situation nor any deep understanding of the nature of the conflict emerged.

Unfortunately, 60 years later, that same lack of understanding and tendency to sensationalize prevails among commentators from Ontario. John Mellor's retrospective reporting on the troubled 1920s in Cape Breton is something of a throw-back to those days. He seems to come to this topic convinced that, before him, no one ever truly comprehended the "brutally feudal" conditions under which Cape Breton miners worked and lived. It is unfortunate that he has taken this approach, for in the process he appears to have ignored ten years of excellent work by some of Canada's best young labour historians. Hopefully, his apparent pre-emption of the topic for a wider audience will not deter historians from approaching the same themes from perspectives more true to their subjects' communities.

The dust jacket and introduction promise a thoroughly researched and carefully prepared analysis of the "company store" phenomenon and the life of James B. McLachlan; much less is delivered. Mellor's treatment of the company store takes up only a few cursory paragraphs, though one could argue that it symbolizes his overall attitude towards the subjugation of miners before the pervasive force of coal operators. Using James B. McLachlan as the fulcrum for his tale projects a dramatic counterpoint which tells us almost nothing of his contemporaries or of the traditions of confrontation and militancy that preceded his rise to leadership. Mellor's adaptation of the rhetoric of conflict and characterization of the miner's position as essentially feudal and passive prior to McLachlan's arrival, misconstrues the experience and contribution of his predecessors.

Rather than attempt a systematic analysis of labour's transformation during the critical first quarter of the century,

Mellor focuses on the confrontations that racked the coal towns during the 1920s. Strikes, trials, and various commissions are featured prominently in this narrative, which never strays very far from the obvious inequalities of such confrontations. He can hardly be faulted for that, given his determination to capture the attention of readers assumed to have no prior knowledge of the events being described. I suppose one might forgive a popular writer for ignoring what tends to be too easily dismissed as the work of anaemic scholarship, but one wonders why a popularizer like Mellor would ignore the worker-poetry of someone like Dawn Fraser, who captured workers' experiences so skillfully and dramatically and who happens to have been anthologized recently. In the final analysis, Mellor's work is derivative and exploitative; an emotionally told tale utilizing literary devices rather than sustained analysis to capture reader interest, while maintaining an emotional pitch that often obscures the reality of the miners' experience.

Mellor's McLachlan is a sort of reverse prism through which all the colour and substance is drained out of the experience of Cape Breton's miners — their struggle rendered a backdrop to the working out of their leader's destiny. No one can question that J.B. McLachlan was Cape Breton's principal labour spokesperson during his day; raising him to martyrdom, though, takes his role far beyond anything with which he would have felt comfortable. In spite of a mass of effective personal testimony, this central character emerges in caricature, bound up by the fond memories of kin and colleagues. Mellor's successes, such as they are, result from his access to reminiscences of surviving members of the McLachlan family and a number of participants or first-hand observers. To the extent that he integrates their unique oral testimony into his narrative, he expands our understanding of the dynamic leadership provided by McLachlan. It should be pointed out

though that all original testimony gathered for this volume appears to remain outside the walls of any archive, unavailable to scholars interested in pursuing the research further. I suppose one might not quibble with this fact in a non-scholarly book, but Mellor's apparent confusion of facts drawn from more traditional sources gives one pause when considering his transcriptions of original testimony.

Mellor's approach to more standard documentation is fairly straightforward. Government documents, commission reports, contemporary newspapers, and a few bits of surviving union records appear to make up the bulk of his sources, though his pattern of citation is somewhat cursory, to say the least. He uses contemporary comments and reminiscences for narrative effect fairly frequently — perhaps even judiciously at times — though he adds little to our understanding of well-known events. Absence of any bibliographical or other citation of historians David Frank or Don MacGillivray, or the work of Paul MacEwan, is unfortunate: on the other hand, where the book is strongest — in dealing with the 1922 strike or the 1925 military intervention, for instance — the above noted authors have made their most decisive contributions. Mellor is hardly breaking new ground in treating these now familiar events. His failure to observe normal scholarly niceties by acknowledging the path-breaking work of those who have preceded him leaves any originality in his scholarship open to serious doubt.

Scholars of the coal industry have dismissed Mellor's book as exploitative and illconceived; a work offering neither serious insight into well-known events nor advancing our understanding of the labour dynamic of Cape Breton's coalfields. Others have pointed gleefully to his careless tendency to put the wrong people in the wrong places, and otherwise to misrepresent the players in the game, although it might be pointed out that most of those gaffs are peripheral to the central

theme of his narrative. Because Mellor offers such a ready list of targets it becomes all too easy to dismiss whatever merits the volume may have. For all its faults, it is still the most elaborate discussion in print of the troubled 1920s to appear in over half a century.

A more serious problem associated with people-oriented history of this sort rests with the relationship between author and subjects. Community-based historical endeavours, where the experience is only borrowed from direct participants, require some end product that can be used to expand understanding. That responsibility cannot be taken lightly; authors cannot behave like historical voyeurs, never attempting to draw meaning out of the experience of past generations. When Mellor begins his volume by emphasizing the "feudal" nature of capital/labour relations in the coal communities of Cape Breton, he chooses to emphasize a relationship existing primarily in the minds of outside observers. Throughout the volume, in spite of the heavy dependence on the testimony of participants or first-hand observers of the events he describes, Mellor does little more than invite his readers to share his horror for their plight during an age of industrial turmoil. His characterization of McLachlan emphasizes the limitations of such an approach, for it paints a uni-dimensional picture of the experience of a complex community, too often oversimplified for those outsiders who have always played such an important part in deciding the fate of Cape Bretoners. Sensationalizing their experience may be an acceptable literary practice, but it hardly repays the debt owed to the people who experienced the 1920s in Cape Breton.

Those people and their descendants deserve more from their historians. The historiographical upsurge of the past decade has not yet progressed to realistic and vibrant renderings of the events which Mellor's book exploits. Yet all the elements are present for any number of truly imaginative presentations. It is insuffi-

cient to condemn Mellor for what he has failed to do. Labour's historians have to get off their duffs and start dealing with people who actually experienced the history we spend so much time analyzing. Alternative mechanisms encouraging exchanges across generations and perspectives have to be found. Scholarly illiteracy on the part of workers should not inhibit understanding the centrality of labour's past experience among the very people on whose lives it had the most decisive impact. Sensationalizing it might be fun, but proper analysis would be infinitely better if it can lead to changes.

Del Muise
Carleton University

Michael Lynk and Sue Calhoun, *The Lockport Lockout: An Untold Story in Nova Scotia's Labour History* (Halifax: Oxfam Canada/Atlantic Region 1983).

IN THE AUTUMN OF 1939 a major dispute broke out between the owners of two local fish processing plants and some 600 fishing industry workers in the small, west shore fishing village of Lockport, Nova Scotia. Fueled by longstanding grievances over wages and working conditions, the conflict was precipitated by the workers' move to secure company recognition of the Canadian Fishermen's Union, an affiliate of the Canadian Seamen's Union. Although past efforts to resolve these grievances had failed, they hoped that this time a new solidarity and the assistance of two experienced CSU organizers would bring them victory. When the employers responded to their demands for union recognition and improved wages with lockout notices, the workers realized that they were in for a long and bitter dispute with the fish companies. Their resolve to win this struggle soon brought nationwide attention to Lockport.

With the critical support of their

families, the predominantly male workers prevented the fish plants from re-opening for several weeks. For workers with limited financial resources and little trade union experience, this alone represented a considerable achievement. In addition, the strikers established a cooperatively owned and operated fish processing plant, with markets as far away as Montreal, in order to feed themselves and to finance their union activities. They also campaigned successfully to secure moral and financial support from the Maritime labour movement. The fishing industry workers remained united well into the second month of the lockout. Indeed, they appeared to be on the verge of victory when the provincial government intervened on behalf of the owners. Premier Angus L. MacDonald and his cabinet were aware that the Lockport situation was being closely watched by fishing workers throughout the province. MacDonald and the fish plant owners worried that a CFU victory in Lockport would inspire fishing boat workers and fish handlers throughout the region to unionize. The CFU's affiliation to the militant CSU clearly struck fear into the hearts of both the government leaders and the owners of the fish processing companies. Government assistance to the owners took several forms: the recently proclaimed Trade Union Act was ignored, picketing of the fish plants was declared illegal, and a large RCMP detachment was stationed in Lockport. The MacDonald government also orchestrated a malicious, but effective, anti-communist campaign against the CFU. In early December, the government wholeheartedly supported the owners' decision to try once again to re-open the plants with non-union labour. A violent confrontation occurred that split the community and soon brought an end to the lockout. The broader issues that initially sparked the struggle remained unresolved; indeed, even today the workers in the small fish plants face many of the same problems.

This remarkable story of the Lockport fishing industry workers and their families was researched and written by a group of Halifax-based social activists and published with financial assistance from Oxfam Canada. Interviews with a number of the participants in the confrontation provide the pamphlet with its essential substance. This record is supplemented with newspaper accounts of the events and with other more traditional historical sources. Of special note are the pamphlet's layout and design, which clearly received special attention. These features greatly enhance the attractiveness and readability of what is already an interesting and important document. Anyone interested in popularizing working-class history would be well advised to consider a similar format. Perhaps the most important feature of the *Lockport Lockout*, though, is that it reminds us once again that the easy generalizations often made about the conservatism of Maritime workers are fraught with danger.

Nolan Reilly
University of Winnipeg

Richard Jones, *Duplessis and the Union Nationale Administration* (Ottawa:Canadian Historical Association 1983).

IN THIS PAMPHLET (available by the author's own hand in both English- and French-language editions), Richard Jones provides a useful summary of political developments in Quebec between 1930 and 1960, naturally focused on the remarkable career of Maurice LeNoblet Duplessis, the Quebec Tory who held power in the years 1936-9 and 1944-59 under the banner of the *Union Nationale* coalition. Only one substantive criticism of Jones' political synthesis of "a complex period of Quebec's history" comes to mind. He understates the role of Duplessis' arch-rival and populist predecessor at

the helm of the provincial Conservatives, Camillien Houde, in galvanizing opposition to Taschereau Liberalism during the 1930s. Where Houde — the Trotsky of the Quebec opposition — and others had sown, Duplessis would reap: a rich political harvest that ended only with his death on 7 September, 1959.

Like Stalin, his contemporary, Duplessis was quickly dethroned after his death. But his statue, long interred in the bowels of the National Assembly, now graces its south lawn. One focus of the rehabilitation is Duplessis' late-blooming — Jones, following René Durocher, emphasizes — advocacy of autonomous nationalism. Another lies in a reconsideration of his social and economic policies for industrializing Quebec.

Labour is not ignored in Jones' survey, with union rivalries and major strikes from the textile struggles of 1937 to the copper-mining wars of 1957, sketched in brief. Jones' evaluation of the Duplessis programme is measured, as demanded by the CHA's format of "objectivity," but he clearly holds no brief for the revisionism of Conrad Black, who attempted to portray Duplessis as the worker's friend: defender of the true interests of "the working class" — Duplessis had no difficulty with those words, in either official language — against profit-seeking employers, intellectuals lusting for power, and dues-hungry union leaders.

The cornerstone of Duplessis' "Foundations of Power," a bolder interpretation might allow, was precisely his willingness and ability to confront and to weaken an emerging working-class movement in modern Quebec. That thesis was first argued by Stanley Ryerson (not mentioned in Jones' bibliographical note) in 1943, and remains as valid today as it was at the time of Duplessis' "anti-communist" laws in the 1930s.

Why did Quebec endure the man from Trois Rivières for so long? As Jones points out, the electoral record of the *Union Nationale* under Duplessis is more

ambiguous than is commonly supposed; it fought seven provincial elections, lost two, and emerged victorious in another with a mere 35 per cent of the vote. Only three Duplessis mandates were clear, in the "Cold War" elections of 1948, 1952, and 1956, which were fought against Soviet Russia and Liberal Ottawa, not domestic opponents or the policy alternatives. Duplessis tended his rural flock like any careful shepherd — simply because they held the electoral balance of power in Quebec well into the 1960s. He needed working-class votes only once, in 1935, when the slogan was: "Free Yourself From the Trusts and Vote For the Candidates of the Union Nationale Duplessis-Gouin."

Taken as a whole, the Duplessis era was not a "great darkness" of labour quiescence or working-class acquiescence. Its lessons show, however, that once ensconced in power, Quebec Toryism has been just as successful as Quebec Liberalism in maintaining it through the politics of "the machine." And power has cemented unholy alliances than the now-defunct *Union Nationale*. Fifty years after its birth during the Great Depression, Québécois and all Canadians were pondering that paradox.

Allen Seager
Simon Fraser University

Jean-Pierre Charland. *Histoire de l'enseignement technique et professionnel* (Québec: Institut québécois de recherche sur la culture 1982).

THE LATE LOUIS-PHILIPPE AUDET, the dean of Quebec educational historians, once remarked that the history of vocational education in the province was yet to be written. Were Professor Audet with us today, it is a good bet that he would revise his comment, for *Histoire de l'enseignement technique et professionnel* goes a long

way in filling the void, it being a systematic treatment of the subject from the time of Confederation to the present.

A word of caution to the reader. Despite the title the work is not a comprehensive examination of vocational education in Quebec. To his credit, the author makes it clear at the outset that his study is restricted to "vocational" as distinct from business and agricultural education, to instruction designed to prepare skilled workers for industry. Approached chronologically, the study begins with a look at developments in the second half of the last century, which by any measure were modest and timid, largely confined to the organization of night courses for workers wishing to upgrade their job skills. In institutional terms vocational education took off in the early years of this century with the establishment of technical schools in Montreal and Quebec city, followed by the rise of trade schools in the 1920s and apprenticeship centres at the end of World War II. At their apogee in the early 1960s there were 45 trade and 13 technical schools in the province. In the wake of the great school reform of the 1960s, vocational education was radically reorganized and brought under the authority of the newly created Ministry of Education. Most trade and technical schools disappeared from the scene, being dismantled or absorbed by the emerging comprehensive secondary schools and post-secondary colleges known as CEGEPs.

The picture that evolves from this long work (almost 500 pages) is that vocational education was a bit player in the educational drama. At no time did it attract more than a small minority of the school-age population. At its height in 1960, only 4 per cent of boys in the 14-20-year-old bracket were enrolled in vocational training programmes. Part of the problem was Quebec's traditionally low educational rate, the fact that over the years most youngsters abandoned school at an early age. Consequently, trade and technical

schools, which operated at the secondary school level, rarely had a large pool of youngsters to draw from. As a result, vocational schools could not supply enough skilled hands to meet the needs of industry.

One gets the distinct impression in reading *Histoire* that vocational education was an intruder, an outsider looking in. Through the years it found curricular expression not in the regular schools, but in separate and independent trade and technical schools. These institutions suffered the indignity of not having a place in the educational hierarchy. Until the reforms of the 1960s, vocational education was in an organizational "no man's land," coming neither under the direction of the Department of Public Instruction nor local school boards. Rather like a relative no one wanted to put up, it was shifted among various government departments, none of which exercised a strong leadership role in education. The initiative, direction, and administration of vocational education fell to a collection of representatives, including business people, municipal leaders, and local educators.

In the last analysis, however, ideology rather than faulty organization condemned vocational learning to a marginal status in Quebec education. It limped along without the moral backing and participation of the Roman Catholic church, which dominated French Canadian education during the period. In the eyes of the powerful clergy, vocational education was tantamount to miseducation since it appealed to the hands rather than to the mind and soul of learners. Vocational education also invited suspicion by reason of government initiatives in this realm. The Catholic clergy, perennially wary of state intervention in education, feared it would eventually lead to godless schools. Vocational education also suffered from an identity crisis, of being regarded as second-class education in the public mind. The supporters of vocational educa-

tion were, as the author points out, partly to blame for this attitude. They promoted practical learning for two somewhat contradictory reasons: to train workers for industry and to provide opportunities for those who could not master academic learning.

Yet it is precisely its marginal status in Quebec education over the years that qualifies vocational learning as both unique and interesting. Trade and technical schools were educational heretics; they were everything that other public schools in the province were not: autonomous in curriculum, religiously neutral, culturally heterogeneous, and beneficiaries of provincial and federal funding. Indeed, they represented a breath of fresh air in the often stifling atmosphere of clerical education. In striking contrast to other schools of the day, vocational schools were essentially secular in terms of outlook and control. Their leadership and teachers were overwhelmingly lay. Clerical influence was confined to the chaplaincy and to the occasional sociology course, which fronted as a vehicle for the spread of Catholic social doctrine. Furthermore, most vocational schools were bilingual institutions, providing instruction in both French and English, in contrast to the usual custom of separate schools for the two solitudes. Finally, vocational schools enjoyed wide latitude in the running of their own affairs. Though nominally government institutions, technical schools were free to determine their courses and programmes and to hire their teachers without outside interference. This is to observe that state participation in vocational education was essentially confined to a financial role.

While *Histoire de l'enseignement technique et professionnel* promises to be the definitive work on the subject, it is not a flawless study, though its defects tend to be in the lesser domains of style and organization. A minor irritation is that the book has not one but two titles. The title cited above, which appears on the front

and back covers, does not match that which is on the title page. An oversight? An example of creative publishing? More seriously, the book is a revised doctoral dissertation and suffers from some of the organizational ills of that genre. Too often it reads like a government report. Perhaps the author was seduced by his research sources, which were largely in the category of ministerial reports, royal commission studies, school records, briefs, and the like. At any rate, the work is overlong and sometimes taxes the patience of the reader. Also annoying is the liberal use of quoted materials, whose frequent occurrence conspire to tire rather than to enlighten. One wonders why the publisher did not exercise editorial responsibility and prune the manuscript of some of its excesses. On a more positive note, the inclusion of tables, graphs, and photographs enhances the presentation.

On balance, *Histoire* deserves more praise than criticism. The author has succeeded in blending descriptive and interpretative history, of defining and analyzing vocational education in the social and economic context of the times. Impeccably researched, *Histoire* is a welcome contribution to the growing literature of Quebec educational history. To paraphrase a popular title, vocational education has come in from the cold.

Roger Magnuson
McGill University

Yvan Fortier, *Menuisier charpentier. Un artisan du bois à l'ère industrielle* (Montréal: Boréal Express/Musée de l'Homme 1980).

LE LIVRE DE Yvan Fortier, présenté dans la collection «Histoire populaire du Québec» chez Boréal Express, s'attache à décrire l'univers technique de M. Edmond Picard, artisan en milieu rural québécois (Ste-Louise, comté de L'Islet) durant les premières décennies du vingtième siècle.

Les divers chapitres se découpent ainsi: tout d'abord, l'auteur présente un aperçu historique sur les métiers du bois et sur l'évolution de l'apprentissage tant en Europe qu'au Canada. Les autres chapitres décrivent respectivement l'artisan, sa boutique et ses travaux. Enfin, la conclusion situe l'artisan à une époque de changements fondamentaux. Nous ne retiendrons ici que certains aspects de cette étude.

De prime abord, l'auteur constate que les saisons rythment les travaux d'Edmond Picard. Le cycle d'été comprend essentiellement les travaux liés à la construction, la réparation, et l'entretien de bâtiments (maisons, granges, et dépendances) ainsi que la réparation et la construction de véhicules d'été. Le cycle d'hiver, outre la réparation et la construction de véhicules d'hiver, regroupe la fabrication de portes et fenêtres ainsi que l'affûtage des outils de bûcherons.

Dès qu'il hérite de l'atelier, appartenant précédemment à son père, Edmond Picard innove en y introduisant un moteur à essence qui agit comme seule source d'énergie pour activer les divers outils et machines. La présence d'un moulin à scie, à l'intérieur de la boutique, constitue une caractéristique originale et intéressante. Le large éventail d'instruments utilisés témoigne de la diversité de ses travaux. Dans le cadre de ses activités, le charpentier-menuisier exerce un contrôle complet sur toutes les étapes du travail, de la planification à l'exécution.

L'ouvrage de Yvan Fortier possède des éléments positifs indiscutables: le choix même de l'artisan et de sa boutique où se rencontrent deux univers techniques différents et deux types de production ne peut être contesté. L'auteur considère avec justesse que l'émergence de la fabrique a entraîné des changements en profondeur de l'apprentissage jusqu'à son élimination complète. Fortier reconnaît que la dissolution de l'apprentissage ne peut être représentée comme une coupure nette et brutale mais bien comme une modifica-

tion lente et progressive, fruit d'une division accrue du travail et non la simple résultante de l'introduction du machinisme.

On ne peut passer silence la description détaillée de la boutique de l'artisan, l'organisation interne des machines et outils; de même que l'analyse de deux procès de travail: la fabrication d'une fenêtre et celle d'une roue. Ces deux derniers éléments témoignent, de la part de l'auteur, d'une connaissance approfondie des travaux liés à ce métier.

D'autre part, la conclusion — que l'on aurait aimée plus longue — met en lumière l'impact de la révolution industrielle sur le travail de l'artisan. Cet impact est double: l'artisan se voit cantonné dans certains travaux spécifiques de fabrication ou directement dans la réparation; (2) pour produire à plus bas prix, l'artisan est contraint d'adopter des machines afin d'abaisser ses coûts de production et répondre aux exigences de sa clientèle. C'est donc à un univers hybride qu'appartient l'atelier d'Edmond Picard, tentant de concilier les outils manuels et les machines; cet univers en est un de transition.

Malheureusement, cet ouvrage contient certaines lacunes, dont les premières tiennent à l'imprécision des termes employés. Dès le départ, la distinction entre les étapes classiques de la division du travail (coopération, manufacture, fabrique) n'est pas faite: l'emploi du terme «boutique» ne peut clarifier la situation. D'autre part, l'auteur associe outils manuels avec artisanat et machines avec industrie; alors qu'à l'étape de la manufacture, bien que le travail soit effectué manuellement on ne peut plus parler d'artisanat proprement dit.

Par ailleurs, l'auteur emploie simultanément (24) main-d'oeuvre qualifiée et main-d'oeuvre spécialisée, ce qui laisse croire qu'il s'agit de termes équivalents alors qu'ils correspondent respectivement à deux catégories très différentes de travailleurs: *skilled* et *semi-skilled*. Dans son ouvrage, l'auteur signale l'existence

d'un livre de comptes, tenu par l'épouse de l'artisan, qui permet de suivre les travaux effectués dans la boutique jusqu'en 1941 (40). Dans sa conclusion, Fortier souligne le cantonnement de l'artisan dans des travaux spécifiques, fruit de la domination de la production industrielle. Une utilisation judicieuse de ce livre de comptes aurait sans doute permis de suivre le processus de rétrécissement des activités de l'artisan et de son marché. Cela aurait situé l'artisan dans son contexte économique et social (qui n'est jamais abordé dans cette étude). On ne sait rien de l'insertion de l'artisan dans son milieu. On ne peut que déplorer que l'auteur se soit limité au cadre naturel et technique d'un artisan, alors que d'autres études, dont celle de Réal Brisson (ré-)insère les artisans dans un cadre économique plus global.¹

À partir du livre de comptes, l'auteur conclut que l'artisan jouissait de revenus suffisants. Toutefois, Fortier a précédemment mentionné que cet artisan cultivait une terre, qu'il avait quelques bêtes dont il vendait la production laitière au village. Les revenus tirés de ces activités non-artisanales ne sont, sans doute, pas très élevés, mais ils permettent quand même à Edmond Picard de subsister et de ne pas gruger inutilement les revenus provenant de son métier. Que serait-il advenu d'Edmond Picard s'il avait vécu au village ou en milieu urbain? Ses revenus auraient-ils été réellement suffisants? D'un autre côté, une comparaison avec un artisan citadin aurait été souhaitable et aurait montré davantage les caractéristiques propres du travail d'Edmond Picard.

Force nous est de constater que cette étude, essentiellement descriptive, n'aborde une perspective sociale et historique que dans deux sections du livre: l'aperçu historique et la trop courte conclusion. Ce manque tient à la nature même de l'ouvrage qui est d'abord et avant tout

¹ Réal Brisson, *La charpenterie navale à Québec sous le Régime français* (Québec 1983).

de caractère ethnologique tant par sa forme (description) que par sa méthode (techniques d'entrevue) dans le but de recomposer l'univers technique de l'artisan.

Malgré ces quelques insuffisances (historiques) l'étude de Yvan Fortier demeure fort utile pour quiconque s'intéresse au procès de travail dans l'industrie de la transformation du bois. Il s'agit d'une analyse attentive et concrète d'un *environnement technique au début du vingtième siècle*; environnement bouleversé par l'expansion de la révolution industrielle. De plus, cet ouvrage est agréable à lire et bien documenté. Les dessins, photographies, et même le glossaire — à la fin du livre — sont fort profitables et soutiennent bien l'étude.

Robert Nahuet
Université du Québec
à Montréal

Jean Bourassa, *Le travailleur minier, la culture et le savoir ouvrier: quatre analyses de cas*, Col. «Documents préliminaires» (Québec: Institut québécois de recherche sur la culture 1982).

AU SEUIL D'UNE recherche portant sur le savoir ouvrier, l'auteur nous livre une étude préliminaire de la culture des mineurs québécois, une brève analyse d'entrevues réalisées en 1980 auprès de quatre mineurs de Thetford Mines.

Jean Bourassa arrête sa réflexion sur ce qu'il considère être des éléments de cette culture. Il étudie, par analyse de contenu, des segments d'entrevues touchant à diverses facettes du travail de ces hommes; il est à noter ici que seul le monde du travail préoccupe l'auteur. La raison de l'engagement à la mine, la représentation mentale du travail, la perception des relations hiérarchiques et du syndicalisme et le savoir-faire ouvrier sont les principaux éléments retenus pour les fins de l'analyse. D'autre part, cette

démarche est doublée d'une volonté de vérifier la problématique générale d'un savoir ouvrier lié au pouvoir des travailleurs au sein de leur milieu de travail.

Cet ouvrage donne accès à la parole ouvrière, à la pensée et aux inquiétudes de ces travailleurs miniers. Le lecteur intéressé par l'étude de l'univers culturel de la classe ouvrière déguste chaque ligne de ces témoignages, qui malheureusement peuvent paraître parfois trop courts.

La démarche de l'auteur se base sur le postulat que la relation de l'individu avec son milieu de travail agit comme principal révélateur de la culture d'un groupe social donné. On passe donc par l'entremise de quatre personnes pour saisir l'univers mental de toute une collectivité. La démarche est certainement correcte dans le cadre d'une étude préliminaire, d'un pré-test, pour réorienter au besoin, mais le lecteur doit se garder de conclure trop hâtivement.

À la lecture de la partie «théorique», il apparaît dommage que Jean Bourassa ne se soit pas plus attardé à mieux nous présenter les concepts qu'il utilise. On nous sert la «culture ouvrière» comme un concept connu de tous et qui n'est nullement situé dans le débat théorique qui l'entoure; le savoir ouvrier paraît être une notion plutôt nébuleuse, composée du savoir-faire et de la représentation de ce savoir. Le lecteur multiplie les interrogations et reste sur son appétit.

Par ailleurs, l'analyse aurait gagné à se servir de quelques autres techniques pour augmenter son efficacité. Ainsi une étude linguistique et sémiologique, par exemple, menée de façon scientifique aurait appuyée solidement l'analyse du discours de ces travailleurs.

Bien sûr ces quelques réserves portent essentiellement sur les faiblesses inhérentes à la dimension préliminaire de cette étude. La qualité première de cet ouvrage est d'entrouvrir la porte sur l'intéressant domaine de la culture des travailleurs miniers. L'étude de la culture ouvrière au Québec n'est qu'à l'état

embryonnaire et il est à souhaiter que les travaux sur le sujet se multiplient pour qu'enfin nos connaissances se raffinent. Espérons que le vaste projet de monsieur Bourassa puisse se réaliser et que la publication de ses résultats ne tardera pas trop.

Daniel Le Blanc
Montréal

Thomas E. Flanagan, *Riel and the Rebellion of 1885 Reconsidered* (Saskatoon: Western Producer Prairie Books 1983).

SAMIR AMIN RECENTLY wrote, "History is a weapon in the ideological battle between those who want to change society and those who want to maintain its basic features... those who want to change society necessarily have ideas of a higher quality than those who wish to keep it from changing..." Thomas Flanagan's latest book on Riel and the 1885 rebellion is certainly the testimony of one who does not have high ideas and is not interested in changing society, not even from a basic honest belief in social justice. His reconsideration comes from one who considers himself to be both a student and scholar of the politics and life of Riel, an academic who is a member of the Riel Project. This project is funded by the SSHRC and is responsible for compiling the writings of Riel for publication to commemorate the centennial of the 1885 North West Rebellion. Yet *Riel and the Rebellion* contributes absolutely nothing to our understanding of Riel or the politics of 1885. In fact, the book has been formally condemned by the different Métis organizations in western Canada for its racism and derogatory depiction of the Métis people.

Flanagan, by his own admission, states in his preface that he at one time believed in the conventional interpretations of history in this country; that the Métis were justified in their actions and were the victims of oppressive or neglectful government policies. After his own

detailed study based upon new-found discoveries, however, he concludes that the opposite is true:

that the Métis grievances were at least partly of their own making; that the government was on the verge of resolving them when the Rebellion broke out; that Riel's resort to arms could not be explained by the failure of constitutional agitation; and that he received a surprisingly fair trial.

Riel and the Rebellion becomes sinister when one reads why Flanagan was motivated to write the book. It obviously was not written to advance a new understanding in order to explain why the native population is in its present position. Rather, to quote Flanagan's own words: "When I came to these conclusions, I knew I had to publish them, especially because of the gathering movement to grant Riel a posthumous pardon in 1985, something which now strikes me as quite wrong." The book has been written to condemn the people again.

Flanagan's supposedly new discoveries are not exactly new; they are his own interpretations of information that has many times before been used. Much of the information that Flanagan refers to has long ago been viewed and analyzed by the Métis political organization in Saskatchewan. It is our contention that Flanagan is choosing and distorting information to suit his own particular point of view.

Interestingly, while conventional history of Riel in 1869-70 and 1885 has been sympathetic, it has not been exactly liberating. For the most part it has been written by conservative and liberal historians. Flanagan's disbelief in the conventional history of Canada can be perceived as being at least a departure from liberalism, if not conventional conservatism. *Riel and the Rebellion* is a work that is, quite frankly, utterly reactionary.

The main areas which Flanagan deals with are: the North West Rebellion, the land question, Riel and his leadership, and the trial. In addition Flanagan deals with the native struggle today in his sec-

tion on the historic basis of aboriginal rights and the posthumous pardon of Riel. The recurrent theme in Flanagan's analysis is the inherent justness of the *growing dominance of European peoples* over the native population in what is now Canada. Although there may have been mistakes and injustices, either bureaucratic or political, such "mistakes" were just difficulties originating from the initial development of an inevitable system. The government of the day was always attempting to overcome their shortcomings, and "justly" resolve the difficulties as they arose. It is the manifest destiny of a superior people and system over a backward people and their economics that Flanagan premises his reconsideration upon. To grieve or resist the "injustices" as they were being imposed was to go against this inherently just, democratic, and superior system.

That could not be tolerated. Retribution was necessary and justifiable, as the resistance was an expression of irresponsibilities. For example, concerning the land question, the settlement of the northwest, and the *systematic expulsion of the Métis* from the land, Flanagan states that, "A highly productive economy was created based on the family farm and the free market... a masterpiece of government doing... within which individual initiative can produce social and economic progress. It was certainly a system whose rules deserved to be enforced and protected for the common benefit of all." A people who were being systematically displaced from any form of livelihood are perceived by Flanagan in their resistance as standing in the way of progress. Their systematic repression was therefore justifiable.

Flanagan portrays the land question as being a conflict between a people and a backward system of land holding standing against a new system of survey and ownership designed for productivity and commercial agriculture. The former was unable to understand or to participate in the

new system. Based upon ignorance, the Métis were unable to see how the new order of things was ultimately of benefit to them. This "incapability of understanding" ultimately became one manifest reason for engaging in the rebellion, and Flanagan argues that, "the minor grievances of the Métis... were not enough to require an armed uprising against the state... the government was already moving to respond to their complaints." This was not the case, however, and if Flanagan were to probe more deeply, he would find that there was a systematic policy of government and large capital exploitation of potential Métis lands, albeit on a "black market" basis. The Métis knew this. Millions of acres of potential Métis lands were fraudulently acquired by large commercial banks (some of which still exist to this day), land companies, and lesser speculators and crooked lawyers, all brandishing Conservative and Liberal party membership. The coalfields around Lethbridge, Alberta were fraudulently acquired by the Galt family through Métis scrip. In fact, as Riel was being tried, the brother of the crown prosecutor, an Osler, was amassing 66,000 acres of Métis lands. Interestingly, the Oslers were connected with the CPR interests.

The North West Rebellion, according to Flanagan, occurred as a result of Riel's self-interested manipulations. Supposedly Riel returned in 1884 and used the situation and the people in order to settle his personal grievances, arising out of the 1869-70 events, with the Canadian government, going so far as to negotiate with the Canadian government to receive a personal bribe. It is one thing to have communication around bribes — depending on who initiates it — but it is another to be actually hanged. There is a great deal more politics to this than just slander. There is no acknowledgement that it was a collective decision to revolt, involving many other levels of leadership and decision-making, among them Dumont as

a leader and strategist of guerrilla warfare. In no real sense does Flanagan portray 1885 as a continued struggle for democracy connected to the struggle and failures of 1869-70. There had been a long on-going struggle against colonialism — both economic and political — by the Métis that had its roots in the free trade struggles of the 1840s, paralleling the Anti-Corn Law agitation in Britain. The events of 1869-70 amounted to an undermined and failed attempt at a democratic revolution, just as the 1837 rebellion in the eastern colonies of the Canadas was a failed effort. Flanagan, by portraying the rebellion in this manner, denies the people as having engaged, and again repeated in 1885, in democratic struggles for independence. To Flanagan, 1885 was a revolt of irresponsibles, manipulated by a selfish and individualistic leader against an inherently just and superior system that was attempting to develop the northwest.

Flanagan's basic ideology is no better expressed than in the section on aboriginal title. It is a section that applies as well to the struggle today. Both historically and currently, aboriginal title or rights is the national question as it pertains to the native population in this country. By attacking it in the past, Flanagan as well attacks the present struggle as being unjustifiable. To Flanagan, the whole question of aboriginal title could only rest within the sovereignty inherent within the British state. In their conquest over the native population, certain rights were imposed or acknowledged by the British as a part of the conquering process, and the extension of control over colonial territory was secured. In short, Flanagan argues the unilateral right of British sovereignty over native peoples in North America as a right of the British due to their "advanced" state and people. To this end Flanagan is an imperialist: he has no concept of the mutuality of different nationalities and the rights of coexistence. The political ideology of Riel, in the for-

mation of Manitoba and the rebellion of 1885, was that an indigenous people had a right to their national territory. That right of national territory would exist in contractual relationship with other national peoples, thus comprising the federal state and the sovereignty of the nation. Sovereignty is not the right of one people to dominate another. Flanagan is critically opposed to Riel's ideology as being overly radical.

Finally, Flanagan is both overt and covert in his expressions of racism. The "rebellion" at Frog Lake is depicted as being a massacre by savages. Yet, in the aftermath of Batoche, the Canadian troops are depicted as marching in an orderly fashion, the symbolic frontrunners of civilization and democracy. Flanagan's racism is subtly expressed by his arguing that democracy and national rights (sovereignty) can only exist within "advanced" European society. Non-Europeans have no rights other than what is accorded to them as the result of their domination. It is the superiority of the "white" and the "inferiority" of the native that is constantly being portrayed throughout *Riel and the Rebellion*.

Riel and the Rebellion is at best an untenable misrepresentation of history. But to deal with it as such is to miss its real intent. Flanagan has written a book that is a condemnation of a people and their struggle for democracy and national rights. There is a continuing struggle to make this country more democratic. Flanagan is opposed. Although the author states that it is based upon a detailed analysis and new facts, that is not the case. Much of the information has been consistently reviewed. It is Flanagan's analysis that is new, but only insofar as it reaches back to an old reaction. It is a further condemnation of a people that have historically been subjugated in this country.

There is a parallel here with the situation of Keegstra in Alberta. There, the holocaust against the Jewish people by

Nazism has been depicted as not occurring, seen as a fabrication and manipulation by the Jewish people themselves. Flanagan's book, so willing to blame Riel and the Métis for the carnage of 1869-70 and 1885, serves a similar purpose. At a time of high unemployment, economic crisis, and mounting racial tensions, *Riel and the Rebellion* will only fan the flames of racism. Unfortunately, it is a study that will be referred to as a book written by a scholar.

Ron Bourgeault
Association of Métis
and Non-Status Indians
of Saskatchewan

Howard Palmer, *Patterns of Prejudice: A History of Nativism in Alberta* (Toronto: McLelland and Stewart 1982).

RACISM HAS NEVER been a very popular subject in Canadian history and, until quite recently, few school textbooks or scholarly works dealt with the problem adequately. There is, as Howard Palmer notes in his introduction, a view that "Canada is a mosaic where ethnic groups have lived together in harmony, each cherishing its distinctive way of life."

Fortunately, there is another school of thought emerging. It argues, in Palmer's words, that "there has been a strong current of prejudice and racism in Canadian national life." This more accurate portrayal of Canada's ugly history of racism has been painted by such bestsellers as *None Is Too Many*, scholarly books like W. Peter Ward's *White Canada Forever*, bold, new textbooks such as Daniel G. Hill's *The Freedom-Seekers*, and other accounts written by Japanese Canadians, blacks, Chinese Canadians, and other victims of inequality.

Patterns of Prejudice, by University of Calgary associate professor of history Howard Palmer, is a useful addition to this literature. Palmer defines nativism as

"opposition to an internal minority on the grounds that it posed a threat to Canadian national life." This definition allows him to analyze both racism towards non-whites and prejudice towards minority ethnic or religious groups. In a clear, easy flowing but serious style, Palmer provides an insightful overview of the various periods and targets of racism in Alberta.

From 1880 until 1920, as the province was settled, the basic patterns of prejudice were set (mainly against central and eastern European immigrants, racial minorities such as the Chinese and blacks, religious groups like the Doukhobors, and immigrants seen as dangerous revolutionaries); nativism waned in the immediate post-war years; a new influx of immigrants sparked the emergence of groups devoted to nativism in the late 1920s; and the depression of the 1930s initially turned a desperate population against many immigrants.

In tracing the development of nativism in these four periods, Palmer reveals some disturbing parts of our history. Regardless of the prevailing winds of public opinion, the small Chinese and black minorities always seemed to endure particularly violent or blatant racism. Palmer also shows that groups like the Canadian Ku Klux Klan gained significant strength on the Prairies (5,000-7,000 members in Alberta alone) and enjoyed influential connections with business people and politicians. And despite the presence of only 4,000 Jews in Alberta in the 1930s, the Social Credit Party and Premier William Aberhart were guilty of some thinly-veiled anti-Semitism.

Palmer also challenges some stereotypes. He argues that "contrary to conventional wisdom, there was no clear relationship between economic prosperity or depression and the rise and fall of nativism." For example, when recession hit the Canadian economy after World War I, Alberta still found itself chronically short of labour: "in the eyes of many Canadian businessmen throughout the

early twenties, immigrants were still needed as farmers, farm labourers and railway workers." Here was a case where — contrary to the left-wing stereotype of capitalists allying with reactionary politicians to wage an anti-immigrant crusade — business people found themselves on the other side of the fence. (Not for altruistic reasons, of course; immigrants meant a steady supply of income for railways and cheap labour for groups like the Alberta beet growers.) And, when the Great Depression hit, the ruling élite opposed immigrants as much for political reasons (the "dangerous Reds") as for economic ones.

If Palmer's book is revealing in its description of nativism in Alberta, and probing in its study of the nature of prairie prejudice, it is somewhat disappointing in its analysis of the roots of racism in general. Palmer concludes his book by saying that "the three most important long-term factors in determining the shape of ethnic relations in Alberta were the prevailing ideas about race, ethnicity and nationalism, the 'visibility' and degree of cultural distinctiveness of ethnic minorities, and the position of non-Anglo-Saxons within the class structure." Is this analysis really helpful enough? To some degree, it is a tautology. To say that racism in Canada rises or declines because of the popularity of racist ideas or the number of visible non-whites in the country may be true, but not very insightful.

Important questions need to be asked: what powers help mould the prevailing ideas of society? How and why is the flow of immigration to Canada controlled? What forces determine the ethnic make-up of our class structure? Surely the ruling circles in society — business, government, church, and media leaders — have more influence on these factors than working men and women. True, people on the bottom of the social scale are often more overtly racist than society's rulers, but that does not necessarily absolve the

power brokers of the major responsibility for spreading racism.

Palmer's book has the merit of showing that nativism was not the preserve of the rich: anti-immigrant stands were championed by many labour organizations, for example. But the facts in his book also demonstrate — and this is not brought out clearly enough in the conclusion — that time and again the ruling powers of society influenced patterns of prejudice. In 1920, for instance, one of the more influential pro-immigration groups in Alberta, according to Palmer, was the Western Canada Colonization Association — "organized by a number of prominent westerners with eastern financial backing" and made up of "some of Alberta's most prominent businessmen and politicians." By the end of the decade, Palmer shows how many politicians and the press were denouncing immigrants for stealing Canadians' jobs and planning political subversion.

Without falling into the facile analysis of some Marxists who see racism simply as a conspiracy of the bosses to divide the workers (in fact, Palmer shows how in many cases employers, politicians, and other leaders were *divided* over the nativism issue), it is possible to make some kind of class analysis of the origins and promotion of nativism and racism. Palmer's book begins to provide the data for that analysis, but not the framework.

Patterns of Prejudice remains, nonetheless, a powerful addition to our understanding of nativism as a crucial socio-economic and political problem. In the author's words, this study will help people "become more aware of the absurdities and injustices to which racism and nativism lead."

Julian Sher
Montreal

Lynne Bowen, *Boss Whistle: The Coal Miners of Vancouver Island Remember* (Lantzville, B.C.: Oolichan Books 1982).

The most tyrannical of all bosses was the boss whistle. It told a miner when to come to work and when he could go home. Its strident voice could be heard when a doctor was needed to help an injured man and it roared continuously when an explosion took the lives of men. The boss whistle was silent when the Big Strike closed the mines; it bided its time and then sounded again defiantly as it called scabs to work in place of union men. When the coal markets began to die, the boss whistle assumed even greater powers. Families listened each day for its voice, their livelihood depending on its message. One whistle — work tomorrow. Two whistles — another day without work. And when a retired miner stopped on the street to check his watch with the twelve noon whistle from the mine he was acknowledging the life long influence of the Boss Whistle. (22-3)

THOSE WHO EXPECT to find new material about the internal workings of the Western Federation of Miners or the United Mine Workers of America, about socialist or labour politics, about the corporate strategies of Robert Dunsmuir and Sons or any of the other companies which mined coal on Vancouver Island, should not look here. As Lynne Bowen's near lyrical description of "Boss Whistle" suggests, this is the story of the miners and their families as they remember it.

Boss Whistle represents a remarkable community project. In 1978 Myrtle Bergren, who in *Tough Timber* (Toronto: Progress Books 1967) had chronicled the efforts of her husband and others to organize the International Woodworkers of America on Vancouver Island, initiated the Coal Tyee Project. This enterprise drew together members of the Malaspina College faculty and the Nanaimo branch of the British Columbia Old Age Pensioners who assisted in undertaking interviews and raising money. After Mrs. Bergren's death in an automobile accident, the society appointed Lynne Bowen to draw on the 130 hours of typed interviews already

collected, and to do additional research in government documents, contemporary newspapers, and an assortment of secondary sources. As well, a cartographer, Gary Crocker, drew eight maps providing a clear reference to the eleven mining communities examined. Thus, while the miners do speak for themselves, Bowen has fleshed out the background and deftly edited the oral sources to create a lively account of the lives of Vancouver Island coal miners from 1900 until the closing of the last mine in 1960.

Coal mining was not an easy job. Not only were the mines dark, damp, and smelly, but the narrowness of some coal seams meant the miners often worked on their knees or their bellies. Sore knees and stiff legs, however, were relatively minor problems; many miners were permanently maimed or lost their lives in underground accidents: cave-ins, floods, and explosions. Accidents were sometimes blamed unfairly on the Chinese but often occurred because miners, who were paid by the ton produced, took short cuts; because mine managers gave inadequate attention to the different scales on maps of abandoned mines and caused breakthrough floods of stagnant water; and because of a natural problem, the gassy nature of the mines. Whatever the immediate cause, the popular belief, if not the findings of coroners' inquests, was that the companies, especially Robert Dunsmuir and Sons, were often to blame. As late as 1909, that company gambled that the apparent wetness and low gas level of its Extension Mine would permit the use of open flame lamps rather than the more costly safety lamps and allow miners, rather than specially trained shot-lighters, to fire blasting shots. Thirty-two men died on that occasion. Similarly, the Dunsmuir mines did not require miners to work in pairs so help was not always at hand if a miner injured himself. The Dunsmuirs, however, were not alone in taking chances with miners' lives. At Cumberland, long after the Dunsmuirs had sold their interests, an

over-extended ventilation system contributed to an explosion which killed eighteen men and seriously injured sixteen others.

In an effort to reduce accidents caused by excessive gas, the provincial Coal Mines Regulation Act of 1911 authorized the appointment of gas committees. When Oscar Mottishaw, a member of such a committee at Extension, reported gas to Canadian Collieries, he soon found himself out of work. By choosing to find employment at the company's Cumberland mine where the United Mine Workers had been organizing, he may, Bowen suggests, have been seeking confrontation. His dismissal from the Cumberland mine set off the events leading to the strike of 1912.

In describing this "emotional high point in the life of any twentieth century Vancouver Island coal miner," (131) Bowen argues that "the union, the companies and the government were disproportionately powerful when compared to the miners." (198) Since this is the miners' own story, the account is particularly strong in explaining how the strikers' families "made do" by supplementing strike pay with hunting and garden produce, how women raised money through benefit dances and concerts, and how the women, who had always feared for their husbands' lives in the mines, petitioned the premier for the release of imprisoned strikers and themselves picketed against scabs. Tension caused by the presence of imported and local strikebreakers eventually led to riots in the summer of 1913 and the year-long presence of the militia. In the longer run, though the strike "nurtured a co-operative spirit in Nanaimo," (197) it also left a lifelong bitterness that even divided families.

Yet, the story is not filled with accidents and strikes. Bowen's informants recall happy events such as picnics and soccer matches. They recollect the abundance of bars and beer parlours and, though no one would admit to having been a patron, of red light districts.

Another separate community within most of the mining centres was a Chinatown and, at Cumberland, a "Jap" and "Coon" town as well. Because the Chinese worked for lower wages, were effectively bound to their employers, and were convenient scapegoats for accidents, they were decidedly unpopular. As the lone Chinese interviewee explained, "we were individually praised [as skillful workers] but collectively hated." (74)

Oral history gives the reader a sense of immediacy but it does have problems. The oral historian, even more than the historian who relies on traditional written sources, is plagued by the fallibility of the human memory. When stories are in conflict — as they inevitably are, especially over controversial subjects — Bowen wisely presents the several sides of the story. She also appears to have eliminated most factual errors though a few have slipped through. Since British Columbia had a provincial police force until the 1940s, it is unlikely, for example, that the RCMP enforced provincial liquor laws in the 1920s. (67)

More significantly, by interviewing only residents of Vancouver Island, the Coal Tyee Society may have glossed over some of the problems related to the decline of the industry. Was the closing of the mines so gradual and the expansion of forest-related industries so timely that there was little economic dislocation? Or, is this factor obscured by the fact that those who left Vancouver Island are not represented in the interviews? Nevertheless, as *Boss Whistle* so poignantly records, many miners and their families remained on Vancouver Island long after the tyrannical "Boss Whistle" was no longer heard.

Patricia E. Roy
University of Victoria

Patricia Marchak, *Green Gold: The Forest Industry in British Columbia* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press 1983).

PUBLISHED IN THE midst of an almost cataclysmic depression in the British Columbia forest industry, Patricia Marchak's study, *Green Gold*, is timely and well worth reading. The book is structured into three parts: "Capital," "Labour," and "Communities." The three are linked together within a theoretical framework of staples dependency.

In "Capital," Marchak establishes the theoretical basis of the study, gives a brief post-war history of the industry focusing largely on government policy and discussing the impact of the Pearse Royal Commission and the subsequent 1978 Forest Act, particularly in terms of access to timber, and outlines the structure of an industry increasingly dominated by large, extra-provincial conglomerates.

In part two, "Labour," which contains the bulk of her original research, she determines that the "human capital" theory ("the more capital the worker provides, the more income, job security, job control, and job status the employer gives") is less appropriate to an understanding of a resource labour force than a theory of social class. (117) We learn that varying conditions of work and job security in different forestry sectors are linked not simply to size of firm, but more importantly, to levels of capital investment (higher in pulp and paper) and variability of market demand (greater in sawmilling and logging, less among foreign-owned subsidiaries). In a chapter entitled "Employment Conditions for Women in Resource Towns," Marchak argues that family status is the most important factor in female labour force participation. But when employed, women are relegated largely to non-surplus producing, low-wage, bureaucratic, and public sector jobs, ancillary to productive enterprise, while at the same time conveniently producing the next generation of production workers.

In two chapters comprising the heart of this section, the author analyzes workers' perceptions of job control, security,

and satisfaction with respect to the different forestry sectors. Satisfaction varies with perception of control, but perceptions of security remain independent of levels of job control. The more secure the worker (in pulp and paper, for example), the stronger the commitment to the dominant ideology of liberal individualism — not surprising, but useful to have documented.

Part three, "Communities," offers a comparative study of two resource-based communities: an instant company town, Mackenzie, and an old logging town, Terrace. In both cases we find economic dependency on external capital and lack of community control over economic decision-making. Though the old logging town has a more significant local elite, real power over the disposal of capital resides elsewhere.

The book concludes with a thorough summary and suggested policies for an economic revitalization of what Marchak sees in British Columbia as an ailing, dependent economy. Included among these are radical changes in harvesting rights to break the monopoly of the giants, a government marketing board for smaller firms, an effective programme of reforestation, government promotion of research and development leading to economic diversification, and establishment of small-scale, decentralized, labour-intensive, community-based secondary industries under workers' control.

Marchak's most notable contribution in this book is her criticism, at a particularly crucial point in British Columbia's economic history, of the myth of the benefits of the large firm. Since the two Sloan Royal Commission reports of 1945 and 1956, she argues, bigness has been clearly linked to job creation and job security in the minds of politicians and union leaders, though increasingly less so among the population of British Columbia resource towns. The crisis of the early 1980s, which put 30-40 per cent of forestry employees out of work, devastated

numerous mill towns and permanently closed others, has called for a serious re-evaluation of the veneration of large corporate units. Marchak quite explicitly questions, in particular, the complacent acceptance by International Woodworkers of America leaders of policy decisions, most recently the 1978 Forest Act, that have helped place a handful of large and mainly extra-provincial corporations in control of most of the province's accessible timber. These policies have led the province into a classic "staples trap," from which it can emerge, Marchak argues, only through a fundamental change in approach to economic development.

Marchak is a committed and active New Democrat, and a politically-minded educator whose two previous books on corporate control and ideology in Canada are valuable tools in teaching college and university undergraduates an alternative perspective on Canadian political economy. In *Green Gold*, however, she departs from the course-book format in favour of a more specialized academic study, the core of which is an extensive sociological dissection of a staples labour force. After a very readable and stimulating first section, she leads us into a morass of empirical data and statistical methodology out of which we emerge with the main argument on staples dependency seriously obscured. This problem arises, in part, from her stated objective. The book serves, incidentally, as an implied "critique of current government legislation and investment priorities." Mainly, though, it is intended "to increase the amount of information available" for the general public, forestry workers, and students of political economy "about the nature of a staples economy." (27) Much of Marchak's work on a staples labour force is new and interesting. Some of it seemingly arises out of the social scientist's passion for proving beyond a shadow of an empirical doubt what would appear to many readers as

self-evident. But in the end, the information she wants to make available on labour in a staples economy is not properly integrated into her larger theoretical framework of staples dependency.

The relationships she draws among job control, satisfaction, security, and attachment to an ideology of liberal individualism are not necessarily peculiar to a staples economy, and they are certainly not shown to be so in this book. Many of the conditions she identifies among workers in the instant resource town of Mackenzie may also be found in towns characterized by a higher degree of secondary manufacturing elsewhere in Canada. If the problem is lack of diversification, that too is not peculiar to a staple-exporting region. As the multinationals organize and rationalize production on a regional basis, Canada's industrial heartland experiences both de-industrialization and over-specialization. As well, both resource-dependent and the more industrialized regions of Canada experience regularly the devastating impact of fluctuating world markets on levels of employment and government revenues, though in this regard resource-dependent regions such as British Columbia may be somewhat more vulnerable.

It is, no doubt, valuable to gain more information on relative levels of job security, safety, wages, and commitment to prevailing ideology and culture among male and female workers in the different sectors of British Columbia's forest economy. To give this information meaning, with respect to her theoretical framework, we need some comparison also with the condition of a manufacturing labour force in a dependent and semi-peripheral economy such as Canada's. While we learn much about workers in a staples economy from Marchak's study, we are not certain that the nature of this work force and this economy differs substantially from that in central Canada. This uncertainty leads us to question the relevancy of the distinct categories, "staples economy" and

"staples labour force," within the broader context of the multinational organization of production and distribution by capital.

In *Green Gold*, Marchak succeeds eloquently in her critique of current government legislation and investment priorities. In terms of her book's real intention — to explore the nature of a staples economy — we need not only information, but a clearer presentation of how these data identify the nature of a staples economy as a distinct economic and social structure.

Stephen Gray
Simon Fraser University

J.L. Granatstein, I. Abella, D. Bercuson, R.C. Brown, and H.B. Neatby, *Twentieth Century Canada* (Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson 1983).

HERE IS A REASSURING BOOK. Five prominent historians, with all the advantages of speed, perspective, knowledge, and specialized research that numbers provide, have put their heads together and managed to produce a very pleasing survey of twentieth-century Canada without upsetting any of the norms of Canadian historical writing. History, this book tells us once again, is past politics and the actors are men. The text is therefore full of familiar faces and events with a plentiful selection of attractive illustrations and written in the sober, judicious tone of historians without a cause.

As for the newcomers on the historical scene, they are present and they are by no means unwelcome. Workers, immigrants, civil servants, French Canadians, and even women have unusual prominence in this book. Indeed, the first four merit entire chapters, the one on immigration being a model of integrative historical writing. Government attitudes to radical labour and political groups, for example, make much more sense in the context of the immigration experience. And on occasion the author allows us to glimpse Canada through the eyes of the immigrants

themselves. The picture is not quite that of the other chapters. But on the whole these historical newcomers do not make much of difference; neither the history nor the telling of it is altered by their presence. For their significance occurs primarily when they impinge upon the political process and their lack of integration shows up in the many repetitions throughout the book. But perhaps that is just one of the hazards of a multi-authored book with the "coordinating author" unable to rein in his headstrong colleagues.

The difficulties involved in integrating new topics and new approaches are best illustrated in the authors' treatment of women. Their choice, I presume a deliberate one, not to devote a separate chapter to women, was probably wise. And their effort — albeit a self-conscious one — to tuck women into the account rather than tack them on is laudable. They are even sensitive to the limited opportunities available to women in Canadian society. But had they asked why, and had they attempted a separate chapter, they would have encountered a history so different as to raise disturbing questions about their own approach. *Twentieth Century Canada* would become instead the institutions, attitudes, and interactions of some powerful men over the past 80 years. An ungainly title, a still significant topic, but not yet a total history. Doubtless, however, historical attitudes are as hard to shake as social attitudes. These authors can still calmly use Underhill's definition of a nation as "a body of *men* who have done great things together in the past . . ." And for all their valiant attempt to mention women, the authors are still burdened with some odd notions about them: women still appear as symbols, as entertainment, as sources of scandal, or as beneficiaries of male protection. Meanwhile, workers, immigrants, and farmers are men. Had the authors known a bit more women's history they would have been less sanguine and more accurate about family allowances. The cheques *did*

go to Quebec mothers, thanks to the intervention of Thérèse Casgrain. One of the motives, very clearly stated by the architects of the allowances but not by the authors, was to remove women from the paid labour force after the war. And it is surely impertinent to suggest that women were liberated by the \$5 monthly allowance (Virginia Woolf in the 1920s knew it took at least £500 annually and a room of one's own).

All of which is merely to say that political history is alive and well and living in the minds of some of the most outspoken critics of political intervention into academe. The book made for fascinating reading during an election campaign. The issues are all there, well embedded in Canada's past: patronage, the business-government link, the growth of the bureaucracy, regionalism, and relations with the United States. The book should be compulsory reading for politicians themselves, as well as for students of political science, history, and even Canadian Studies. They'll all enjoy it.

Susan Mann Trofimenkoff
University of Ottawa

Marion Royce, *Eunice Dyke: Health Care Pioneer* (Toronto and Charlottetown: Dundurn Press 1983).

EUNICE DYKE: Health Care Pioneer is both a biography of Eunice Dyke and a study of public health nursing in Toronto in the first several decades of the twentieth century. By focusing on an individual central to its growth, Marion Royce has been able to trace the changing foci of public health concerns. As a result several significant themes in the history of health care emerge: the dynamic between cure and prevention; the interplay between national and international developments; the rise in medical specialization; and the role of nurses in the health care system. *All touched the life of Eunice Dyke.*

Eunice Dyke was raised in Toronto and, as many young women in the late

nineteenth century did, she chose to go to normal school and teach. This provided her with an income and time to decide what she really wanted to do. She determined it was nursing and in 1905 entered the John Hopkins Training School for Nurses in Baltimore, one of the top schools on the continent. After graduating in 1909 she nursed privately, took care of a terminally ill aunt, and then in 1911 was hired to help in the care of tuberculosis cases in Toronto, thus beginning her long association with the Health Department of that city. Due to lack of manuscript sources, little is known of her personal life and so it is her public life which Marion Royce concentrates on and, while this perhaps works against an understanding of Dyke, it does favour an understanding of the crucial years of public health nursing in this country.

Toronto was in the forefront of public health activity and nurses were the heart of that offensive. They were the ones who were on the spot and who could gauge what the needs of the populace were. By 1915, as head of the nursing division, Eunice Dyke had 37 public health nurses under her and by 1931, 115. During these years nursing responsibilities expanded greatly. At first only tuberculosis cases came under their purview. Soon added to this was child welfare and by the 1920s few areas escaped their jurisdiction. By then nursing efforts were more organized and systematic, with cooperation occurring among the schools and the social welfare agencies. There was no doubt that nurses were the key to the success or failure of the public health movement for they were the public representatives of the middle-class morality that it espoused. They were the spearhead of intervention in the lives of their patients. They freely entered homes and freely gave out advice. They even became public watchdogs, for in 1914 they were given the responsibility of investigating cases of illness among civic employees in what seems to have been an attempt to cut down on absen-

teism. Needless to say, the employees were not consulted (neither were the nurses).

Because the focus of the book is on the professional life of Eunice Dyke, it is her public personality which is visible, and unfortunately this only emerges in work-related disputes. As a result, a rather negative view of her relationships with others is depicted. At times she appears to be rather insensitive to the needs and weaknesses of those around her. For example, to help improve the status of her nurses, she consistently encouraged them to upgrade their education. Eventually this caused some dismay, since she tended to link promotional opportunities to education and thus alienated those who were rich in experience after years of service with the department but weak in educational certificates. In 1923 she was invited by the League of Red Cross Societies to spend some months as a consultant on public health nursing in Paris and London. It was not a particularly successful trip due to divisions within the league and personality clashes for which she was not responsible but to which she was not particularly sensitive. But the real problem came when her mentor Dr. Hastings, the medical officer of the Health Department, retired and was replaced by another. To the new man, she posed a threat. She was knowledgeable. As the Paris trip had indicated, she had an excellent reputation and was well known in the field and she was sure of herself. All combined in a petty incident which led to her dismissal in 1932. It was a major crisis in her life and it took her some time to get over it. Fortunately, she had the help of a Rockefeller fellowship immediately after her firing to soothe her hurt feelings. Unfortunately, this was followed by a disastrous six-month stint as secretary of the Division in Maternity and Child Hygiene of the Canadian Council on Child and Family Welfare. Warned by friends and colleagues alike that she and the head, Charlotte Whitton, would not get along, she per-

sisted in taking the job. By 1935 she was again unemployed, with little to do. Not interested in accepting a well-earned retirement, she took up a new cause — the elderly. Beginning on a volunteer basis, she eventually founded in 1937 the Second Mile Club in Toronto, the first senior citizens' group in Canada; she remained director of it until her retirement in 1947. It was her efforts which helped bring the plight of the elderly to public view.

Eunice Dyke: Health Care Pioneer is not a standard biography or a history of public health nursing. Rather it is an amalgam of the two. Each plays off the other and each adds a dimension which the other by itself could not offer.

Wendy Mitchinson
University of Windsor

Jonathan Prude, *The Coming of Industrial Order: Town and Factory Life in Rural Massachusetts, 1810-1860* (New York: Cambridge University Press 1983).

SAMUEL SLATER, THE "Arkwright of America," opened a water-powered cotton mill in 1813 in an obscure pocket of south-central Massachusetts. By 1860 the erstwhile agrarian society and economy of the towns of Dudley and Oxford had been transformed to the extent that several textile mills employing hundreds of operatives had come to flavour and even define the character of the local society. Moreover, parts of the towns of Dudley and Oxford had been detached to form the autonomous and "industrial" town of Webster. Before 1810, the area's social structure had been shaped by a highly localized subsistence agricultural economy that was little changed in organization and function from the conventions of 1750. On the eve of the Civil War industrial "order," by its very force, had swept away the eighteenth-century agrarianism of this rural enclave, and had replaced it with a new definition of rural economy, labour, and community.

The transition from traditional to "modern" society provides an intellectual paradigm that inspires and informs social historians. Jonathan Prude has discovered a striking example of that transition in the history of nineteenth-century Massachusetts. To be sure, he begins with and expands on existing studies of rural industrialization in ante-bellum New England. But in this book there is no "hidden hand" shaping the new social landscape. Rather, there is an old-fashioned causal agent in the person of Samuel Slater, who in many respects propels Prude's subject. Slater was the quintessential eighteenth-century English industrial entrepreneur. He had learned his technical, managerial, and accounting skills from a giant of the English textile revolution, Jedediah Strutt, who was himself a partner of Richard Arkwright. Slater came to America in 1789, in time to heed the Hamiltonian call for industrial competency and growth. After 20 years, Slater had a well-established reputation as a stealthy replicator of Arkwright's technology and Strutt's model of organized capital and labour in textile production. Despite considerable success in coastal Rhode Island, further enterprise for Slater eventually became limited by competition and with problems in partnerships. He responded by setting out on his own, and took his ambitions, experience, and capital to a site that offered accessible water power, an available and pliant labour pool, and an accommodating — if skeptical — local political authority. Labour was drawn from the underemployed rural workers and unpropertied offspring of subsistence farmers, and it was attracted to the textile manufactories by the promise of increased employment and income. In time, those original "informal" factory workers would become, or be replaced by, a full-time class of mill operatives drawn from all over the New England region.

But Prude's study is not solely a "labour history," and the analysis of a

vocationally defined group is but one component of his multi-layered and shrewdly integrated thesis. His book is a well-researched and thorough synthesis of local and social history that incorporates the themes of labour, community, business, and politics. Prude's obvious concern is to gauge the effects of industrialism — in their widest implications — on a traditional pastoral community. In that way this case study of Oxford, Dudley, and Webster deals with the multiple consequences of *imposed* change and the "conflicts," "tensions," and "frictions" of the clash of systems: one old and one new; one agrarian and one industrial. Like many social historians, Prude uses the motor of "conflict" to make history move and change. But he also shows, in this example, that even conflict can transform a society with a minimum of *crisis*. Certainly if one is to compare Prude's rural New England with studies made of similar phenomena in Europe, and elsewhere in America, it is remarkable to see how smoothly rural New England adapted to industrialism.

Prude notes that the various conflicts resulted in permanent changes in the rhythms and purposes of work habits, and set standards for the new employer-employee relationships. He encloses those observations in his demonstration of a shift in basic economic and domestic values and in the eventual socio-political reformation of rural community life. He divides his time frame into two distinct and useful segments: a first and formative generation that flows nicely into a second and mature generation. He provides notes on preconditions and an extended legacy by way of setting his study within a longer continuum. The result is a plausible development of change over time, from one set of social conditions to a distinctive new order. In that way Prude the historian enlivens the methodologies of economics and sociology. What he shows, in the end, is a significant revolution in the social

organization and values of ante-bellum rural New England.

In 1810, 70 per cent of the study's population derived all or most of its income from agriculture. In 1860 only 30 per cent did so. The extended effects of that crucial statistic include an enlarged and diversified economy, including inter-related commerce associated with the presence of mills. Furthermore, there was a working population that can be described as "industrial" which had been liberated from the closed economy of agrarianism. The resulting new labour, entrepreneurial and managerial status, and mobility sharpen the contrast with the near static agrarian world of 1810. Indeed, the textile economy had thrust local society into a wide, regional labour and market orbit even before railways reached the Massachusetts hinterland. Prude's recurring motif of social tension, labour resistance, and political conflict is the kinetic force behind the "coming of industrial order." *But this study can also be seen as a case of tentative adaptation to economic alternatives that were made available to a society that was amenable to change.*

The very comprehensiveness of Prude's approach means that his book should appeal to a variety of specialist historians with interests in labour, community studies, business history, and local political and institutional history. For the social history generalist the study will demonstrate the value of the transitional model, and should remind all social historians of the compatibility of literary and statistical sources. Prude not only convinces the reader of the fact of a transition but shows with clarity and precision *how* that transition occurred. The informal, personalized, and paternalistic regime of the first generation of mill society grafted itself to an existing agrarian environment and then proceeded to a more sterile, efficient, regimented, and managerial ethic by the second generation. Prude's discussion of the reaction of workers to the standardized labour discipline of textile

production is made especially vivid because the author understands the familial and neighbourly contacts, and seasonal irregularities that underlay eighteenth-century agrarian work practices. In fact, the various overt forms of worker resistance (always short of violence) to regulated tasks and "work days," reminds the reader of the vestigial power of rural attitudes to work, even if, in the end, the factory discipline prevailed.

Prude is at his best in delineating the post-Samuel Slater shift from paternalistic industrialism to a profit-dictated set of managerial-labour relations, and the ideological consequences of that change. It is here that the author catches the most significant meaning of rural industrialization in nineteenth-century America. At the level of community politics, the actions of a business-industrial élite of owners and managers finally broke down the political system that had been bequeathed by the eighteenth-century local grandees. The convergence of civic politics with industrial priorities successfully competed with the older socio-religious purposes of town government and created a new corporate politics that included an influential industrial plurality. Prude's discussions of the political wars that were fought over education, suffrage, and public works issues are each capable of sustaining further research.

Studies similar to Prude's abound in the social history literature of Britain, France, and North America. The impact of rural industrialization, especially in the standardized manufacturing of textiles, has received much scholarly attention. Yet Prude shows the further possibilities that are available to the historian who can integrate the study of industrial innovation with the many threads of social history. In the first place, he tempts the reader to compare New England's experience with examples of rural industrialization anywhere. Also, he suggests that by examining *how* the indus-

trialization of rural America occurred, we may see more clearly the cultural traditions of American society and how those traditions affected, or were modified by the early industrial revolution. For example, Prude implies that changes in the ethnic composition of mill populations meant that Irish and Québécois immigrants were providing a mudsill stratum that afforded native-born industrial workers opportunities for geographical and vocational mobility that had not been available to unskilled and unmonied agricultural workers. Prude's findings on the mills' worker turnover (it reached 100 per cent a year in some cases) and on high levels of residential transiency, tell us a great deal about the local and immediate social effects of rural industrialism, but those findings also add to our knowledge of the generation that rode the first wave of Manifest Destiny. And in a period of American history dominated by continental expansionism, Jacksonian politics, and the crises of sectionalism, it is of some importance to note the profound changes that were occurring in older, local, rural American society. As the locus of American agriculture was moving west, Prude's book shows us that a new definition of community was emerging in northeastern society in the wake of its departure. That new society was a portentous conjunction of factory and farm, and capitalism and community.

Eric G. Nellis
University of
British Columbia

Michael B. Katz, *Poverty and Policy in American History* (New York: Academic Press 1983).

MICHAEL KATZ IN his new book calls for a break from the institutional analysis of welfare and dependency that has hitherto dominated the field. He argues instead that this history must be rewritten from

the bottom up through local case studies and that welfare policy must be viewed as integral to the history of American capitalism. The result is an important, often stimulating work, but one which also promises more than it delivers.

The title of the book suggests a survey or comprehensive study of welfare throughout American history. In fact, the book is a series of loosely-connected case studies of poorhouse policy in the state of New York in the late nineteenth century. Almost all the studies are heavily quantitative, revolving around re-analyses of nineteenth-century data on poorhouse inmates. In the book Katz stresses two themes: that dependency in all its forms was a structural feature of working-class life, and that there was a glaring discrepancy between the true sources of pauperism and its perception in contemporary social thought. It is the second theme which is developed most forcefully.

Unlike insane asylums or schools, there is no written history of the American poorhouse, despite the fact that it touched more lives than most nineteenth-century public institutions. The poorhouse was the major alternative that destitute or unemployed people had to charity, then known as "outdoor relief." Intended from the beginning to be a deterrent to idleness rather than an institution for reform, poorhouse conditions were almost always terrible.

In three studies, which constitute the core of the book, Katz tests the arguments of the movement for scientific charity which transformed welfare policy in the late nineteenth century against the facts of poorhouse life. Scientific charity, Katz argues, appeared as a response to a social crisis stemming from an increase in dependency, a breakdown in the deferential relations between classes, and a rise in capital-labour conflict. The solution, said reformers, lay in the abolition of outdoor relief, which demoralized the poor, and the centralization of charity under Charity

Organization Societies, whose visitors would detect fraud, promote the independence of the poor, and prevent charity from becoming an entitlement. If this seems similar to contemporary welfare reform, Katz stresses the dreary fact that American welfare reform has always been "mean-spirited."

Charles Hoyt, secretary of the New York State Board of Charities, was an advocate of this new policy. In 1874-5 he compiled the first "scientific" study of the almshouse population. His conclusion, that pauperism was caused by idleness, intemperance, and imprudence, and that these character defects were inherited, served to reinforce the shift away from the humanitarian reform impulses of the ante-bellum period and to legitimize the harshness of scientific charity.

After reviewing Hoyt's own questionnaires, Katz finds that his decisions in setting up the study pre-determined his conclusions. For example, Hoyt's sample was taken only from the long-term residents of the state's poorhouses, excluding the mass of temporary inmates. The sample also included inmates of the state's insane asylums. Hoyt classed any degree of alcohol use as "intemperance." In short, Hoyt found what he wanted: objective evidence for what everyone already believed. In contrast to Hoyt's conclusions, Katz finds that what differentiated long-term residents of almshouses from the rest of the working class was not any particular character defect or heredity, but simply the lack of grown children to support them in times of distress. Katz comes to similar conclusions when he makes a retrospective examination of Frederic Wine's study of the "dependent, defective, and delinquent" populations of the United States in volume 21 of the 1880 U.S. Census.

Katz concludes his assault on the ideology of nineteenth-century social observers with a study of 5,000 questionnaires distributed to tramps by the New York State Board of Charities in 1875. Never before tabulated and analyzed, the

questionnaires, according to Katz, constitute the largest and most complete body of information about the tramp population in the 1870s. Again, the results are used to invalidate the stereotypical view of tramps. Only a small majority — 55 per cent — were foreign-born and few of these were recent immigrants. More interesting is the fact that most tramps claimed to have craft skills. Of the various ethnic groups, only among the Irish did the majority call themselves labourers. Indeed, the skill breakdown was similar to that of the 1870s working class. Katz concludes that tramps were unlucky casualties of working-class life rather than a degenerate sub-stratum outside civilized society as feared by contemporaries.

The uncovering and re-analysis by Katz of the New York poorhouse and tramp data is undoubtedly an important contribution to a social history of the late nineteenth-century working class. Nonetheless, by using the data mainly to test contemporary images of the poor, Katz has limited its value. Despite the current political assault on public welfare, few modern historians would accept nineteenth-century characterization of the poor at face value. More interesting would have been an extended examination of the ways in which a revised view of tramps and poorhouse inmates illuminates the nature of nineteenth-century capitalism and the shape of class relations in a particular locale. Katz has important observations on this point. Thus, he argues that the shift in the 1870s to a repressive welfare policy was a conscious, class-related choice. Yet, there is no real examination of how this took place in New York.

This is ironic given the author's criticisms of the works of other authors on the same topic. In the last 60 pages of text, Katz offers an extended critique of the historiography on dependent populations and institutional policy towards them, giving special attention to the works of Paul Boyer, David Rothman, Roy Lubove, and Frances Fox Piven and Richard Cloward. It

is not possible to do justice here to these detailed critiques. It must suffice to say that Katz argues persuasively that all previous studies have been limited, either in failing to relate public and private responses to dependence, by their giving too much attention to the ideology of reformers and the practice of institutions, while viewing inmates as passive victims; or finally by what Katz calls, "the neglect of fine grained analyses of the politics and administration of public welfare on the state and local level." Though Katz's work falls short of some of his own admonitions, his critical observations point the way towards integrating the history of welfare and philanthropy with the history of capitalism and of the working class.

Richard Schneirov
The Newberry Library

Hartmut Keil and John B. Jentz, eds., *German Workers in Industrial Chicago, 1850-1910: A Comparative Perspective* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press 1983).

THIS BOOK IS the first volume to come out of the "Chicago Project," a German-American collaboration focused on German workers in Chicago from the middle of the nineteenth century to World War I, with special emphasis on the workers' everyday experience and their social and cultural response to industrialization. Funded since 1979 by the Volkswagen Foundation, the project has been associated with the John F. Kennedy Institute for North American Studies in Berlin and with the Newberry Library in Chicago. The two editors of this volume reflect this transatlantic association. Hartmut Keil is based at the Amerika-Institut der Universität München, and John Jentz is at the Newberry. The volume reviewed here is the product of a conference of German and American scholars, not all associated

with the project, held in Chicago in fall 1981.

The first impression when reading this product of German-American collaboration is the preponderance of American labour history on the research agenda and the absence of a particular "German" perspective on American history. In other instances of recent German scholarship, such as Jürgen Kocka's study of white-collar workers, American history is used comparatively. The underlying question of Kocka's work is why the German white-collar workers supported the Nazis. This volume on "workers," however, says little about pre-migration experience or the influence of imperial policies on German-Americans.

The justification for the volume is simply that it fills a gap in American historiography. "Why do we need a book about German immigrant workers?" ask the editors. Because we know little about them. The proof? "The recently published twenty-year cumulative index of *Labor History*, the standard scholarly journal in its field, did not even include a heading for Germans." Fourteen historians contributed to this effort. At this stage of the project, the editors correctly did not attempt to unify the contributions or propose an overarching interpretative theme. Rather, they provide a series of informative progress reports. The volume opens logically with Keil's description of Chicago's Germans (including discussions of immigration patterns, occupational distribution, generational patterns) and an analysis of the declining germanism of the German community. This essay is followed by Jentz's description of the world of work. Jentz concentrates on cabinetmakers and machinists and proposes an explanation of how traditional skills were reused in the changing context of large-scale industrialization. Then, Thomas Suhrbuth takes the case of Chicago carpenters to analyze the classic problem of ethnic divisions within the labour movement (with interesting asides

on the stinginess of German contractors). In turn, James Barnett studies the adaptation to work automation in Chicago's packing houses. Into this half of the book, the editors have also incorporated comparative chapters: a brief review by Nora Faires of the varying occupational structure of American cities and a remarkable analysis by Richard Oestreicher of the ways in which the working class of Detroit was both simultaneously "made and unmade" as workers were caught amidst conflicting loyalties.

The book then moves to an analysis of the neighbourhood, beginning with a description of the German north side of Chicago by Christiane Harzig and a rather thin analysis of budgets of German-American housewives by Dorothee Schneider. Although one cannot say for sure from the way the data are reported in this chapter, the author probably underestimated the significant contribution that German daughters made to the family budget because she derived her figures from all German families rather than only those with children old enough to work.

In good Marxist tradition, the book ends with discussions of politics and culture (*le troisième niveau*). Bruce Levine focuses on the attachment of German intellectuals to the Jacobin doctrines of 1848 and the fight against slavery in the new land. Richard Schneirov analyzes the strength of the People's Party in municipal contests in part of the 1870s. And Christine Heiss discusses the culture of German radicals, especially their effort to promote the constitutional rights of workers to self-defence against factory owners and state militia. Other aspects of German working-class culture, especially the ways in which radicals sought to promote their ideas through the organization of picnics and other such community affairs, are explored by Paul Buhle. Finally, Klaus Ensslen and Heinz Ickstadt analyze such other cultural events in German Chicago as the German theatre, the beer garden, and the German procession.

Altogether we have here a rich description of the multifaceted aspects of German working-class life in late nineteenth-century Chicago. Despite the breadth of the volume, however, I regret that cultural problems were not analyzed jointly with economic and sociological issues. In respecting the specialized interests of the contributors, the editors have missed the opportunity to provide a more integrated picture of German life in Chicago. I also wonder whether the emphasis solely on workers prevented the contributors from exploring in greater detail vital connections the German workers had within and without the German community. Let us not forget that Germans had the most socially diversified and complex immigrant communities in America. In studying workers for their own sake, one runs the risk of separating them artificially from the larger worlds of the German community and American society at large where they also belonged.

Olivier Zunz
University of Virginia

Roy Rosenzweig, *Eight Hours for What We Will: Workers and Leisure in an Industrial City, 1870-1920* (New York: Cambridge University Press 1983).

ROY ROSENZWEIG'S study of the leisure time activities of the working people of Worcester, Massachusetts in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century merits wide recognition and attention both for its content and its method. Rosenzweig provides rich material on a subject relatively neglected and prone to conjecture and easy generalization. His finely documented and written presentation is notably keen and well balanced.

Rosenzweig focuses on four aspects of recreational life: the saloon, holiday celebrations, public spaces, and the cinema. He finds each to have been an arena of

conflict involving tensions between middle-class fears and sensibilities and working-class needs and norms. Rosenzweig shows, however, that the course and results of conflict were rarely clear cut; ambiguity, negotiation, and compromise marked social confrontation in Worcester.

The saloon emerged as an institution in the city in the late nineteenth century. Earlier, drink could be procured from informal neighbourhood home breweries and grogshops and was often supplied on the job. The rise of the factory system, tightened discipline at work, shorter work days, and gains in working-class incomes, Rosenzweig argues, all contributed to the rise of the saloon. Passage of a local option law in Massachusetts in 1875 allowing for the licencing of public drinking places formalized and enshrined its existence.

Rosenzweig describes the six-year battle that ensued in Worcester over licencing. Pro-saloon forces eventually achieved a referendum victory, but the sides to the dispute and its consequences were complicated. Prominent citizens of Worcester's Protestant community provided the leadership for the anti-licencing campaign; they found responsive audiences in upper-, middle-, and working-class Protestant wards, and, most important, among the city's growing Swedish immigrant labouring population. Local merchants defended the right to proprietorship, but support for licencing centred by and large in Worcester's non-Protestant, mainly Irish, working-class neighbourhoods. Temperance did have advocates among the city's working people, however, and Rosenzweig is at his subtle best in delineating motivations. For some workers, sobriety represented a means towards individual advancement and social acceptance and for others, a way to bring security and stability to their lives; for the politically minded, abstinence was crucial for challenging the existing political structure (including the influence of the saloonkeepers).

Social control forces thus did not hold

sway completely in Worcester, yet successful defence of the saloon yielded mixed results. Rosenzweig portrays the saloon as an insular institution, male and often the preserve of a single ethnic group, cut off to a greater extent from the family and the community than the earlier "kitchen" grogshops. The life of the saloon was certainly at odds with middle-class values — and Rosenzweig provides a vivid portrait of the mutualistic customs and ethics of the working-class barroom — and yet, as the author emphasizes, in victory, space for an alternative, but hardly oppositional culture was carved out and created.

Rosenzweig's dialectical approach is further echoed in his chapters on holiday celebrations and public spaces. By the 1870s the Fourth of July celebration in Worcester, the author's case in point, had become a segmented rather than a community event and experience. The middle class retreated to their private parties and summer houses; for working people, the holiday became a time for decidedly raucous revelry but within the confines of particular ethnic groupings. In the twentieth century efforts by reformers under the aegis of the Safe and Sane July Fourth movement to resanctify the day only partially succeeded; new immigrant groups continued to use the occasion to honour their own heritages and outwardly to enjoy their well-earned day of rest.

The use and control of public spaces also sparked tension in the city. Reformers emerged to petition for park and playground areas, but Rosenzweig is quick to note that their motives and goals were complex and not entirely aimed at social engineering. The crucial debate was over placement and the designation of particular neighbourhoods to benefit by the setting aside of land for recreational purposes. Political in-fighting produced compromise and the creation of facilities, though limited, in working-class wards. Further attempts by the reform-minded to shape the play activities of working people, especially of the young, met little

success: public spaces in both better and worse neighbourhoods were utilized by workers and their families according to their own standards. Here, Rosenzweig argues that leisure time entrepreneurs with their amusement parks, skating rinks, and spectator sports had a greater influence on working-class recreational life than the concerned and pious of the middle class, a point similarly made by Francis Couvares in his recently published study of leisure time activities in Pittsburgh during the same time frame.

Entertainment promoters also brought the motion picture to Worcester, but a different kind of history was written here. Workers and their families, and particularly immigrant children, flocked to the new, low price movie houses. Leaders of the community voiced initial apprehensions about the content of the films, the behaviour of the audiences, the presence of minors, and the condition of the theatres; they accordingly supported the appointment of a censor to cut portions of films deemed deleterious to the morals of Worcester's young. Movie operators then moved to undercut middle-class reaction by building opulent cinema palaces suitable for the attendance of the entire community and by abiding to the standards set by the censors, local and national.

Rosenzweig stresses that the movies, unlike earlier forms of leisure time activity, became a cross-class, cross-ethnic, homogenized, and homogenizing experience. A single set of values — consumerist in orientation — was now imbibed by the community at large. Rosenzweig even surmises at the conclusion of his book that the cinema provided a unifying experience for Worcester's various working-class immigrant groups, thus laying the basis for common protest during the 1930s when the CIO was organized in the city.

There is much to admire in Rosenzweig's monograph. Marvelous anecdotes spice what in general is an engaging book: an amusing story of

Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman in Worcester, a telling portrait of former shoemaker-turned-amusement-park-operator Horace Bigelow, and an incredible quote from G. Stanley Hall lamenting the passage of the saloon for drink's influence in stilling labour radicalism easily come to mind. Rosenzweig's precise, measured method also deserves emulation. Workers appear in his study neither as complete agents of their own history nor as passive products of larger social forces. Rosenzweig points to constant dialogue within and between classes as working people developed separate, but not necessarily antagonistic ways and understandings.

Trouble spots exist, however. Rosenzweig's speculations at the end of his study on the impact of the motion picture are overdrawn and unsubstantiated. At times ethnicity appears a more crucial factor than class; this thorny issue merited greater scrutiny. More important, Worcester proves to be an odd town — an industrializing city in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries bereft of a trade union movement or labour politics. Rosenzweig never contends that social peace within the community derived from negotiated settlements reached over leisure time activity, but so little else is rendered about Worcester's history that the reader remains puzzled. This is a book about play with work and politics deliberately left out. Perhaps on the job and in the political realm, Worcester's labouring people secured equally or even more significant "small" victories through similar informal means. Rosenzweig's method extended to other domains could have rendered a fuller story and placed those "eight hours for what we will" in better perspective.

Walter Licht
University of Pennsylvania

Dorothy Schwieder, *Black Diamonds: Life and Work in Iowa's Coal Mining Communities, 1895-1925* (Ames: Iowa State University Press 1983).

THIS IS A rich and multifaceted approach to the study of American labour history. Not only does the monograph offer an in-depth microcosmic investigation of the coal mining industry in Iowa, it also delves into the day-to-day work routine of the miners and their families, their social experience, ethnic behaviour, religious beliefs, and economic lifestyle.

The study begins with a panoramic sweep of the American coal mining industry during the nineteenth century, from its earliest organized beginnings in the post-Civil War era to 1895 when it "had become an integral part of the nation's industrial life." (18) Technological improvements and innovations are briefly looked at and considerable space is devoted to discussing the first stirrings of working-class associations and unionization as a direct result of miners' complaints about excessive and arbitrary managerial powers, inadequate safety measures, and inhumane child labour. But invariably when miners finally walked out of the coal pits to demonstrate dramatically their displeasure, it was almost always to draw attention to the fact that "their major grievances were economic." (12)

Schwieder is also vitally interested in what she calls "Life Above Ground." Here the author concentrates her focus on a socio-economic analysis of the average Italian-American family in Iowa's mining belt which, in turn, is followed by a revealing comparative study of Italian-American women over a prolonged period of two generations. The author also constructs paradigms of three Iowa coal mining communities utilizing such demographic indicators as percentage of male and female occupations, number of births, and average annual incomes.

In the final chapter, Schwieder traces

the roots of the United Mine Workers' involvement in Iowa's coal districts. The UMW's influence, observes the author, was of inestimable value; it helped miners in their struggle for numerous social contracts, including death benefits and the eight-hour working day, to name only a few of the most noteworthy achievements. "Between 1895 and 1925 the UMW was an immensely constructive force in the lives of Iowa's coal mining families. During this period union officials spoke out on every significant issue involving miners and their families. For the most part, the union succeeded in obtaining policies or creating programs desired by its membership." (155)

In sum, this book is a solid, useful, and well-written work. It contains valuable pictures, graphs, and maps which blend perfectly into the text. For this accomplishment, the author deserves praise.

André G. Kuczewski
McGill University

Ronald D. Eller, *Miners, Millhands and Mountaineers. Industrialization of the Appalachian South, 1880-1930* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press 1982).

THE INDUSTRIALIZATION OF Appalachia awaited improvements in transportation that could overcome the region's mountainous terrain and carry both natural resources and people to the manufacturing centres of the nation. Professor Eller shows that this transition from an agrarian to an industrial economy depended on developments outside the mountains themselves, a fact which coloured nearly every facet of the general transformation which he terms modernization.

Eller analyzes social, political, and cultural aspects of modernization in

Appalachia, but he places most emphasis on economic development between 1880 and 1930. Before this period of time, the Appalachian South resembled other areas of rural America where geographic isolation and traditional agriculture preserved loosely structured communities. Here were dispersed, self-sufficient farms, linked mostly by kinship bonds around which socializing, political structures, and *community institutions* revolved.

When the rise of American industry finally drew attention to Appalachia's vast store of raw materials, there was a simultaneous "discovery" of the indigenous culture and the lumber, coal, and gas reserves. Writers anxious to describe Appalachian folkways for the growing population of book and magazine readers accompanied the geologists, prospectors, and title lawyers on their expeditions into the region. The literary portrayal of Appalachians as an archaic society directly descended from America's colonists stimulated interest among urban progressive reformers at the same time that reports of superior minerals and hardwoods captured the attention of industrialists. Both groups, based largely in the northeastern United States, spearheaded the modernization of Appalachia. Their view of the mountaineers as an "unspoiled," primitive Anglo-American group needing uplift complemented the plan to bring Appalachian raw materials into the mainstream of American economic development.

Eller describes the remaking of Appalachia which resulted from this realization of the region's potential. He recounts the rise of railroads, lumber, coal, and other industries in a somewhat monotonous way. But he deftly analyzes the new bases of community in the mountains created by lumber camps, coal company towns, and boom cities like Middlesborough, Kentucky. The mountain farm families came to these new places for cash wages and gradually settled in, exchanging agricultural work for industrial

labour. The entrepreneurs who owned these towns most often designed them to stabilize the local labour force. The owners' exploitation of labour and their ruthless attempts to control the new communities fostered class divisions among Appalachia's emerging industrial population.

The nature of industrialization in Appalachia differed from that in other regions. By 1930, Appalachia was linked to industrial America by railroads and highways. Its resources were tapped by the energy and manufacturing industries of the country. Its population had been drawn into towns and cities, given jobs, and housed in company-owned dwellings. Religious, educational, and social service reformers had enrolled these remodeled Appalachians in programmes designed to equip them mentally and spiritually for progress. But surrounding all these changes was a crippling dependency on the metropolitan centres of the country to which Appalachia's riches were shipped. When the demand for coal, lumber, and gas slipped, the industrialized mountaineers were stranded economically. A full decade before the 1930s depression overtook the United States, coal mining and logging districts in Appalachia sank into a long-term decline.

Any criticisms of this book must recognize that Eller's treatment of modernization in Appalachia is the best one yet produced; it describes well what happened when industrial capitalism penetrated the eastern mountains. In places, however, Eller has only thin documentation for his generalizations, especially in his analysis of pre-industrial Appalachian material culture and society.

A more serious flaw which his book shares with many other treatments of industrialization is the geographic framework for a discussion of socio-economic process. Any real boundaries for broadly defined, dynamic change must be at least partly arbitrary. Though authors obviously must place their studies

within a place and period of time, they must also be ready to range beyond these boundaries in order to follow the directions which historical change may take. In the case of Appalachian modernization, thousands of hill farmers confronted industry *outside* their homeland when they migrated in search of jobs, whether in the textile manufacturing towns of the Carolina piedmont from 1890 to 1920 or in the auto, rubber tire, and steel centres of Ohio and Michigan from 1910 to 1930. Since wages earned in these destinations often supported the migrants' kin who remained in Appalachia, an analysis of Appalachian industrialization which focused on the population as well as the geographic area would reinforce Eller's well-constructed theme of dependency and partial modernization.

Peter Gottlieb
 Pennsylvania State University

Mansel G. Blackford, *A Portrait Cast in Steel: Buckeye International and Columbus, 1881-1908* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press 1982).

THIS STUDY PRESENTS an analysis of Buckeye International over its nearly one hundred year history. Beginning as a small malleable iron company in the early 1880s, Buckey evolved to become first a large independent steel castings firm, next a large diversified industrial corporation, and finally a unit in a larger conglomerate. As such, Buckey represents the history of many small- to medium-sized corporations in American history.

Buckey's early years involved an intense struggle merely for survival. Not having clearly defined a segment of the market for itself, it tried for a decade to find success in the highly competitive malleable iron business. Finally, in the 1890s, Buckeye tied its fortunes to the burgeoning railroad industry. At this time

the company began manufacturing cast iron couplers for railroad cars. Later, as trains became longer and heavier, Buckeye helped lead the change to stronger steel couplers in the twentieth century. By the early years of that century Buckeye had become a highly successful, though still rather small firm. Its success was the result of the convergence of several factors, but most important, according to Blackford, were the personal and business connections of the firm's management. These brought in badly needed capital and helped open new markets for their products. By 1920 Buckeye had emerged as a leader in America's steel casting industry.

The period from 1922 to 1959 was one of consolidation and ultimately of stagnation at Buckeye. Becoming complacent during the prosperous 1920s, putting profits ahead of technological innovation and expansion, the firm failed to expand and progress during the decade. Then, with the onset of the depression in the 1930s, Buckeye, like the rest of American industry, found itself sorely tested. It responded by enthusiastically supporting the New Deal and Franklin Roosevelt, especially the National Industrial Recovery Act, which allowed Buckeye and other steel manufacturers to legally restrict competition within the industry. By the end of the decade the firm began to move slowly and fitfully towards a more innovative system of management, but it was the outbreak of World War II which saved the corporation. Linking itself with the production of war material, Buckeye experienced significant prosperity for the first time in a decade. Yet this also blinded management to the deeper problems its conservative short-term profit orientation was causing for the company. This lack of foresight caught up with Buckeye in the 1950s, as it came close to foundering. Having tied itself exclusively to the railroad market, the severe decline of that segment of industry after the war, coupled with Buckeye's refusal to either diversify or to develop innovative tech-

nologies, created a real crisis for management in the 1960s and 1970s.

Blackford's final four chapters analyze Buckeye's emergence as a diversified corporation. The major effort of management during these years was to find new market areas into which the firm could expand, although these efforts were made in a generally unplanned and uncoordinated way (Buckeye's highly successful entrance into industrial plastics was made with no foresight into the automobile industry's switch to plastics — it was just luck). Buckeye's success, however, made it attractive to larger firms, and during the 1970s the corporation was the target of several takeover attempts. After fighting off several of these, management finally agreed to a friendly takeover proposal by Worthington Industries in 1980.

Blackford's study is interesting and valuable for two reasons. First, as he points out, historians know relatively little about small- to medium-sized businesses, and his work is a welcome effort at filling that gap. The attention of most historians has perhaps understandably been on the large corporation, but there is much to be learned from studying less gigantic enterprises. With their smaller, more personal framework, we can sometimes observe important and nearly identical transformations in a manner which is more understandable. Second, since Blackford's study focuses on a corner of the steel industry, we learn more about management decision-making in an industry notoriously reticent to allow scholars even a glimpse at their records. Buckeye's management is to be commended for opening their records to Blackford without restriction, and for allowing him to write an objective, often pointedly critical history of its management. This, in turn, has illuminated some important facets of the steel industry itself. For example, although we know in a general way that the steel industry began to stagnate after 1900 and especially after 1920, since pre-

vious studies have had to rely largely upon trade journals and enthusiastic and self-serving company reports, we are often presented with an anomaly: we observe energetic far-sighted management spending billions of dollars on innovation over the decades, only to end up with the pitifully obsolete giant it became by the 1970s. Blackford's study shows far more clearly just how conservative, how hidebound, how profit-oriented steel management became during that critical half century.

Yet, having said all of this, there are several levels on which Blackford's book is disappointing. First of all, he tries to do too much in too little space. He not only attempts in just under 200 pages of text to give the reader a comprehensive history of management decision-making, but he also tries to tie Buckeye's fortunes to that of Columbus itself, and to give the reader some sense of what it was like to be a labourer at Buckeye throughout its hundred-year history. Both these efforts are dismal failures. All we really learn of Columbus is what Blackford has culled from standard histories of the city. He then tries to tie Buckeye's management into the city's development, but what emerges sounds rather too much like it comes from the company's own promotional literature. There is no real attempt at critical analysis, no rigorous analytical framework within which to judge the performance of management, company, or city: just short little lists of "accomplishments." Compared to the recent work of Burton Folsom, Blackford's attempts in this area are sorely lacking. Nor do we learn much about labour at Buckeye. We are told a little of work force composition, a word or two on wage rates, and a few paragraphs on unionization and strikes, but the worker never really emerges, nor is management's labour policy ever clearly delineated.

Secondly, and in a related vein, Blackford asserts time and again that "the importance of [management's] personal

relationships may well be the key to success in small business. . . ." (208) Yet these relationships are never examined in any systematic manner. We learn, for example, that the Rockefeller family played a key role in the firm during its early years. Yet we never clearly see the social networks that integrated the Rockefellers and their Cleveland cohorts with the indigenous Columbus management. A club membership is mentioned, a marriage is alluded to, but the reader is given no clear picture of either the Columbus upper class or its ties to other upper-class groups. This is admittedly a complex and difficult subject, but given Blackford's insistence on its importance, it behooved him to develop it in a far more systematic and comprehensive manner.

Finally, I think one could justifiably criticize the book for not providing much that is particularly new. Relying heavily on frameworks developed by Alfred D. Chandler, Jr. and others for his analysis of management, Blackford is usually content to simply detail the way in which Buckeye's management fits the "mould" in all of these areas. All in all a more concisely focused book, one which took just a couple of aspects of decision-making at Buckeye over the years and developed them intensively with astute use of company records would have been more valuable than the present broad approach. It is, nonetheless, a welcome if somewhat disappointing addition to the literature on American business.

John N. Ingham
University of Toronto

Mark Naison, *Communists in Harlem During the Depression* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press 1983).

FOR MANY YEARS the historiography of American communism was caught in a suffocating vise, with ritual denunciations

on one side and wooden apologetics on the other. However, the declining intensity of the (first) Cold War and the ideological ferment of the 1960s helped to lay the basis for a more balanced assessment of the role of the Communist Party in American society. Mark Naison's new book is perhaps the most impressive achievement yet among a growing number of studies by young scholars who have transcended the old categories of good and evil. Although Naison is very much aware of the Communists' failings, he recognizes that the "story of the Party in Harlem is in some measure the story of the rise and fall of a dream of human betterment." For him the historian's special challenge is to "scrutinize the dream, while respecting the dreamer." (xx) He has done the former with critical intelligence and the latter with acute sensitivity. The result is a brilliant monograph.

Naison's approach is more or less chronological, but the book seems to have three major focal points: the evolution of Communist mass activity and of the party's social base in Harlem; an evaluation of the twists and turns of the party line; and an intriguing discussion of the social psychology of commitment to and leadership in the Harlem CP.

In 1928, Communists were an insignificant force in Harlem. One cadre acknowledged publicly that it was possible to count the party's black membership "on the fingers of one's hand." (3) However, the onset of the Great Depression, and the party's aggressive and imaginative campaign to free the Scottsboro Boys, led to a major breakthrough. Within a few years, party membership stood at 700 (it would peak at over a thousand in 1938); the *Saturday Evening Post* ruefully acknowledged that "Communist Party headquarters is a place where every Negro with a grievance can be sure of prompt action;" (172) and a rising community leader (Adam Clayton Powell, Jr.) proclaimed, "The day will come when being called a Communist will be the

highest honor that can be paid an individual...." (87)

Naison's discussion of the party's class composition and appeal is fascinating. In the face of a devastating depression which struck blacks even harder than whites, Communists laboured heroically on behalf of Harlem's unemployed. Their militancy struck a responsive chord in the black community, but it brought the party few recruits among the dispossessed, who were more attuned to fundamentalist religion and the nationalism of streetwise "race men." Ironically, the self-proclaimed party of the proletariat found its most receptive audience in Harlem not among workers but among intellectuals and professionals. Long before the Seventh World Congress of the Comintern decreed the necessity of an anti-fascist "popular front" with non-proletarian strata, Harlem Communists were forging close and sometimes enduring ties with important elements of the community's middle class. One former Communist has recalled that "75 per cent of black cultural figures had Party membership or maintained regular meaningful contact with the Party." (193) And no wonder. Communists served as an effective instrument for publicizing the talent and building the careers of black intellectuals and artists like Richard Wright, Langston Hughes, Fats Waller, and Count Basie. They used the Federal Theatre Project as a means of showcasing black talent outside Harlem. They agitated relentlessly on behalf of the integration of professional athletics. White Communist teachers entered the schools and "displayed an idealism and enthusiasm... that deeply impressed blacks who worked with them." (216) Above all, they argued that the struggles of oppressed blacks were a vital component of the American democratic tradition.

For those who came of age during the great freedom struggles of the 1950s and 1960s, when the concerns of blacks were at the very centre of American life, the

full significance of these pioneering efforts in the 1930s may not be readily apparent. But, at the time, even the Communists' ideological opponents on the left were compelled to recognize the magnitude of their commitment and achievement. Naison argues that the enormous energy the Communists brought to these campaigns derived from their belief that the Popular Front offered them the hope of transcending "their position as outsiders (ethnic as well as political) in the American nation." (170) While the results were uneven, the party exerted a power far beyond its numbers. In fact, Naison concludes, "No socialist organization before or since has touched the life of an Afro-American community so profoundly." (xvii)

Of course, the story does not end with this affirmation. Any serious book about communism must encompass the themes of sectarianism, failure, and defeat. First and foremost, there was the undeniable subservience of the American party to the Comintern and the Soviet Union. The chains were forged in the 1920s, with the enthusiastic support of black Communists, who welcomed the Soviets' emphasis on black issues and recruitment. But the climactic moment came in 1939. With the signing of the Hitler-Stalin Pact, the Popular Front came to a crashing halt; anti-fascism ceased to be a theme of Communist agitation; and President Roosevelt was transformed from a hero into a warmonger. The party lost many members, as well as its credibility among erstwhile allies. Although some important alliances held firm, the emergence of the March on Washington Movement under the charismatic direction of A. Philip Randolph signified the beginning of the end for Harlem Communists. Randolph bitterly denounced communism and excluded the party from his coalition. Moreover, by forcing unprecedented changes in federal policy, he seized the mantle of protest leadership from the Communists and invested himself and his movement with

"an clan and aura of effectiveness" that they could no longer match. (311)

Unlike Harvey Klehr's widely praised but one-dimensional *Heyday of American Communism*, Naison refuses to oversimplify or distort the relationship between American Communists and the Soviet Union. In the shaping of the Popular Front, for example, he notes a "fortuitous congruence" between the perspective developed by Harlem party leaders on the basis of their own experience in the early 1930s and the strategic imperatives imposed by Comintern officials in the summer of 1935. (126) Naison argues that, even during the era of the Nazi-Soviet Pact, black Communists operated on the basis of "an American political logic" and "fought to retain their credentials as authentic American radicals under circumstances which called into question both their patriotism and good sense." (289)

The strengths of Naison's work are considerable; of necessity, this brief review has only begun to explore them. But the book is not without weaknesses. This is a study of Communists in Harlem, but the focus is very much on the Communists. For the most part, Harlem remains a mere backdrop, and the reader does not develop a sufficient sense of it as a complex, vibrant community. Moreover, the black Communists whom the author discusses appear more as ideal types than as living, changing human beings. To be sure, Naison paints engaging portraits of many of his subjects, but after these initial sketches they tend to become disembodied bearers of particular political tendencies within the party. In my judgement, this detracts from Naison's otherwise important and insightful discussion of the social psychology of commitment and leadership among Harlem Communists.

Overall, however, the book's strengths far outweigh its weaknesses. In fact, this

study should stand as a model of balanced, intelligent scholarship for many years.

Bruce Nelson
Middlebury College

Michael J. McDonald and John Muldowny, *TVA and the Dispossessed: The Resettlement of Population in the Norris Dam Area* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press 1982).

AMERICANS HISTORICALLY have been a people on the move, impelled by the lure of greater opportunity, salubrious climate, or even riches. Historians and social scientists have underlined both the positive aspects and costs accompanying this rootlessness. In the last two decades, scholars have accorded increased attention to another kind of traveller — persons whose uprooting reflected external imperatives, and who did not relish their sudden change in domicile. The roster of unwilling in-migrants includes native Americans shunted to reservations; the "Okies" expelled from their farms during the great dust storms of the 1930s; and, more recently, the many residents (mainly poor and of minority stock) removed from urban cores to facilitate programmes of urban renewal.

McDonald and Muldowny have compiled a meticulous assessment of the impact of the Tennessee Valley Authority upon the residents of the Norris Dam region of eastern Tennessee. The TVA marked the first major step by the federal government to compete with private industry. This seemed an earthshaking development in its time, a march towards socialism, or as former president Herbert Hoover pointed out in 1934, a "challenge to liberty."

From the perspective of a half century, however it is clear that Hoover missed the point. Contrary to critics who felt that TVA either went too far, or not far enough, depending upon their point of

view, Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal aimed not to replace capitalism but to save it. The TVA experiment in the Norris Dam area epitomized the ambiguous record of New Deal liberalism. The authors show that "selling electricity" played but a minor role in the original TVA mandate. Roosevelt prophesied much broader socio-economic goals, especially the eradication of poverty for thousands of "forgotten Americans" in the area. These citizens, the president informed members of the National Emergency Council in December 1934, would now have the chance to overcome the poverty that dominated their lives.

To assess the TVA "social experiment" in modernization at the grassroots level, the authors assess the short-term effects of population removal in the Norris Basin. *Building on oral history, statistical analyses, and a clear empathy for the region and its inhabitants*, McDonald and Muldowny cut across disciplinary lines to reconstruct the wholeness and richness of life in the basin, as well as the ambivalence with which residents confronted the New Deal's version of modernization.

The authors provide a first-rate social history as they discuss, among other facets, the size, density, and fertility rate of the local population, as well as the implications — both before and after *resettlement* — of farm size, living conditions, income structure, and education. Evidence suggests that contrary to Washington's perspective, residents of Norris Basin did not see their isolation as evil and found much to value in the virtues of permanence and community. The authors are at their best in assessing the problems of buying the land and of planning resettlement. McDonald and Muldowny also present a moving treatment of perhaps the most poignant chapter in the resettlement process, the large number of disinterments and reburials necessitated by the hydroelectric programme. The lack of grave markers and proper identification of the dead, together with the strong reli-

gious sentiments of basin inhabitants, made this a tricky issue, one that TVA performed well.

In analyzing TVA "from the bottom up," the authors employ a populist paradigm popular during the 1960s. But their critical frame of reference is tempered by their appreciation of the many constraints that hampered achievement of TVA's human goals. From its inception, *the authority became embroiled in several important legal suits concerning its constitutionality*. While battling for its very existence, TVA was distracted from its socio-economic experimentation with local populations. In addition, important differences over the broad aims and goals of the bureaucracy divided its three early directors. These disagreements generated administrative stress as early as 1933 and became crucial in 1936 when David Lilienthal was reappointed director over the opposition of the first chief, Arthur E. Morgan. Morgan's subsequent erratic behaviour led to his ouster by Roosevelt as TVA's head executive and to a lengthy congressional investigation of Morgan's accusations. These debates did not end until TVA had assumed its war role, emphasizing power and munitions production, and pushing the issue of social experimentation into the background.

Of these constraints, legal limitations seemed to matter most. *The authority chose to work, and even seek refuge within, existing legal guidelines, rather than to forge a more interventionist role*. Moreover, activist elements within TVA were quickly co-opted by the elite-oriented interests of the New Deal's agricultural extension programme, its county agents, and the Farm Bureau Federation, which stressed the limited, conservative side of population removal.

The book's main value lies in the revealing way in which the authors assess the well-meaning, but *faltering*, steps taken by TVA to implement population removal. Both Roosevelt and the authority assumed that the availability of electric

power would bring swift industrialization, and that agricultural output would be stimulated by farm demonstration programmes and the widespread use of triple phosphate fertilizer. Improvements in river navigation, furthermore, would facilitate commerce, while industries attracted by inexpensive power would absorb unproductive farm labour.

But these assumptions were too sanguine. The TVA failed to confront the host of immediate problems (poor soil, small farm size, undercapitalization, and rural overpopulation) that made the region so chronically ill. A heavier dose of medicine might have ameliorated this situation, the authors suggest, but they also point out that neither Congress nor residents of the basin were prepared to accept radical surgery. And even if expanded legal powers were forthcoming — an unlikely possibility in the light of Paul Conkin's study of the resettlement administration project — TVA leaders lacked the moral courage to argue on their behalf.

Like political platforms, the federal government's ideal goals provide a poor yardstick to assess results of reform programmes. Too many practical and empirical compromises must be made along the way. But TVA's problem was less the lack of, than conflicting, ideals. Arthur Morgan, for example, was driven by a community-oriented dream of a ruralized, decentralized, and democratic industrial capitalism. David Lilienthal, meanwhile, felt that industrial opportunity and modernity for the "backward" area would follow the harnessing of electric power.

If TVA's directors possessed considerable progressive idealism, they also lacked the ability to deal with masses of people except as statistical abstractions. With this conclusion, the authors underline the nemesis of liberal social programmes since the 1930s — their inability to translate smoothly from theory into practice. During the 1930s, as after, idealistic reform concepts failed to become

radical action programmes that transcended self-help notions to embrace regional planning at a grassroots level.

TVA did not halt the out-migration that only reversed itself in this decade. Norris Basin counties still rank among the lowest in the state in per capita income. McDonald and Muldowny find irony here. The authority, they conclude, exerted a baleful influence upon a people whose resilience was tied to their land. The successful aspects of the programme — its water management programme and recreation developments — have attracted technologically skilled outsiders that form the nucleus of that group that in the name of ecology seeks to halt the authority's continued development.

Paradoxically, TVA strengthened the forces of modernity to the point where people entering the valley now want to preserve the region as it was. Those who lived in it as it was have either left or have been unable to secure the advantages TVA hoped to provide. Roosevelt's "forgotten Americans" in the Norris Basin were still denizens of Michael Harrington's *Other America* in 1962, and today they remain recipients of the sere remains of Ronald Reagan's economic pie.

Geoffrey S. Smith
Queen's University

Ronald W. Schatz. *The Electrical Workers: A History of Labor at General Electric and Westinghouse 1923-60* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press 1983).

RONALD SCHATZ'S monograph appears in the University of Illinois Press series called "The Working Class in American History." Schatz's contribution is well-organized, analytical, and packs a great deal of information into a short 279 pages. The book jacket boasts that this book provides "a balanced blend of traditional and 'new' labor history" and by and large that

is the case. The author has deliberately tried to synthesize institutional and social history. He tries to "explain how unionism emerged from the factories and how the union's economic and political activities reflected the consciousness and influenced the situation of the rank and file." He comments, "I could see that the rise of industrial unionism was a social phenomenon, a development which transformed relationships among people at the same time that it altered the institutional structure of the economy."

In order to explain the characteristics of the electrical workers and why they organized a union, Schatz first describes the structure and growth of the industry, the nature of the work, and the management style. The management of these giant electrical firms was moderately progressive, and tried to harmonize the interests of labour and capital. In the 1920s they introduced welfare programmes as a "vaccine against labour unrest" and sought to create the "new capitalist man." Such programmes forestalled unionization for many years; however, paradoxically, the size and scope of these corporations which encouraged the rise of managers with a broad view of economic and political affairs, also encouraged the emergence of a core of visionary union leaders, who were influenced by Catholic social philosophy, their experience on workers' councils, socialism, and communism.

Early strikes were led by revolutionaries and were crushed. In the 1920s the paternalistic labour relations policy created harmony, a more positive worker attitude towards incentive pay, and tough times for the craft unions. There was never a complete integration of workers into this corporatist regime, but unionization might have been avoided indefinitely had it not been for the Depression. Even in the 1930s, management tried to maintain a programme of employee unemployment insurance benefits known as the

"Swope Plan," but eventually wage cuts and layoffs became the order of the day.

In 1936, as the CIO movement "took off," the United Electrical Workers' union (UE) was founded and led by James Carey and Julius Emspak — two young men of quite dissimilar backgrounds. Carey was an Irish American in the liberal Catholic tradition. Emspak was from a Hungarian immigrant Catholic family which had a history of political radicalism; their socialism was synonymous with anti-clericalism. Emspak was a genuine worker-intellectual. He had worked in the plants, acquired a university degree in philosophy, but "the times, his family background, and his political convictions all impelled him to return to the factory." Despite company efforts to promote in-house unions, UE organized the industry. It was accorded recognition by General Electric in 1938 and by Westinghouse in 1941.

The 1946 strikes were a turning point in company-union relations. Under Lemuel Boulware, management changed its relatively tolerant approach to labour relations and introduced a system designed to circumvent the union. This company offensive coincided with the attack by government agencies and the Taft-Hartley Act against Communists in the labour movement and there were Communists in UE. The combination of "Boulwarism," congressional investigations, and raids by other unions led to internal opposition in UE. Inter-union rivalry in the industry fragmented bargaining and weakened labour's presence at the bargaining table. When the companies decided to decentralize operations, move to the South, and, in the 1960s, introduce new technology, labour was placed on the defensive.

Political controversy touched all aspects of union life in UE. The conflict between the Communists and the anti-Communists is an important theme, and the discussion is lively because it is rooted in the political life of several communities

and in the background of the members in various locals. Schatz's awareness of the local context, the social and ethnic differences between political factions in the union, and the different work experiences and treatment of male and female employees, result in an interesting and sophisticated analysis, as does the discussion of the effects of unionization on working conditions and social relations. Using case studies and individual examples, Schatz carefully explains how workers collectively developed internal self-discipline and their own code of behaviour to restrict output to a certain level so that rates in an incentive system would not be reduced. They tried to make the incentive wage system work to their advantage, and succeeded for a while. Seniority rules also limited corporate personnel policies which seemed to workers to be arbitrary and insulting. He concludes: "it is essential to realize that employed workers made enormous gains as a result of the inclusion of seniority provisions in union contracts" particularly in the 1930s and 1940s. He rates this effort as one of the great movements "for freedom and dignity in American history." His view is positive even though he recognizes that in modern times the seniority rules did not upset the sexual division of labour or further the promotion of blacks in industry.

The earlier era is treated in more detail and is the most interesting part of the book, but overall it is an impressive study in both its substance and organization. It could well be a model for Canadian scholars writing about individual unions in Canada — an area of writing in which much remains to be done.

Laurel Sefton MacDowell
University of Toronto

Mark McCulloch, *White Collar Workers in Transition: The Boom Years, 1940-1970* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press 1983).

THE EXPLOSIVE GROWTH of white-collar occupations is undoubtedly one of the most significant social changes of the twentieth century. By 1960 white-collar employees outnumbered manual workers in both Canada and the United States. Yet despite their increasing visibility, white-collar workers remain an enigma. Scholars continually debate the class position of white-collar workers, the changing content and requirements of their jobs, gender divisions and inequalities, the impact of technology, and the chronic tension between individualism and collective action. Much of this literature, argues Mark McCulloch, is flawed in two respects. First, researchers tend to treat white-collar workers as "an amorphous mass." And second, few studies provide a historical perspective on the evolution of white-collar work. This work directly confronts these two problems. Specifically, McCulloch presents case studies of American white-collar workers and their employment conditions in banking, electrical manufacturing, and public welfare agencies during the pivotal decades between 1940 and 1970.

McCulloch's choice of case studies appropriately reflects major areas of white-collar expansion during World War II and the post-war boom: the financial core of the private sector, blue-collar manufacturing, and government. Essentially, the study compares variations in the development of the work process, changes in the composition of the work force, and shifting patterns of collective action in the three industries. Drawing on primary and secondary sources — interviews with 31 workers, managers, and union officials; archival and government records; newspapers; and management and union publications — McCulloch constructs a factual framework which helps us better understand white-collar work.

Sandwiched between a brief introduction and a terse conclusion are three lengthy chapters which McCulloch

organizes according to time periods: 1940-6, 1947-59, and the 1960s. Each of these chapters examines topics such as employment patterns, feminization, technological change, working conditions, living standards, and unionization. Data are presented separately for each of the three industries. Short summaries highlighting similarities and differences among the three industries punctuate the factual material. The reader can easily follow developments in each industry. But the book falls short of providing a comprehensive comparative analysis of the industrial and occupational variations in white-collar work. Still, McCulloch traces the transition of key white-collar jobs from a situation of relative status in the early twentieth century to more bureaucratized and routinized working conditions in recent decades.

Indeed, the white-collar world of 1940 stands in sharp contrast to what had evolved by 1970. Banking was characteristically old-fashioned at the start of World War II. Women constituted barely one-third of the bank work force; technology was rudimentary, and unions were virtually non-existent. Electrical manufacturing, however, presents quite a different picture. At the core of the United States economy and relying heavily on research and development, the electrical sector employed a considerably higher percentage of white-collar workers than the auto or steel industries. Outside of management ranks there was a clear hierarchy which placed engineers and scientists at the top, technicians in the middle, and clerks at the bottom. Independent white-collar unions sprang up in the wake of CIO organizing drives in the 1930s. The stage was thus set for the post-World War II spread of collective bargaining and rising militancy among nearly all non-managerial white-collar workers in the industry. Public welfare, the third of the industry case studies, was buffeted by different forces of change. Welfare rolls swelled during the Depression, yet the

system was still mainly non-bureaucratic. For instance, many appointments continued to be based on patronage. Women were concentrated in clerical jobs, but nonetheless comprised a sizeable share of total employment. And unlike banking and electrical industries, public welfare agencies employed a significant number of blacks. Even though working conditions were far from ideal, unions had barely made a dint: in 1940 there were a mere few hundred union members and no negotiated contracts.

McCulloch next examines the impact of World War II on these three industries. The massive war production effort, coupled with armed forces recruitment, created acute labour shortages in most industries. Women became the major labour supply for many lower level white-collar jobs. Business growth sparked some mechanization, especially of clerical procedures in banking. But the introduction of punch card and tabulating machines had a downgrading effect on only a small number of jobs. Some rationalization occurred in electrical firms; even technical and engineering jobs became more routinized. Wartime inflation and the growing bargaining clout of blue-collar unions signalled a real decline in white-collar salaries, and a narrowing of the the historic gap with manual workers.

Of course, salary grievances sparked unionization drives. In 1944, for example, 2,500 New York city bank employees joined the United Office and Professional Workers of America (UPOWA), paving the way for a flurry of post-war union campaigns. White-collar employees in electrical firms unionized in much larger numbers. Interestingly, McCulloch points out that the demands of these white-collar employees were no different from production workers: higher wages, grievance procedures, and overtime pay. In a marked departure from the trend in electrical manufacturing, unions made little headway in public welfare.

The immediate post-war period was

characterized most of all by a surge of union activity. Unions scored key victories in banking. From 1945 to mid-1947, the UOPWA recruited between 3,000 and 5,000 bank workers. Electrical office employees displayed intermittent militancy as unionization spread to about 40 per cent of the industry's white-collar workers. Strikes in 1945-46 and a growing cooperation with production workers led this group to fully embrace trade union principles. Public welfare, too, experienced a rise in union membership.

McColloch next trains his sights on the 1947-56 era. The ugly spectre of McCarthyism looms large in these years. Wielding the legislative club of the Taft-Hartley Act, management in all three industries launched concerted anti-union campaigns. McColloch's account of these management offensives forms the heart of this section and, in fact, is the most fascinating part of the book.

Unionism was virtually crushed in banking. The Brooklyn Trust strike was *the linchpin in the assault against unions*. The Taft-Hartley Act facilitated management's harassment and intimidation tactics. The act, among other things, excluded supervisor employees and anyone with access to confidential information — including many bank clerks — from bargaining units, allowed management to make anti-union statements in the workplace, and required union officials to file affidavits denying their membership in the Communist Party. Not surprisingly, Brooklyn Trust red-baited the leadership of the UOPWA. Similarly, electrical firms used blacklistings and firings to purge the United Electrical Workers (UE) and the UOPWA of alleged communists. In 1950, the newly-formed International Union of Electrical Workers (IUE) took over key UE locals. What is interesting here is that white-collar workers at Westinghouse and General Electric supported IUE in even greater numbers than did manual workers. And in public welfare the scenario was repeated, with attacks on unions leaving

them foundering until the 1960s. Welfare officials faced a problem not found in banking and electrical industries: the rising solidarity between caseworkers and their impoverished clients. In sum, only in electrical firms did unions survive beyond 1950, albeit in abbreviated form.

Looking at the structure of white-collar jobs from the end of the war through the 1950s, surprisingly, there were few notable changes. Banking underwent only moderate advances in the mechanization and systematization of clerical jobs. Feminization accelerated, with women holding 60 per cent of bank jobs by 1958. Likewise, the pace of rationalization was less than might be expected in the electrical industry, especially considering that firms such as GE and Westinghouse were at the forefront of research and development. The line between engineers and technicians did, however, grow more rigid. Clerical jobs grew increasingly fragmented and monotonous. Finally, there were few basic changes in the way public welfare employees performed their jobs. Feminization was especially pronounced in public welfare; its work force was about 80 per cent female by the 1950s. The ghettoization of women into low-level, poorly paying, routine jobs became increasingly evident in all three industries. While McColloch observes that average white-collar earnings fell relative to those of manual workers, he fails to link this to the recruitment of lower paid female employees.

The final period McColloch examines spans the 1960s. One word captures the transformation of white-collar jobs in this decade: computers. Automation in banking wrought sweeping changes. Management's primary motive for computerizing was to reduce staff, but the impact in this regard is difficult to measure due to high turnover rates. Bank staffs were polarized, with menial computer tasks growing more factory-like while an upper stratum of technical and professional jobs

emerged. Unions in the electrical sector were not prepared for the onslaught of technology. Redundancies mounted, new data centres attempted to operate "union-free," and drafting workers were displaced by computer graphics. Only in public welfare do we find few negative effects due to automation. There, it seems, computers were a boon in handling the mountains of paperwork.

McColloch also presents other evidence of growing work rationalization. For example, in banks the jobs of stenographers and secretaries were made more standardized and typing pools arose. Routes into management became blocked, except to young male college graduates. In the electrical sector, work measurement techniques brought speedups. Furthermore, engineers faced difficulties moving up into management and technicians' jobs increasingly resembled those of production workers. Insecurity was rampant, as companies regularly cut large numbers of workers after losing government defence contracts. Jobs in public welfare also become more routinized and, moreover, client contact diminished.

Although McColloch makes the link only tenuously, it seems clear that the thrust of work rationalization accelerated white-collar feminization. In banking and public welfare, recruitment of women increased, especially into the most subordinate and menial jobs. At the same time, educational standards remained constant or declined, reflecting the more trivial nature of the tasks being performed. Part and parcel of these more proletarianized working conditions was the continuing downward slide in wages. Gains in blue-collar earnings outstripped all white-collar groups except engineers. Many workers found their wages frozen after reaching the top of the salary scale in five or ten years. All these changes generated rumblings of discontent. However, there were few substantial membership gains for unions in banking and electrical manufacturing. Only in public welfare, where

workers were especially hard hit by deteriorations in pay, working conditions, and status, did unions register major advances.

After having presented this firmly documented account of changes in these three areas of white-collar employment, McColloch draws only sparse conclusions. Generally speaking, the book's descriptive nature militates against incisive analysis. Few would deny the value of a case study approach to understanding occupational changes. Yet the book falls short of providing satisfying answers to some of the important questions it raises: Why was unionization stronger among some white-collar groups and not others? Why did feminization proceed according to a different pace and pattern in each industry? Why did deteriorating living standards and working conditions not push white-collar workers into the labour movement and, eventually, lead to a broadly-based class alliance? Does the author's evidence actually support Braverman's degradation thesis, as he claims it does? In sum, the book leaves the reader hankering for more. As such, it can serve as a research agenda for those drawn to plumb more deeply the depths of the white-collar enigma.

Graham S. Lowe
University of Alberta

Jeanne Stellman and Mary Sue Henifin, *Office Work Can Be Dangerous to Your Health* (New York: Pantheon 1983).

STELLMAN AND HENIFIN'S book begins by pointing out that "simply being safer and cleaner than a coal mine doesn't make the office clean or safe." As is the case with the author Jeanne Stellman's previous books, *Work Is Dangerous to Your Health* and *Women's Work: Women's Health*, the book is clearly pro-worker and pro-union. Recognizing that most

safety hazards are readily visible to workers, the authors concentrate on the sources of occupational disease.

Most public attention in the 1970s and 80s has been directed to occupational health and safety problems of blue-collar workers. The recent North American decline in heavy industry accompanied by growth in the service sector has meant that many more people are exposed to the hazards of the office environment. A popular, readable book explaining the hazards of office work is, therefore, overdue.

The chapter on the hazards of Video Display Terminals (VDTs) gives a comprehensive examination of all aspects of problems associated with VDTs. Biomechanical recommendations for VDT workstations, recommended visual characteristics for VDT screen displays, and rest time away from machines are some of the useful detailed recommendations. Concerns about the possible hazards of radiation from VDTs are dealt with in a calm, factual manner. An easily understandable explanation of what radiation is and how it is or is not produced by VDTs serves to demystify the current popular debate. When explaining that the levels of emission of ionizing radiation (the most harmful type of radiation) is usually very low for VDTs, the authors do not jump to the opposite conclusion and declare all VDTs safe. Instead, they caution users to insure that radiation emission data be demanded from each manufacturer, and that all machines be shielded to minimize non-ionizing radiation. They also recommend that proper scientific studies be conducted on the possibility of birth defects or damage to both female and male reproductive systems.

The book concentrates on the importance of improving workplace design and the working environment with particular emphasis on chair design, desk height, lighting, and noise. Involving office workers in the determination of the workplace layout and generally giving workers

more control over their work reduces stress and its associated ill health effects.

Indoor air pollution is examined at length with the "tight building syndrome" — hermetically sealed modern office buildings — often being the culprit. Pollutants include asbestos from insulation, formaldehyde from furniture and carpets, and a myriad of airborne contaminants including cigarette smoke, germs in air-conditioning systems, radon gas from granite or cement, and microwaves, all of which are distributed throughout offices by the ventilation systems, with the exception of microwaves. Devices to measure indoor air pollution are described, as are standards which are often inadequate to prevent ill health effects developing. One international standard, for example, requires a minimum of only two air changes per hour for "offices and jails" and allows up to 75 per cent of the exhaust air to be recirculated!

The "Where Do We Go From Here" chapter provides a number of useful suggestions for developing a strategy to make health improvements in the office including a very detailed employee questionnaire. It is in this area, however, that the book's major deficiency for Canadians is found. This is a book written by and for Americans. While much of the information is equally applicable to Canadian and American offices, strategies for dealing with them are oriented to the United States.

Mandatory occupational health and safety committees with at least 50 per cent worker participation may seem like a pipedream throughout the United States, but in Canada most jurisdictions require them for all workplaces over a certain size. If this book had been written for Canadians, the committee structure would have been emphasized as an important vehicle for making improvements. The many resources listed, from addresses of government agencies to contacts in the various Committees for Occupational

Safety and Health (COSH) groups are solely American. Comparable Canadian sources are listed in the Canadian books *Assault on the Worker* by Reasons, Ross, and Paterson (Butterworth 1981), and *Canadian Occupational Health and Safety Law Handbook* by Izumi-Nash (CCH 1983), studies which need to be consulted if *Office Work Can Be Dangerous to Your Health* is to be made fully useful to Canadians.

Cathy Walker
Confederation of
Canadian Unions

Iain McLean. *The Legend of Red Clydeside* (Edinburgh: John Donald 1983).

IT IS UNDERSTANDABLE THAT this book took thirteen years to write, as the author tells us. It travels over controversial ground, and draws on a great mass of varied materials: they include many unpublished papers, some official, some from private collections or archives like the Independent Labour Party's. Oral history was not neglected: a score of surviving witnesses were interviewed. Printed sources, books and newspaper files, are very numerous; not surprisingly the writer laments that the authoritative *Catalogue of Some Labour Records in Scotland*, by Ian MacDougall, secretary of the Scottish Labour History Society, did not come to his aid earlier: this "stupendous work" (291) only came out in 1978.

"By December 1918, 'Red Clydeside' was an established journalistic cliché." (154) The book's argument is that Glasgow's fiery reputation was quite undeserved. It arose from two mass struggles in 1915 and 1916. One was against rent increases. War brought more labour flooding into the region, as into all munitions centres, and intensified pressure on accommodation already inadequate: hous-

ing had always been worse in Scotland than in England. At the same time, it sharpened the rapacity of landlords, who were scenting the opportunity to fill their pockets like the rest of Britain's patriotic profiteers. There was mounting resistance during 1915; Lloyd George saw the point, and the workers were given some protection.

Less successful was the other struggle against "dilution," the government's insistence that new workers from outside the old cadre of skilled craft workers should be allowed to share their work, and increase output. Craft workers, of course, feared that their protected status, once lost, would be impossible to regain after the war. Glasgow workers had good reason to remember how employers in the nineteenth century brought over boatloads of hungry Irish as blacklegs, to undercut their wages. There were strikes against the Act of July 1915 making dilution enforceable; but this was an issue on which the government could not compromise, and in less than a year the opposition was beaten down. During the rest of the war, Dr. McLean emphasizes, there was little industrial militancy on Clydeside. Politically, he allows, unrest was growing. Disillusion with the war was, of course, having a similar effect everywhere.

There were times, like March 1916, when the "revolutionaries" and their enemies "were united in seeing far more revolutionary potential... than actually existed." (83) We hear of a big employer "bursting with the desire to arrest a lot of people," though what people was not clear (35) — a common capitalist syndrome. Military Intelligence, that quaintly misnamed organization, had an eager eye open for "reds," and German spies or sympathizers were, inevitably, conjured up. The book's main contention is that the engineers who resisted dilution were an aristocracy of labour selfishly defending its privileged status. Essentially, that is, they were conservatives;

already before the war they had been ruffled by the introduction of new machinery, and now they feared that by the end of the war newcomers, including large numbers of women, would have picked up their skills and would displace them by working for lower wages.

This has always been a stumbling-block for "Red Clydeside" loyalists, and its vigorous statement here should usefully help to compel Marxists to review their often too facile belief in a natural, innate revolutionariness of the working class. Yet it should be borne in mind that defence of established rights, or bread-winning skills, can sometimes take on a radical character, and represent a rejection of the capitalist spirit for which the greatest happiness of the greatest number of capitalists is the sole touchstone. Something like this has been witnessed in the past twelve months in the strike of the British coal miners, against closure of pits by a Tory party with its god in its belly. Craft workers may have done more than factory hands to oppose capitalism in the era of Europe's industrial revolution. Resistance to innovation may develop into far more sweeping innovation.

Whether it will do so or not has always depended very much on the quality of leadership available. The author's estimate of the Clydeside leaders is not a favourable one: it is summed up sharply in a set of "biographical notes" at the end. J.T. Murphy, writing as a repentant ex-Communist, is preferred as a witness to wartime events to "the self-glorifying heroics of Kirkwood, Gallacher, or Bell." (92) No doubt leaders at all times have had their weaknesses, and wartime conditions and restrictions put these people under special difficulties. But this judgement does less than justice to Gallacher, especially, and the same must be said of the portrayal of John MacLean, whose memory has been stirring again in recent years, thanks largely to the efforts of his daughter, Nan Milton. One whose name has never dropped out of memory,

Harry McShane, on 21 December 1984, at the age of 93, was presented with the freedom of the city of Glasgow.

An epilogue to wartime unrest was the Bloody Friday, or 31 January 1919, which Dr. McLean believes must have alarmed the "revolutionaries" as much as it alarmed the government into sending tanks into Glasgow. Thereafter, there was a growing movement by the workers towards the Labour Party, of more significance in his view than the dilution issue had been, because it united labour instead of dividing it between skilled and unskilled. Dr. McLean produces interesting statistics to illustrate the new drift, and to substantiate his belief that it owed most to "the housing crusade and the Irish," (201) with the Housing Act of 1924 as its crowning success and the Catholic Wheatley, minister for health in the first Labour government, as the hero. This new political trend was also, however, towards very moderate reformism; and the winning of the Irish vote away from the Liberal Party to Labour involved surrender to the Catholic church over education. Segregated schools were to have dismal effects in perpetuating sectarian division: for Catholics they meant poorer teaching, as Dr. McLean sees; and their virtual exclusion from skilled jobs, as in Belfast, continued.

Its tendency to denigration of the Clydeside leaders must be one reason why the work has not been well-received by some left-wing critics. It is reasonable to add that personages in the opposite camp are treated equally unceremoniously. Lloyd George's legal case for suppressing the socialist journal *Forward* was "a tissue of distortions, innuendoes and lies." (57) As much or as little as readers may share the book's viewpoint, its thesis is well argued, and it is a storehouse of valuable and suggestive materials.

V.G. Kiernan
University of Edinburgh

Charles Docherty, *Steel and Steelworkers: The Sons of Vulcan* (London: Heinemann 1983).

EVERY ADVANCED industrial nation worth its salt has always wanted a steel industry. Steel has provided the backbone, the sinew, the bedrock (choose your metaphor) of twentieth-century industrialization, enabling a diversification of manufacturing, most often under domestic control. Largely as a result of the centrality of the industry in so many national economies, it has also become a political football, as forces of the left made its nationalization a key plank in their programmes and the right just as adamantly used it as the rallying cry for unfettered private enterprise. Nowhere has this been truer than in Britain.

Steel industries have also produced distinctive and influential patterns of industrial relations. Steelworkers are a tough, no-nonsense group, who have traditionally spent their working hours in the nearest approximation to hell on earth and have often been at the forefront of working-class militancy — in 1919 and 1937 in the United States and in 1946 in Canada, for example. In contrast to the North American pattern, however, Britain's steelworkers have had a quieter, more conciliatory record, dating back more than a century to the establishment of orderly, bureaucratic collective bargaining, with elaborate conciliation and arbitration procedures.

The title of Charles Docherty's book is misleading, since it by no means provides a full-scale history of the British steel industry and its workers. Its purpose is rather narrower, but nonetheless worthwhile: it is primarily concerned with the industrial relations that developed when the major British steelmakers were nationalized for the second time in 1967. The first third of the book is a somewhat dry outline of the evolution of the industry and its unions up to nationalization. We are introduced to a manufacturing sector

with serious structural difficulties — insufficient technological innovation, increasing foreign competition, and narrow pursuit of immediate profits by the private owners, who were united in the highly centralized private planning association, the British Iron and Steel Federation. We also meet the major unions, which have a long history of fragmentation, but which covered virtually the whole work force, including the white-collar workers, and had made great strides towards amalgamation. Relatively amicable relations had long existed between steelmasters and union officials, since the cornerstone of union policy had long been an identification with the health of the industry through sliding scales of wage payment pegged to steel prices.

The new world of industrial relations which dawned with the creation of the British Steel Corporation (BSC) gave the unions increased leverage through their connections to the Labour government. Wages and benefits were improved. Blue- and white-collar workers joined forces in the same organizations, and centralization of union power increased through a coordinating Steel Committee of the national Trades Union Congress (TUC). One response was the rapid growth of company-backed managers' associations, which the steel unions tried unsuccessfully to bring under their wing. At this point, it would have been useful to have a much fuller treatment of the inner dynamics of the new steel corporation, especially who controlled it and what could be expected of them. BSC regrettably remains a shadowy presence in Docherty's account.

Whatever newly enhanced power the unions believed they had won, the context was changing so rapidly that British steelworkers were soon being thrown onto the defensive. The 1970s were a difficult decade of adjustment for most countries' steel industries, and BSC eventually decided on a survival strategy modelled on Japan's huge new, technologically

sophisticated mills — one which Docherty believes was ill-conceived, blindly imitative, and inappropriate for Britain. The implications of this strategy (on which the steelworkers' unions were never properly consulted) would be plant shutdowns and massive layoffs to reduce so-called "overmanning."

The Labour government never opposed these plans but tried to cushion the impact somewhat. Margaret Thatcher's Conservatives, however, showed no such restraint when they took over in 1979. Their battle plans for dealing with the nationalized industries were already well known by this point: starve them into self-reliance and international competitiveness (to the point of extinction, if necessary — Thatcher called steel one of "yesterday's industries"), and break the backs of their unions. An ideological offensive had been raging from the Conservative benches and the national media, which insisted that the central problem with British industry, and the steel industry in particular, was low productivity, resulting from "overmanning" and other union controls over the production process. As Docherty demonstrates, the unions' correct insistence that labour costs in British steel were among the lowest in the industrialized world was continually ignored in this war of words.

The culmination of this confrontation was the first great labour battle of the Thatcher years — a national steel strike which began early in January 1980, the first since the 1926 General Strike. The last third of Docherty's book chronicles in detail the national mobilization which was so unfamiliar to a union leadership steeped in the tactics of peaceful negotiation and conciliation. The organizational success of the strike rested on regional strike committees and their flying picket squads, built on the experience of unofficial, local strikes which had always counterbalanced the quiet diplomacy of the leadership. Unfortunately for the steelworkers, the settlement accepted after

three long, bitter months on the picket lines was a humiliating defeat, which effectively ended the union's resistance to shutdowns and layoffs.

Docherty's study of this dramatic moment in British working-class history is flawed in several ways. He fails to provide sufficient background on the new BSC and on the specific difficulties of the industry internationally. His lengthy narrative of strike events is not matched by adequate analysis of the larger political context, especially the role of the TUC and the Labour Party in what was clearly emerging as the first skirmish in a prolonged war between the British state in Tory hands and the entire labour movement. Yet Docherty has produced a record of events which can provide a useful basis for further analysis, and his detailed account of the strike certainly indicates how tenaciously British workers are prepared to defend their livelihood. In 1984, of course, the whole story would be repeated even more dramatically in the British coal mines. Docherty also makes a convincing case for more democratic planning processes in re-organizing an industry in crisis, especially one under public control. "Management who did not believe in a nationalized steel industry ran a public corporation with as much aloofness and secrecy as any private owner," he laments. Here in Canada, Sydney's steelworkers could make the same charge. There must be a better way.

Craig Heron
York University

Paul Whiteley, *The Labour Party in Crisis* (London: Methuen 1983).

THE FUNDAMENTAL thesis of this book is that the Labour Party is experiencing a crisis caused by the failure of past Labour governments to achieve policy objectives. Whiteley discerns three interrelated

aspects of the present crisis: first, an ideological crisis as evidenced in recent battles over the party constitution, the breakaway of revisionists to form the SDP, and the running debate over entryism from the left; second, an electoral crisis culminating in only 20.6 per cent of the electorate voting Labour in the 1983 general election, the worst result since 1918, thus raising doubts that Labour will ever regain power; and third, the membership crisis. Labour has been losing an average of 11,000 members a year since the war, which places the continued existence of the party organization in question.

The objective of part one, "The Political Sociology of the Crisis," is to confirm the "performance hypothesis." Accordingly the three aspects of the crisis are linked to past performance by data from a survey of attitudes of the Labour élite (elected representatives), time series on party membership, and the 1979 British Election Study. The objective of part two, "The Political Economy of the Crisis," is to assess Labour's performance in office with particular reference to economic policy and social security policy. Whiteley concludes that, largely because of a preoccupation with short-term expediency rather than long-term socialist strategy, Labour has achieved little economic success. At key junctures it has lacked political courage and has capitulated to the financial orthodoxy of the City. The implications of the study and the lessons of past performance are discussed in the final chapter. The significance of the 1983 general election, which took place as the book was in proof, is commented on in a postscript. The book contains two appendices, one providing a non-technical explanation of statistical methods and the other reviewing surveys used in part one.

Before commenting, this reviewer must admit to being skeptical of the value of significance tests conducted in the absence of an adequate theoretical basis for the investigation. Whiteley's treatment of the link between Labour's per-

formance in office and its present problems is sophisticated statistically, meticulous, yet ultimately unconvincing. The reasons for the decline of the Labour Party are complex and cannot easily be accommodated by his unicausal model. Indeed, the line of causality could be reversed. For example, one could reasonably argue that had Labour been a genuine socialist party from the outset, instead of a parliamentary protective device for trade union rights, it might have been more successful in building a working-class organization. Had mandatory reselection of MPs and the widened franchise for electing the leadership been in place in the early 1970s, the Callaghan government might have found it more difficult to abandon its socialist promises in the face of the sterling crisis of 1976. Had rank-and-file organization been stronger, the party might have been more effective in political recruitment, political education, and in mobilizing the vote. Further, Whiteley's thesis, despite the statistical verification, begs some obvious questions. Given that the Conservative Party's record in office is not noticeably better than that of Labour why isn't it in crisis? How could the Tories achieve a landslide victory in 1983 after their disastrous handling of the economy? If longstanding failures in policy have eroded the support base of the party why did Labour's standing in the opinion polls plummet only in 1981? Why is it that the electorate, which cannot recall last week's headlines, is able to remember past government record?

For these reasons — applying a simplifying analytical scheme to complex events and a lack of regard for counter-evidence — the central thesis of this book is less convincing than the statistical glitter suggests. Moreover, Whiteley omits consideration of the ties between the party and the source of most of its income — the trade unions. Predictably, the importance of this link has not been lost on the Thatcher government which last year passed the Trade Union Act requiring

unions with political funds to hold secret ballots to decide whether members want to retain these funds. Indications are that the majority of trade unionists do not and, in consequence, the party risks losing up to 80 per cent of its total income. This, more than anything discussed in Whiteley's book, is likely to threaten the continued existence of the party.

Part two, an assessment of Labour's record and its prospects for the future, indicates to this reader a failure to appreciate fully the changed political situation in Britain. Chapter 6, "The Labour Party and Economic Policy," is a solid review of the main features of economic policy since the war but it is derivative and offers no new insights. Whiteley seems to attribute past failings of Labour governments to a lack of political courage and ill-thought out economic strategy on the part of the leadership. Yet this view is less than fair and does not suffice as an explanation of the *real politik* of economic policy-making. A case in point is the imposition of monetarism on a cabinet of non-believers in 1976 (which is acknowledged as the final death knell of revisionism). Whiteley attributes this pseudo-conversion to a reluctance to call the bluff of the monetarist ideologues in the American treasury and the IMF. However, this is only part of the explanation, for it ignores the pervasive influence of monetarism as it became injected into political debate by financial journalists and taken up by the right wing of the Tory Party, thereby becoming a political force. Chapter 7, "Labour's Social Policy," the case for poverty, is unduly restrictive. In what purports to be a political economy of the crisis, it is surely a mistake to omit consideration of housing, education, and health, for these areas will tax the ingenuity of Labour's policy-makers in the impending fiscal crisis.

The weakness of the book's underlying analysis is finally brought home in chapter 8, "The Future of the Labour Party." While this contains a thorough

review of Labour's alternative economic strategy for industrial regeneration, the assessment of the prospects for the future results in a circular argument: "if Labour can achieve electoral success, and if it can then implement a successful economic strategy, then it can reverse the decline in its support base." (188) If Labour can win power it can reverse the decline in its support, but to win power it must reverse the decline in its support. Whiteley recognizes the paradox but not that it is one of his own making. The problem is, if the electorate votes on the basis of past performance, and Labour's record is so bad, then how is it ever going to regain power? The truth, of course, is that what matters at election time is not the past but how it is interpreted in the present and linked to promises for the future. It is a matter of ideological packaging.

In conclusion, while the central thesis of *The Labour Party in Crisis* is less than convincing, the book should prove a valuable stimulant to further analysis. Perhaps future discussion should begin with a recognition that to understand the crisis of the Labour Party one first has to understand the meretricious appeal of the radical right. Thatcherism has proven more than a temporary swing of the political pendulum. By changing the rules of the political game in its favour it has produced a lasting realignment of class forces. It can no longer be dismissed as an effect of Britain's economic crisis for, by becoming ingrained as a reactionary commonsense, it determines the course of the crisis and how it will be worked out politically. Displacing this commonsense with a credible alternative socialist strategy, in a period of accelerating deindustrialization, is the major challenge facing the Labour Party.

Richard Marsden
Athabasca University

Samuel Clark and James S. Donnelly, Jr., eds., *Irish Peasants: Violence and Political Unrest, 1780 — 1914* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press 1983).

THIS IS ONE of those rare collections of scholarly articles that in one volume offers the reader an introduction to an entire field of study by historians who are in the vanguard of current research. Editors Samuel Clark and James S. Donnelly have provided an inestimable service for labour and agriculture historians in assembling and introducing ten original essays that demonstrate the complexity of collective action in Ireland from the late eighteenth century to World War I, showing how the history of Irish country people fits into the general field of peasant studies. The essays span a variety of related topics, from tumult over taxes in the revolutionary 1790s, agrarian class conflict after 1800, and popular Catholic millenarianism during the 1820s, through the rural protest movements of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

The editors have grouped the essays into three sections to accord with their perception of the major historical problems that Irish scholars have faced in studying agrarian society and popular politics in Ireland. Those in the first section seek to understand the nature of traditional protest during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Essays in the second section offer examples of the very distinctive patterns of collective action in the province of Ulster. In the third section various facets of the modernization of rural collective action in Ireland during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries are studied.

Most of the essays are empirical studies heavily based on primary sources. The editors endeavoured to obtain studies focusing on relatively neglected subjects in Irish agrarian history, such as the impact of taxation, rural sectarianism, agrarian politics in Ulster, agricultural

labourers, and the cleavages between graziers and small farmers.

The editors provide a general introduction to the volume and introductions to each of the three sections. They are not at all reticent in pointing to weaknesses in argument by their contributors. The general introduction at the beginning largely dwells on the impact of modernization of a peasant society, the mobilizing of peasants into collective action, and the differences in agrarian social structure as they relate to peasant movements within the larger literature of peasant movements. The editors conclude the book by passing "judgement on the gaps in the existing historiography and by offering prescriptions as to how they should be filled." It should come as no surprise that the lacunae are wider than the existing historiography.

There are some weak moments in a few of the essays. These result more often from an occasional insufficiency of sources than from flaws in arguments or concepts. The major triumph which must be lauded in this book, considering that it recurs in one article after another, is the attempt by many of the contributors to offer the reader a sense of the source and impact and consequences of violence and political unrest for the various levels of society and various communities affected.

This book is a welcome relief from too long a tradition in labour history in which a caricature of the impoverished, exploited worker is set against the equally stiff figure of the manipulating, greedy capitalist. Instead of focusing only on the ills of the peasant, and how they eventually were or were not remedied, many of the contributors to this volume attempt to present the views and motivations of the various classes, groups, and interests, and through showing the complications of interaction the cause for violence is revealed. True, in some instances the landlords, clergy, shopkeepers, traders, estate managers, graziers, farmers, politicians, and members of the Orange order

remain unattractive figures to the reader, but at least their motives, like those of the peasants, are revealed. They become human beings with comprehensible motives, not simply cardboard villains or heroes serving the ideologies of either Whig or Marxist historians. The provision of the larger context in essays that span nearly a century and a half results in recurring themes, such as the combination of factors that pitted the Orange lodge against Catholic peasants.

Many Canadian historians could benefit from reading this collection of essays, both in considering general approaches to writing labour history and social history, as well as specifically developing an understanding about the environment of protest in Ireland from which emigrants to Canada retreated in the pre-Confederation era. A reading of the Clark and Donnelly volume might help many Canadian historians to revise some of the misconceptions they continue to apply in studies of Irish immigrants in Canada. Rural collective action and violence in Canada has yet to be treated as a subject of historical inquiry. Now that Donald H. Akenson, in *The Irish in Ontario*, has exploded the several myths of Irish immigrants being largely urban dwellers, largely refugees from the potato famine of the late 1840s, and comprising the dregs of Upper Canadian society, perhaps the time has come to build on the example and foundation of the Clark and Donnelly volume. Were Irish Catholics and Irish Orange lodge members strictly intolerant of one another, as legend and previous generations of Canadian historians have been content to surmise? Should Canadian historians accept the arguments of historians of Orangeism that the order played a primarily positive role in Canadian society, or should they believe that Irish Orangeism played a major role in promoting bigotry and dividing Canada along intolerant religious lines during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries? Perhaps it is time to consider the world of

rural Canada, by defining and acknowledging the various classes, communities, interests, and groups that intermingled and engaged in combat in the past. A worthy precedent, in this collection of essays on Ireland, has been set by Clark and Donnelly.

Glenn J. Lockwood
University of Ottawa

T.W. Moody, *Davitt and Irish Revolution, 1846-82* (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1984).

THE LIVES OF revolutionaries, like those of saints, are full of mysteries. This exhaustive life of Michael Davitt answers many questions about his activities and also, one intriguing question in Irish historiography. That latter question should be posed first, for it leads into the former. It is this: was the late T.W. Moody a good historian?

That is not a frivolous question, for Moody was the most powerful person in the Irish historical community for nearly 50 years, from the 1930s to the early 1980s. Indeed, he was probably the single most powerful academic in Ireland for the last 30 of those years. He joined the staff of Trinity College, Dublin in the early 1930s, and from 1939 to 1977 was professor of history there.

Most importantly, he helped found and virtually controlled the periodical *Irish Historical Studies* and the monograph series *Studies in Irish History*. These introduced standards of objectivity into Irish historical writing. Moody placed an especially high premium on the quality of documentation for statements of fact. That said, by the mid-1960s these publishing efforts were becoming sclerotic. Moody was out of touch with most movements in the historical field occurring outside of Ireland, and *Irish Historical Studies*, therefore, contained virtually no

social or cultural history and nothing even remotely innovative methodologically. Also, as an editor, he was technically inept: he did not hire professional copy editors or designers, and his publications suffered by comparison with those of good university presses.

During these years in which Moody wielded power, he, like so many professors in universities in the British Isles, put into print nothing of consequence himself. His doctoral thesis, published in the 1930s, was a masterful piece of Ulster history, but thereafter he gave only popular lectures and did nothing that would permit the Irish historical community to judge his competence as a professional historian.

He need not to have been so self-protecting. This biography of Michael Davitt indicates that Moody, in the classical, narrative form which he understood, remained a very good historian indeed. Revolutionaries are notoriously hard to write about accurately, largely because they usually leave so few records, and Davitt is no exception. Born in 1846 in county May and raised in England, he left no papers dealing with the years before the 1870s.

Davitt was a compelling and complex figure. He was born in Ireland, but raised in the industrial slums of England. He went to work very young, and at age eleven, caught an arm in a textile machine and thus had it amputated below the shoulder. Davitt grew into revolutionary Irish republicanism as naturally as he had joined the industrial work force, and in 1870 he was sentenced to fifteen years for treason-felony, for which he served seven years. Despite his early association with Fenianism, he had an instinctive loathing for terrorism, and his great achievement was quite the opposite of secret-society violence: he conceived and provided much of the energy for the great Land League campaigns of the late 1870s and early 1880s. Although Charles Stewart Parnell increasingly was the front for these campaigns, Davitt was the driving

force. To Davitt, more than anyone else, should be given credit for the fact that well before the 1916 rising, the small farmers of Ireland had largely obtained title to the land they farmed.

This is a long volume, but Davitt is worthy of the detailed chronicle. If Moody's narrative is innocent of anything that resembles analysis, that is not an unmitigated problem, for enough information is provided for each reader to make independent judgements. The one question that lurks, unanswered, behind the volume is this: why has there never been an Irish revolution? Very few Irish political revolutionaries ever have been social revolutionaries, and even the 1916-22 war of independence resulted only in a change of management: in the south of Ireland a liberal British administration was replaced by an arch-conservative Irish administration.

This softcover edition is produced beautifully by the Clarendon Press. Well-designed, perfectly set, with notes at the bottom of the page, it is a model of scholarly book production.

D.H. Akenson
Queen's University

W.W. Daniel and Neil Millward, *Workplace Industrial Relations in Britain: The DE/PSI/SSRC Survey* (London: Heinemann 1983).

DANS UNE RECENSION publiée dans le dernier numéro du *British Journal of Industrial Relations* (March 1984), Keith Bradley écrivait que «Daniel and Millward's study represents a watershed in British workplace industrial relations. It is the most important book in the area since the publication of the Donovan Report.» Bien qu'il s'agisse effectivement d'une publication de très grande importance, notre jugement d'ensemble sera un peu plus nuancé.

Il s'agit bien de l'enquête la plus complète et plus étendue sur les relations industrielles en Grande-Bretagne et, pourrions nous ajouter, nous ne lui connaissons pas d'équivalent dans un autre pays. Alors que les enquêtes précédentes se sont souvent limitées au secteur manufacturier, celle-ci rejoint un échantillon représentatif de toute l'économie. La population fut élargie à tous les établissements de 25 salariés et plus, et l'information porte sur les cols blancs comme sur les cols bleus. Un total de 4 466 entrevues par questionnaire ont été réalisées en 1980 auprès de cadres et de représentants de salariés de 2 041 établissements. La recherche est le fruit d'une collaboration entre le Department of Employment, le Policy Studies Institute et le Social Science Research Council.

Bradley montre son enchantement pour l'ouvrage recensé en soutenant que «in one careful and comprehensive survey... the authors have eclipsed much of the research emanating from other research institutes and the universities.» De façon plus particulière, il fait ressortir les mérites de cette étude en la comparant à celle de l'University of Warwick intitulée *The Changing Contours of British Industrial Relations* (William Brown, ed., 1981). Cette dernière enquête de l'Industrial Relations Research Unit était limitée aux établissements de 50 salariés et plus du secteur manufacturier, et les entrevues furent effectuées auprès de cadres seulement. Or, quant à leur couverture, les enquêtes ne sont pas comparables. À l'intérieur de leurs limites particulières toutefois, il nous semble qu'une enquête n'éclipse pas l'autre.

Avant de présenter des considérations d'un caractère plus substantiel, il est peut-être pertinent de noter que Daniel et Millward n'ont pas répété le tour de force du groupe de Warwick qui avait présenté ses résultats dans 121 pages de texte dont la lecture n'est pas fastidieuse. Bien sûr, le lecteur trouvera beaucoup plus d'information sur un plus grand nombre de sujets

dans les 297 pages de texte de la présente étude, mais cela ne conduit pas à plus de profondeur dans l'analyse et l'interprétation des résultats.

Bradley développe la comparaison favorable à l'enquête recensée en soutenant que ses résultats «differ significantly» de ceux de Warwick sur au moins trois questions majeures: l'importance des comités paritaires de consultation, le principal niveau de la négociation des salaires, et la professionnalisation des cadres en relations industrielles. Or, selon notre lecture, la contradiction entre ces résultats n'est qu'apparente. Pour le secteur manufacturier, les données des deux enquêtes sont assez similaires sur ces questions comme sur plusieurs autres sujets.

Ainsi, les données sur la récente croissance du nombre de comités paritaires de consultation, le plus souvent en parallèle avec le renforcement des structures syndicales et de la négociation collective d'établissement, confirment celles de Warwick et de quelques autres études. Sur la question du niveau de négociation le plus important, l'étude de Warwick concluait que «single-employer bargaining has become the most important means of pay determination for two-thirds of manual workers.» (24) Les données de la présente enquête confirment cette conclusion pour le secteur manufacturier, mais ses auteurs insistent sur le fait que «it is clearly not the case for the economy as a whole.» (187- et 290-) Finalement, alors que l'ouvrage édité par Brown insistait beaucoup sur le «growing professionalism of industrial relations management» les informations analysées par Daniel et Millward indiquent que ce progrès aurait été moins marqué dans l'ensemble de l'économie. Ces derniers discutent le contraste apparent et concluent que, dans la mesure où les différences quant à la population couverte et les définitions utilisées peuvent être contrôlées, les résultats sont assez similaires quant à la place des spécialistes en relations industrielles. (126-7 et 286)

De façon générale, les auteurs de la présente étude tiennent à situer les tendances déjà dans le secteur manufacturier dans une perspective plus large, celle de l'ensemble de l'économie. Ce portrait plus complet permet de faire ressortir la *diversité* des structures et des pratiques dans les relations industrielles en Grande-Bretagne. Par exemple, la tendance dominante observée par les chercheurs de Warwick était celle de l'institutionnalisation des relations du travail aux niveaux de l'établissement et de la compagnie. Les données étudiées par Daniel et Millward suggèrent que cette réforme aurait été moins généralisée. Néanmoins, ces auteurs soulignent en conclusion que, dans la mesure où leurs résultats sont comparables à ceux des enquêtes précédentes, «nearly all of those comparisons have shown a growth in the formality of workplace industrial relations, either in terms of the presence of institutions such as committees or the presence and use of formal procedures and processes.» (295-296)

Cette enquête d'une envergure sans précédent étend la portée de l'information disponible sur un bon nombre de sujets précis. Le chapitre sur le conflit industriel nous est apparu particulièrement riche à cet égard. En particulier, il fournit des données intéressantes sur les manifestations de conflit autres que la grève et sur le piquetage, le tout ventilé selon la branche d'activité, la taille de l'établissement, etc. Néanmoins, les principales tendances soulignées par les auteurs ne devraient pas surprendre le lecteur déjà au fait des relations industrielles dans ce pays. De façon générale, les résultats confirment des tendances déjà observées plus qu'ils ne marquent un nouveau courant dans l'étude des relations du travail. Ainsi, parmi les nombreuses variables indépendantes considérées, celles qui s'avèrent significatives avec le plus de persistance tendent à élaborer et à préciser des relations causales déjà observées. C'est le cas de la variable «ownership,»

laquelle faut ressortir plusieurs différences significatives entre les grands secteurs de l'emploi (entreprises nationalisées, administration publique, services privés, et industrie manufacturière). C'est aussi le cas de la taille de l'établissement, laquelle s'avère à nouveau une source de variation considérable sur plusieurs aspects de la structure des relations du travail, de même que sur la propension à toutes les manifestations de conflit. Il est à noter toutefois que l'influence de la taille de l'entreprise sur le niveau de la négociation collective ne va pas dans la même sens que celle de la taille de l'établissement. Ainsi, «the overall impact of these divergent sources of variation was that plant bargaining was most common at the larger establishment belonging to a relatively small enterprise. Bargaining at a higher level was most common for the small establishment that belonged to a relatively large enterprise.» (199)

Ce type d'enquête par questionnaire génère des informations considérables sur la structure des relations du travail, sur les arrangements institutionnels. Elle offre beaucoup au lecteur intéressé par les rapports institutionnalisés et les politiques publiques. Toutefois, la méthode ne permet pas en elle-même de cerner la réalité sociale, de comprendre et expliquer les rapports de production de façon satisfaisante. Cela est illustré de façon assez exceptionnelle dans ce cas-ci, alors que l'enquête effectuée en 1980 ne montre pas vraiment d'effet de crise. . . . Néanmoins, cette enquête d'une ampleur considérable et celles qui l'ont précédée fournissent des matières premières de qualité pour l'étude des tendances actuelles dans les rapports de production en Grande-Bretagne.

Jacques Bélanger
Université Laval

Duncan Gallie, *Social Inequality and Class Radicalism in France and Britain* (New York: Cambridge University Press 1983).

WHEN SOCIOLOGISTS POSE questions about the revolutionary potential of the western working class, one of the issues they have increasingly had to confront is the fact that some national working classes are more radical than others. Different working-class responses to structured inequalities have made it evident that factors other than some universal law of capitalist development determine levels of working-class consciousness.

The book under review is an attempt to identify those factors in two societies frequently seen as polar opposites in typologies of class radicalism in western Europe. On the one hand, Britain is viewed as a society in which the possibilities for a revolutionary working-class movement are all but exhausted. On the other hand, France is held up as a society in which elements of a socialist counter-ideology may still be found in workers' social consciousness. Skillfully marshalling case study material (drawn from his own survey of workers in four advanced technology plants in Britain and France) and data from larger national samples, Duncan Gallie critically examines the nature and determinants of cross-cultural variations in working-class consciousness.

The first part of the work examines the structure of class attitudes among French and British workers. On the basis of the case study material, Gallie argues that while both groups shared essentially similar images of the class structure and their place within it, the concept of class carried a deeper personal resonance for the French than British workers. Their greater class awareness and working-class identification went hand in hand with a more politicized perspective on class relationships. However, the scope of the French workers' egalitarian aspirations for political change fell a long way short of revolutionary socialism.

Class-based inequalities were to be ameliorated by an extension of collective bargaining rights rather than the abolition

of private property ownership, and a broadening of the powers of parliamentary democracy rather than by smashing the bourgeois state. Thus, while French workers displayed more elements of a radicalized class consciousness and a clearer vision of the type of alternative society they would like to see than the British workers, their aspirations were essentially reformist rather than revolutionary.

Now it is one thing to demonstrate that two different national working classes are imbued with different types of social consciousness; it is another thing entirely to explain these systematic variations. This is the theme of the second part of the book.

The thrust of Gallie's argument is that French working-class radicalism is a product of the interaction between high levels of work grievance, imputed by an effective collective bargaining system, and long-term exposure to the counter-ideology of socialism offered by left political parties. Work grievances in the French plants translate into broader-based discontents because authoritarian managerial practices remain unchecked by adequate collective bargaining. In Britain, by contrast, effective bargaining has, first, moderated union-management conflict and, secondly, segmented industrial from political conflict.

But if it is authoritarian management which is responsible for broadening the scope of working-class grievances in France, then it is the left-wing political parties which mould them into a distinctively political form.

General ideological orientations learned early in life favourably predispose workers to the messages of the parties of the left. Thus the fact that French workers hold less fatalistic views about the prospects for fundamental social change than British workers is attributed to the differing influences of the British Labour Party and French socialist and communist parties. Whereas the French left political par-

ties have consistently held open the possibility that differences in material wealth can be eradicated by purposive political action, the British Labour Party has done little to challenge the orthodoxy that inequality is inevitable.

In the course of developing this argument, several alternative explanations of French working-class radicalism are examined and disposed of by Gallie. He downplays, first of all, the importance of the French revolutionary tradition; and secondly, he tests, and finds wanting, the thesis that radicalism in the modern French working class can be explained as a legacy of traditional agrarian radicalism. What he does suggest, however, is that historical experiences associated with the two world wars exerted profoundly contrary influences upon the development of the French and British labour movements.

France suffered much higher casualty rates during World War I than did Britain, and also had to contend with an army of occupation. Moreover, French employers were more repressive than British employers in responding to workers' grievances about wartime working conditions and living standards. The differing responses of French and British industrial and political élites to organized labour continued in the post-war years. The result was that French industry became a fertile breeding ground for the embryonic Communist Party. The more accommodative policies adopted by employers and government forestalled a similar development in Britain.

Having consolidated its position in the inter-war years, the French Communist Party went on to play a decisive role in the resistance movement during World War II. Particularly because many employers collaborated with the Germans, the Communist Party was able to present itself as a defender of both class and national interests. The legacy of its wartime performance is measured in terms of post-war electoral successes.

This book should be compulsory reading for anybody interested in the position of the working class in capitalist society. The attention that Gallie pays to institutional and historical differences between France and Britain, and his ability to show how they effect contemporary class attitudes makes for a study that avoids the flatness and ahistoricity often found in sociological research on class consciousness. Indeed, seeing how Gallie handles the complicated relationship between "proximate" and broader historical sources of variation in class radicalism is one of the major rewards of reading this book.

Gallie's maintenance of a tight relationship between evidence and explanation is the other major strength of this study. Ideas are suggested, confirmed, rejected, or modified in light of the available evidence. Thus, the reader gets not only a strong feeling for the interdependence of theory and research, but also a sense for how an explanatory framework is incrementally developed. In sum, the study of working-class consciousness has been considerably advanced by the publication of this book.

Julian Tanner
University of Alberta

Michel Bilis, *Socialistes et pacifistes — l'intenable dilemme des socialistes français (1933-1939)* (Paris: Syros 1979).

LE LIVRE DE Michel Bilis est, d'abord, une chronique de l'évolution de la SFIO face aux problèmes de la guerre et de la paix au cours des années 1930. Où, comment le «parti de la paix,» progressivement rallié à la sécurité collective s'est peu à peu divisé devant les envahissements du fascisme; à un point tel qu'en 1939, après une approbation de Munich majoritaire dans l'appareil du Parti, et sans doute au groupe parlementaire, il a

fini par perdre tragiquement son emprise sur la vie de la nation à un tournant décisif de son histoire.

Au début des années 1930, le thème de la politique extérieure n'est pas essentiel dans la vie du Parti. C'est Léon Blum qui, sans mal, donne le ton. Après une phase de méfiance, il a fini par se rallier à la politique de Briand, aux idéaux de la SDN et à leur souci de désarmement général. Même l'arrivée de Hitler au pouvoir en 1933 ne lui semble que renforcer l'argumentation en ce sens. L'affaire éthiopienne, puis la remilitarisation de la Rhénanie l'amènent bien à prendre ses distances vis-à-vis de sa période genevoise et il amorce un certain repli derrière les alliances traditionnelles de la France, sur un front de sécurité rassemblant avec elle la Grande-Bretagne, l'U.R.S.S., et le maximum de petits pays. Mais le pacte franco-soviétique de 1935 ne lui paraît pas moins avoir de fâcheux relents de la politique d'encerclement de l'Allemagne avant 1914, dont on sait où elle a mené; et, en 1936, le fameux discours de Luna Park — comme ceux qui le suivent — reprend, pour justifier la non-intervention en Espagne, tous les thèmes traditionnels de la défense de la paix et des dangers de la course aux armements. Les cris de «Vive la paix» qui interrompent ses propos montrent à quel point ils correspondent à une sensibilité profonde des militants, au-delà des tendances organisées du Parti. Après les premiers élans du cœur, c'est la crainte que l'intervention en Espagne n'entraîne un embrasement général qui l'emporte. Et là, Blum retrouve tous ces socialistes minoritaires qui, eux, ont toujours voué la SDN aux gémonies. Car ce n'est pas la politique extérieure qui fait les «tendances», et J. Zyromski, qui dénonce la... «dupérissement sinistre de la non-intervention...» se coupe des ses camarades «de gauche» qui désirent que la France se dégage de ses alliances.

Le vrai tournant, c'est Munich, qui, à la fin de 1938, ouvre une fraction esquis-

sée seulement quelques mois auparavant, et c'est la crise tchèque qui cristallise les tendances en les recomposant en deux camps. D'un côté, Blum, d'emblée soucieux que des garanties soient données à la Tchécoslovaquie, impatient devant la Noblesse anglaise. De l'autre, Paul Faure, qui reprend les arguments de 1936 sur le danger que la France ne soit entraînée malgré elle dans un conflit élargi. Et au Congrès de 1939, symboliquement, pour la première fois depuis 1920, les deux hommes soutiennent des motions d'orientation générale différentes. À tel point que les mêmes mots n'ont plus le même sens, le projet par exemple d'une grande «conférence de la paix». Pour les uns, elle doit être l'occasion d'acculer à la défensive des dictatures considérées comme les principales responsables des menaces sur la paix, pour les autres, elle doit aboutir à leur faire de nouvelles concessions afin de réparer les injustices du traité de Versailles. La synthèse du dernier Congrès d'avant-guerre est un leurre, et seule la crainte d'une nouvelle scission (il y a le souvenir de 1921, celui de 1933) empêche que n'éclatent deux blocs irréductiblement antagonistes dans une ambiance, de la part des fauristes, d'invectives et d'accusations.

Comment en est-on arrivé là? L'arrière-plan idéologique n'est pas aisé à démêler, si tant est qu'il existe. Car du côté de Blum lui-même, jusqu'en 1936 au moins, ce n'est qu'une construction très abstraite d'un système de régulation internationale, plaquée sur une réalité dont la dynamique lui est de plus en plus étrangère. Par la suite, sa réflexion n'échappe pas à la phraséologie, aux précautions ou aux contradictions souvent déroutantes, et la non-intervention n'est justifiée qu'au prix de pas mal d'acrobaties idéologiques. Pour être moins fermement exprimée, la sensibilité de la masse des militants est tout aussi peu adaptée au contexte des années 1930 au fur et à mesure qu'avance la décennie. Elle est dominée, quelle que soit la tendance, par la volonté de ne pas

se retrouver dans la situation de 1914, et, au lendemain de Munich, ce n'est pas un hasard si on mobilise, chez les fauristes, des vétérans comme Sixte-Quenin et l'obscur mais proluxe Sabinius Valère. Du côté de la «Gauche révolutionnaire» et de Marceau Pivert, c'est la stricte position de refus, et l'adhésion au défaitisme révolutionnaire; or, son influence se développe jusqu'en 1938; elle fait ainsi écho au «Comité d'action socialiste révolutionnaire» de Stéphane Just, qui rassemble un moment 12 pour cent des mandats, tout en partageant avec lui un ouvriérisme pur et dur. Quelle que soient les circonstances, la sécurité collective est une duperie, un sous-produit de Versailles; l'affaire d'Ethiopie n'a fait qu'accentuer la méfiance vis-à-vis de la SDN, et le pacte franco-soviétique de 1935 n'est qu'une nouvelle mouture de l'alliance russe de 1914. Ailleurs, il y a aussi le pacifisme intégral autour de Félicien Challaye: relayé par les intellectuels de «Révolution constructive», peu nombreux mais influents: la guerre est la barbarie suprême, et les moyens modernes de destruction entraîneraient la fin de la civilisation elle-même.

Assez curieusement, un certain souci de conserver la spécificité du courant socialiste va dans le même sens, surtout à partir de 1935-6 quand les cadres craignent qu'elle ne soit oubliée ou dénaturée par le flot des nouveaux adhérents, qui y sont moins sensibles. Une volonté d'identité qui s'affirme d'abord contre le communisme. Le discours anti-bolchévique de Paul Faure est bien antérieur à 1933, il ne fait que se durcir après 1936, à propos de l'Espagne, elle encore. Et le voilà qui reçoit le renfort depuis les cercles extérieurs du mouvement, celui de la CGT où, dès octobre 1936, la tendance *Syndicats*, avec Belin, Dumoulin, etc. . . . reprend à son compte l'obsession du grignotage et du noyautage par le PC, au moins aussi forte que la hantise de l'Union Sacrée. Ce n'est pas un hasard si, aux côtés du Syndicat national des instituteurs et André

Delmas, les leaders syndicalistes inspirent en 1939 l'activisme *munichois* le plus convaincu. Pour soutenir que l'«antifascisme belliqueux» est étranger à la tradition socialiste, une forme de contamination par le stalinisme; et P. Faure de dénoncer, en mars 1939, la «... tentative sournoise et interne du bolchévisme. . . .» Pour *Redressement*, la nouvelle tendance qu'il anime, c'est là l'ennemi principal; et la première critique que l'on porte aux thèses de Zyromski, c'est de s'aligner sur celles du PC; d'introduire ainsi le ver dans le fruit.

«Redressement» d'ailleurs, et *Le Socialiste*, créé par P. Faure dès l'été 1937, prétendent vouloir d'abord lutter contre les tentations centrifuges que suscitent des idées étrangères à la tradition du Parti. Soucieux de son unité autour de son identité, ils pratiquent une sorte de guesdisme rebouilli qui mêle un vocabulaire prolétarien au souci de revenir à une analyse «marxiste» stricte. En son nom, certains avaient déjà déploré la «dérive patriotique» du Front Populaire; suite logique du revirement du PC en 1935. Et en 1938-9, l'on réfute un soi-disant cli-vage entre un «bloc fasciste» et un «bloc démocratique:» voilà J. Le Bail refusant la complicité avec les «impérialismes repus» contre les «impérialismes avides.» Quitte à invoquer, en une autre occasion, les nécessités de la défense républicaine: la guerre, ce serait la victoire assurée du fascisme à l'intérieur, et la fin du régime républicain. Si bien que le renoncement à l'extérieur s'apparente à la lutte pour la démocratie et le socialisme. . . .

Enfin, il sort au cours des dernières années d'avant-guerre de ce retour aux principes d'étranges affirmations. Chez certains, la complaisance est à peine cachée pour les revendications des fascistes, toujours au nom de «... l'absurde traité de Versailles» et de la nécessaire réconciliation franco-allemande. Il faut relativiser la nature des fascismes, et ne convient-il pas de s'y féliciter de l'étatisation du crédit, du contrôle des changes, de

la limitation des profits, de la planification de l'économie? Dans la mouvance du «planisme», certains vont même jusqu'à penser, et à dire, que l'Allemagne de Hitler et l'Italie de Mussolini sont plus proches du socialisme que la France, et la Grande-Bretagne, deux états capitalistes.

Justement, disent les blumistes, il y a longtemps que Versailles — dont ils ne nient pas les responsabilités — est mort. Et comment se reconnaître aussi peu soit-il dans des régimes dont l'émergence s'est fondée en priorité sur la liquidation brutale du mouvement ouvrier, quel qu'il soit? Leur réflexion ne se donne pas la même rigueur théorique. Elle ne s'appuie pas moins sur une autre idée du socialisme, qui est la justice entre les hommes, comme la paix ne peut être telle que si elle s'accorde à la justice entre les nations. Surtout — et c'est là le grand hiatus — ils décrivent la nature radicalement nouvelle des fascismes, reprenant le propos apparu dès 1935-6 à la marge du Parti, autour de J. Zyromski et de certains de ses amis de la *Bataille socialiste*. Des gens peu suspects de laxisme idéologique, puisque de toujours rassemblés autour de l'affirmation de la lutte de classes et contre toutes les déviations du début des années 1930, le «néo-socialisme», le planisme, etc. . . . Pour eux, à situation nouvelle, formes nouvelles de lutte: le fascisme, c'est la guerre; et la persistance à l'extérieur ne fait que prolonger celle que l'on mène à l'intérieur. Des thèses qui ont fini par faire éclater la tendance, mais qui ont peu à peu gagné ceux qui suivent Léon Blum, même s'ils sont plus précautionneux.

À l'arrivée de ces évolutions idéologiques divergentes, c'est donc, derrière l'unité de façade, l'antagonisme profond qui divise la SFIO sur elle-même en 1939. Mais avec des armes inégales. Dans le champ clos du Parti, les fauristes sont les mieux armés, d'autant qu'après le Congrès de décembre 1938, la conquête par les partisans de la fermeté de la majorité à la CAP n'empêche pas Paul Faure d'occuper le Secrétariat général. Lui-même dis-

pose d'un évident charisme, qui facilite dans les sections la circulation de ses idées, à travers un appareil où ses fidèles sont majoritaires: le *Bulletin d'information* réservé aux cadres contrebalance largement *Le Populaire*, d'ailleurs accusé à l'occasion d'être à la remorque des communistes. Au-delà, la base elle-même ne peut qu'être sensible au discours d'identité; elle a tendance à ne voir dans le débat que conflit de personne ou querelle, lointaine, des sommets. À l'évidence, elle saisit mal l'importance des enjeux et, malgré le prestige de Blum, certains socialistes avaient été dérouterés dès 1933-5 par ses premières, et cependant timides, interrogations.

La méthode de M. Bilis, limitée à l'analyse d'une documentation écrite et publique — la presse socialiste, les brochures officielles, les débats des Congrès, les livres de Blum — ne permet guère d'aller plus loin. S'il pose la question des relations entre les militants et la direction de la SFIO, c'est pour, rapidement, conclure à l'ignorance et à l'indifférence de la base. Dont le premier péché, semble-t-il, est de nature sociologique. En 1938-9, ce sont les fédérations paysannes de la SFIO, celles du Centre, du Languedoc, la Saône-et-Loire, l'Isère, qui accentuent le pacifisme ambiant: le souvenir des hécatombes de 1914-18? Et, dans la CGT, les gros bataillons qui suivent A. Delmas et les instituteurs — un tiers au congrès de novembre 1938 — sont ceux des employés et des travailleurs des services, alors que ceux des travailleurs manuels s'opposent à lui; n'est-ce pas là, justement, l'électorat de la SFIO et, depuis 1936, le vivier de ses nouveaux adhérents? Par là, le Parti est une sorte de parti «moyen», collant aux aspirations «moyennes» d'une société française en voie de tertiarisation. La second raison tient au flou idéologique du socialisme français, à son manque d'outillage intellectuel pour analyser le changement d'une situation; une carence d'autant plus grave pour une organisation où les idées circulent libre-

ment, sans contrainte véritable d'orthodoxie, reclassant sans cesse des tendances fluctuantes autour d'un thème et d'une équipe.

La démonstration n'est cependant pas pleinement convaincante. Au plan sociologique, n'y a-t-il pas aussi des fédérations cégétistes ouvrières — les mineurs, par exemple — gangrenées par le pacifisme intégral; auquel n'adhèrent pas tous les employés — voyez Robert Lacoste, Neumeyer; la base de l'Isère et de la Saône-et-Loire est plus diversifiée qu'il n'est dit, etc. . . . Globalement, sur la clientèle de la SFIO, M. Bilis raisonne peut-être plus à travers ce qu'elle a été sous la Quatrième République qu'à la fin de la Troisième. Un filtre de la fin des années 1970 encore plus fort quand il aborde les problèmes de l'arrière-plan théorique: sa faiblesse n'est-elle pas, aussi, la rançon de la liberté? Se poser la question de la nature «socialiste» de l'U.R.S.S., celle des pratiques du communisme, était-ce à coup sûr errer et déboucher fatalement sur un philofascisme? L'interview d'E. Depreux, dont on sait par la suite l'action sans équivoque pendant et après la guerre est très éclairante là-dessus, et l'on peut regretter au passage que l'auteur n'ait pas eu un recours plus systématique aux témoignages des acteurs survivants. À l'opposé, on a vu à quelles aberrations pouvait mener la rigueur «marxiste.»

Peut-être est-ce au niveau des individus qu'il faut aller, même s'il y a quelque danger à glisser dans un psychologisme — que M. Bilis n'évite pas toujours — tout à fait gratuit. Léon Blum, d'abord, mais aussi un Marx Dormoy, pourtant proche des «néos» en 1933 et anti-munichois en 1938-9, bien d'autres aussi. Pour l'heure, le livre, s'il apporte beaucoup, n'explique pas pleinement le décalage grandissant entre la phraséologie et la réalité, la perte tragique d'emprise sur celle-ci, l'évolution d'autres socialistes qui, convaincus de la décadence historique des régimes parlementaires bourgeois allaient se lais-

ser aller alors même que les événements leur donnaient tort, à l'alliance avec les pires ennemis du socialisme et y perdre leur âme.

Yves Lequin
Université de Lyon

Erich Fromm, *The Working Class in Weimar Germany: A Psychological and Sociological Study*, edited and with an introduction by Wolfgang Bonss (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press 1984).

THIS BOOK IS a fascinating historical document. It originated in a survey undertaken by Erich Fromm for the Institute for Social Research at Frankfurt in 1929. The instrument was a 271-item questionnaire distributed to 3,300 manual and white-collar workers, of whom exactly a third had returned completed versions by the end of 1931. The analysis was still in progress when the Nazi seizure of power intervened, and many of the materials were lost in the institute's move to the United States, with only 584 of the completed questionnaires surviving. Some preliminary findings appeared in the context of the institute's work on *Authority and Family* (1936), but the commitment to publish the study as a whole became stymied in a series of intellectual and personal disagreements which seemed to pit Horkheimer, and especially Adorno, against Fromm, and which ended in 1939 with Fromm's withdrawal from the institute. As Wolfgang Bonss says in his valuable introduction, the survey then "disappeared into Fromm's desk drawer after these unpleasant developments, and was later also partly deleted from the annals of the Institute." (2). There it remained until its German publication in 1980, and we now have Berg Publishers (an enterprising new press based in Leamington Spa, England) to thank for this English translation.

In conceiving the study, Fromm sought to embody Horkheimer's commitment to exploring "the connections between economic life, . . . the psychic development of the individual and cultural change" by means of a new "interdisciplinary materialism." (15-19) As Horkheimer posed the question in his 1931 inaugural address: "What relationship can be established for a particular group . . . between the role of this group in the economic process, the changes in the psychic structure of its individual members and the influence on it of ideas and attitudes?" (18) But as Bonss points out, Fromm's project was far more than merely derivative of this emerging institutional commitment. In fact, it had independent roots in the very interesting contemporary conjunction of Marx and Freud, and in these terms Fromm made an important contribution to the institute's early theory formation of his own, arriving at his concept of an "analytical social psychology" via an earlier training in the sociology of religion and the law. In these terms Fromm sought to harness both Horkheimer's programmatic interdisciplinary commitment and the tentative left Freudianism of the late 1920s to an inquiry whose combination of quantitative and qualitative approaches was extremely original for its time. In this sense the study's place in a history of social science (and of the left-intellectual culture of the late Weimar Republic (is probably more interesting than its own substantive concerns, which were to do with the relationship between character structure and political affiliation.

Given the suppositions of the Weimar left intelligentsia, the findings of the study in this respect were disconcerting, because the assumed dichotomous unities with which Fromm's research began — between consistently revolutionary and anti-authoritarian leftists and consistently authoritarian rightists — tended to break down in the detailed analysis of the subject's replies. As the content of the ques-

tions moved further away from overtly political matters where the rhetoric and slogans of the left-wing parties could be most easily invoked (as in the question concerning the best system of government) towards more obliquely political ones (for example, about the greatest personalities in history, or tastes in plays) and films and the formally non-political ones (concerning education, social attitudes, and styles of life), the radicalism of left-wing respondents became increasingly compromised, though more markedly so for Social Democrats than for Communists and for ordinary supporters than for party officials. While this is perhaps not very startling for late twentieth-century sensibilities, given the now-familiar inability of most left-wing movements to change appreciably the social mores and everyday culture of the working class, particularly in the sphere of sex-gender relations, this inconsistency impressed Fromm and his colleagues as the most important result to emerge from the study. They concluded that only a small 15 per cent of left-wingers possessed "the courage, readiness for sacrifice and spontaneity needed to rouse the less active and to overcome the enemy," while another 25 per cent could be regarded as less consistent but generally reliable supporters. (228)

We may certainly agree that the left had failed to change the personality structure of its adherents in any comprehensive or fundamental way, and that the persistence of "authoritarian" attitudes decisively inhibited the development of effective and genuinely radical politics across a wide range of social and cultural issues. Moreover, "the discrepancy between manifest opinion and latent attitude" in broad sections of the working class may well have provided the ideological space for the politics of fascist consolidation which so effectively destroyed and disorganized the traditional and not-so-traditional bases of working-class culture after 1933. But whether such discrepancies

were quite so disabling for the purposes of immediate political mobilization of the more obvious issues of working-class defence before 1933, and a "left-wing outlook" quite so powerfully "neutralized or perverted by underlying personality traits" (29) as Fromm and his collaborators maintained, are much more ambiguous questions. Similarly, we may find the detailed responses to the various questions, particularly the ones concerning *leisure pursuits and cultural taste*, fascinating and suggestive in themselves, without accepting the hard ideological inferences which the study was continually disposed to draw. In some respects, given a more prosaic expectation of the degree of cultural radicalism among the working class, it is precisely the consistency of certain Communist attitudes (for example, on the abortion question) that is most impressive.

So there are limits to what the study's detailed findings can tell us about the real political configuration of the German working class in the final years of the Weimar Republic and its potential for effective anti-fascist opposition. In this sense its sociological value is flawed by the historically contingent character of the social psychological analysis that supplied its motivating problematic, and it is as a slice of recent intellectual history that the study may prove to be most rewardingly approached. As such it belongs with a series of equally interesting contemporary German essays in social inquiry, of which the famous Marienthal unemployment study by Marie Jahoda, Paul Lazarsfeld, and Hans Zeisel is mentioned by Bonss in the introduction, but of which some others are not, including the research of Hans Speier, Theodor Geiger, and Emil Lederer on various aspects of the so-called new *Mittelstand* or the white-collar lower middle class. As intimated above, this form of social research also intersected in certain ways with the emerging interest in Freud, and there is much room here for an imagina-

tively conceived historical sociology of knowledge directed at the institutional and ideological coordinates of late Weimar's left-academic intellectual culture, an ambience which has been wonderfully explored in Atina Grossmann's unpublished dissertation (Rutgers 1984) on the sex reform movement. Bonss does a very good job of painting some of this context's broad outlines in his short introduction, together with some of the study's *antecedents* in the late nineteenth-century *enquête ouvrière* and the pre-1914 survey research sponsored by the *Verein für Sozialpolitik*. But for the Fromm study to be set properly into context, there is much that still needs to be done.

Geoff Eley
University of Michigan

Eve Rosenhaft, *Beating the Fascists? The German Communists and Political Violence 1929-1933* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1983).

THE LEADERSHIP OF the German Communist Party (KPD) during the final years of the Weimar Republic displayed such a degree of political ineptitude, intellectual debility, and moral corruption that it is hardly surprising that the rank and file of the party was sometimes at loggerheads with them. On the eve of the total defeat of the German labour movement they blandly talked of a revolutionary situation and of organized proletarian terror. At a time when the party was increasingly recruited from the ranks of the unemployed, they preached the mass strike and argued that the workplace should form the basis of all organizational activity. Every defeat and setback was heralded as a giant leap forward and welcomed as a sure sign that the contradictions were becoming heightened, thus creating a situation from which the organized vanguard of the German proletariat was bound to benefit. For

all this talk of revolution they were petrified that radical factions within the party might precipitate it too soon. Above all they were saddled with the idiotic theory of "social fascism" which proclaimed that the Social Democrats were objectively as bad, and possibly even worse, than the fascists. After January 1933, when the leadership was either in concentration camps or in exile, and the party destroyed, they were finally forced to begin rethinking their position.

Rosenhaft's book only deals briefly with such questions and is concerned with the Communist street fighters. She is a diligent and careful researcher, well aware of the problems presented by the nature of the evidence, most of which comes from police files, and deeply sympathetic to the subjects of her inquiry. She examines the nature of the violence within the working-class neighbourhoods, analyzes the backgrounds of those who took part in the fighting, and sets all of this within a wider perspective of the economic and political problems of Weimar Germany and the changing attitude of the Comintern and the KPD. The result is a most interesting and provocative study, but it is one which has a number of serious flaws.

Kindhearted as she undoubtedly is, Dr. Rosenhaft is all too ready to equate violence with radicalism, and even worse, with a form of social protest. According to this view, breaking the law is of necessity a rejection of the power and legitimacy of the public forces of law and order, of the bourgeois state and of bourgeois culture. Crime is thus a means of articulating a grievance against the existing economic and social system by those who lack economic or political power. Crime places the criminal in direct confrontation with the agents of the state and thus provides a vivid lesson in the social and political relations of the bourgeois state and illuminates its repressive nature. From this perspective, gambling is seen as an "occupational crime of

the financially insecure and the non-specialist poor" and pimping the result of a "situation in which low wages or unemployment make the search for a second source of income imperative." The theft of food could be described by the party, with total ignorance of Marx's analysis of theft in the *Poverty of Philosophy*, as "proletarian shopping trips," a description to which Dr. Rosenhaft has no objection. The distressing fact of the matter is that a great deal of what is here described as "political violence" was in fact sheer delinquency. A Nazi pimp like Horst Wessel had his Communist equivalents of whom at least the party leadership had the decency to be ashamed. Theft, thuggery, murder, and blind violence may all be symptomatic of things being seriously wrong, but they are not of themselves expressions of political radicalism whatever the badge or uniforms the criminal may be wearing.

At times one wishes that the author had spent a little less time in the archives and more in the pubs and workplaces of Berlin, for there is throughout the whole book a sense of unreality and detachment which at times borders on the absurd. Thus, when an intrepid Communist joined in with about 30 others to beat up one SA man who died shortly afterwards, this is excused as an "act of solidarity" without a raised eyebrow from the author. Similarly the idea that construction workers are by the nature of their employment more prone to physical violence, more political because their work is conducted in the open, devoted to teamwork, and keenly aware of all that is going on in the neighbourhood might sound convincing in the comfortable *marxisant* atmosphere of King's College, Cambridge, but would cause some amusement on a construction site. This highly romantic view of crime and violence and the determination to find a political dimension in any anti-social and deviant behaviour seriously detracts from the value of the book, as does the tendency to present dubious sociological

explanations for the data which derive from rather spotty sources.

The central contention of the book is that with the onset of the depression and mass unemployment the arena of resistance to fascism shifted from the workplace to the neighbourhood and thus radical violence was necessarily localized and carried out by small groups. The party was never able to articulate the needs and aspirations of these neighbourhoods and "individual terror" could never be replaced by "mass terror." The author insists that "the aim of the KPD was always to transform the culture of self-defence into an offensive revolutionary movement." This is highly doubtful, as the discussions about armed violence clearly indicate.

It is rather strange that in a book on political violence virtually no mention is made of the KPD's outstanding military organizer, Erich Wollenberg, nor why it was deemed necessary to get rid of him (it seems likely that he was betrayed to the police by a comrade). Nor is there any discussion of why the Communists failed to create a party army as effective as the SA and why they chose to ignore the Comintern's claim that armed insurrection was the sole means of establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat without which, it was argued, Marxism degenerates into social democracy. Party history "from below" is all very well and good, but without a clear idea of what was going on at the top, particularly the struggles between Thälmann, the party leader, and Wollenberg, it does not make much sense, and an opportunity to make a real contribution to the discussion of resistance to fascism is lost.

Martin Kitchen
Simon Fraser University

Ivaar Oxaal, *Black Intellectuals and the Dilemmas of Race and Class in Trinidad* (Cambridge, MA: Schenckman Publishing 1982).

THE PUBLICATION OF *Black Intellectuals Come to Power* was timely: 1968, *annus mirabilis* of ideological confrontation and class conflict world-wide, focused attention on the role of intellectuals in politics and Oxaal's book viewed the emergence of a parliamentary-style nationalist government in one corner of the Commonwealth Caribbean, Trinidad, from this perspective. The title must not be read, however, in any Gramscian sense. Oxaal's intellectuals are simply the great names of the Trinidad political scene, some of whom contested for power: C.L.R. James, his contemporary, George Padmore, the leader of Trinidad's Indian population, Dr. Capildeo, and Dr. Eric Williams, whose scholarly contribution to Caribbean history, *Capitalism and Slavery* (1944), has proved no more digestible to the profession than his practical contribution has been to Trinidad itself.

To trace these careers provides, as the author claims, "a synoptic sociological account" which clearly reveals, for example, the structure and content of the education system and the density of British cultural hegemony for the academically gifted. Four of these five intellectuals were the product of a primary education system geared to producing scholarship winners: four free places were available every year in two secondary schools, modelled on British public schools, staffed by ex-patriates who taught a British curriculum. Williams then went on to win one of three scholarships available for university education which, until the University of the West Indies was established in the 1940s, led to a British, usually an Oxbridge, degree.

James and Padmore plunged instead into left-wing London of the 1930s. They became internationalists: Padmore moving via Moscow to become adviser to Nkrumah; James, via proletarian populism in Detroit, to a very brief association (1965) with Williams, then prime minister. Oxaal points to an essential philosophical difference between James and

Williams. The latter's *Capitalism and Slavery* assumes that economic factors are the final arbiters of history: James's *Black Jacobins* (1938), a history of the Haitian revolution, that the exploited can break through seemingly inevitable continuities and create new societies. The difference reflects the different class identification of the two intellectuals which it is tempting to attribute to Williams' Oxford exposure.

To read this reprint in 1984, with the Caribbean reeling under the impact of United States intervention in Grenada, and pressured by American hostilities against Nicaragua and El Salvador, highlights, however, its lack of an international political dimension. In 1953 the Commonwealth Caribbean reeled under the impact of British intervention in what is now Guyana. The overthrow of the People's Progressive government, with its slightly socialist programme, vitally influenced political developments throughout the area. The event is not mentioned. The preface talks about "the reality of the Caribbean as an American lake," (xiv) but the realities, as a live force shaping political ideas, are not demonstrated. Serious discussion of trade union leaders, who do not rate as intellectuals, is also lacking although their activities also shaped the options open to Williams and the PNM.

Williams won power in 1961 and died in office in 1981. His death so frightened his colleagues it was not announced for three days — such was the political hegemony he established in decades distinguished by political change in the rest of the Caribbean. The book's new addenda, under the subtitle "Dilemmas of Race and Class," present material relating to the years in office. They consist of two pamphlet reprints: a small collection of documents on the 1970 Black Power revolt and a 1973 critique of its leadership, strung together by personal reminiscences which embalm even a conversation with a taxi driver.

The documents on the 1968-style Black Power revolt — one slogan ran "Williams is keeping us in Capitalism and Slavery" — are interesting in themselves, though too few to be considered representative. They tend to illustrate, once more, a well-established pattern: revolutionary situations do not necessarily produce adequate analysis, or leadership. Trinidad's new generation of academically-trained intellectuals grouped in Tapia House stood aside, their togas lifted above the morass of what they defined as Black Power simplicities, "black vs. white, we vs. they, capitalism vs. workers." (259) James' hope, that the regime was, nevertheless "in serious danger from the accumulated wrath of the population" (273) remained unfulfilled. Doc Williams lived to die in his bed, saved by his enemies' weakness and a boom in oil prices.

The class interests these black intellectuals served can only be inferred from this book.

Mary Turner
Dalhousie University

Rob Stevens, *Classes of Contemporary Japan* (New York: Cambridge University Press 1983).

JAPAN'S ABILITY TO outcompete the West has led to a spate of books praising one or another aspect of Japanese society. One of the most interesting of these has been Ezra Vogel's *Japan As Number One*. That book contains a hidden message: that much of Japan's success is due to a particular pattern of social stratification, one in which business dominates over labour, men over women, and age over youth. This system, Vogel argues, both promotes a highly productive economy and a high level of human happiness. It does the first, for instance, by tying

workers to their firms (in part because of the absence of much state welfare), so that workers identify with and work hard for their companies; by paying workers by age, so that firms have a motive to expand in order to acquire cheaper (younger) labour; by forcing retirement at 55, thus making way for new talent, and creating a pool of part-time workers which gives the economy flexibility; and by insuring that youths undergo rigorous schooling, so that the level of human capital is high.

It generates happiness not only by creating material wealth, but, for instance, by the fact that firms provide workers with permanent employment until retirement, extensive welfare benefits, and help in finding new jobs upon retirement; or by the fact that the incentive to hire young workers frees youth of the need to face high teenage unemployment. In short, the system is seen as striking a nice balance between functional necessities for societal efficiency, on the one hand, and the meeting of human needs, on the other.

While such a positive evaluation of the Japanese system of social stratification may contain some elements of truth, it has been difficult for interested readers to judge this in the absence of works in English written from the opposite point of view, works which would permit a comparison of the pros and cons of the matter. Stevens' book, therefore, is a useful addition to the literature, because it is a sustained attempt to identify negative features of the stratification system, and to do so with data. The book is written from a critical Marxist standpoint. It contains five chapters on individual classes (the bourgeoisie, the petty bourgeoisie, the peasantry, the middle class, and workers), and two chapters on the state dealing with, respectively, its impact on economic growth and social control. Stevens' concern, in particular, is with the impact of the current economic crisis on the class system and whether this system is beginning to experience changes which may

permit revolutionary action. The book rests principally on data from government reports, often as reworked by others, although the author did run a small questionnaire survey of 456 employees in 62 companies. The book contains nearly 200 tables and figures.

Stevens offers a relatively dark vision of the Japanese class system and its consequences, arguing, for instance, that the economy is heavily dualized, so that most workers work in firms without either permanent employment or extensive welfare benefits; that educational "credentialism" has escalated to such an extent that even a university degree no longer guarantees satisfying work; that the competitiveness of the educational system has become so severe that small children must now undergo "examination hell" even for admission to the better kindergartens; that the need for and costs of private tutoring have risen so high as to largely price working-class parents out of the educational market; that the current economic crisis has meant large numbers of retired workers can no longer find new jobs; and that pay by age is hindering adaptation to this crisis, since stagnating firms can not hire new workers (youth) to hold down their labour costs, so that labour costs are rising as the firms' work forces age. This system, then, is seen as neither promoting happiness nor efficiency. Such an analysis provides a useful foil to the more positive accounts so common in the literature.

To say that this book is useful, however, is not to say it contains no deficiencies. To begin with, it is excessively difficult and time-consuming to read, a combined result of theoretical turgidness, an infelicitous style, and inadequately labelled and explained tables.

The theoretical turgidness stems in part from an attempt to overcome the well known difficulties of Marxist theory concerning the state, a problem Stevens tries to solve by interpreting the Marxist concept, infrastructure, to refer not to the economic "base" of a society, but to the

hidden mechanisms which determine what happens in the visible world. Into this infrastructure, Stevens places not only the capitalist elements of production, but the state, classes, unions, the educational system, and the like, making them all important determinants of the functioning of society. He, then, however, distinguishes dominant and subordinate mechanisms, with this one stroke reintroducing at the level of the infrastructure the problem of the autonomy of the state, so that nothing is solved after all, leaving only a cumbersome scheme dividing society into an essence (the infrastructure) and its forms (the visible world), and which leads to the use of a complex terminology in which, for instance, the bourgeoisie *manifests* itself in various *forms* (such as stock-ownership), in which class elements serve as *agents* of hidden class forces, *mediating* them, and the like, all of which makes for difficult reading without adding to understanding. On top of this, in the midst of his research or writing, the author became converted to feminism, deciding that "even more fundamental than the mechanisms of production are the mechanisms of species reproduction," so that these, too, belong to the infrastructure, apparently as autonomous forces, resulting in a kind of theoretical indeterminacy, in which the author argues two positions simultaneously, Marxism and feminism.

The Marxism, furthermore, is often of a distressingly vulgar sort, a fact reflected in the neglect of virtually any non-Marxist (or non-feminist) theoretical literature, as well as the frequent use and highly orthodox interpretation of such Marxist concepts as the labour theory of value, the organic composition of capital, unproductive work, and the two-class tendency of capitalist society, resulting in such highly questionable arguments as that while small business people "... might be very busy people, they are not productive workers," or that the bourgeoisie is much larger than the middle class.

This narrow vision makes one nervous

about the ability of the author to assess the validity of the data he so often takes from articles in Marxist journals, an assessment always necessary when taking data from political journals of whatever persuasion. What is one to make, for instance, of data taken from an article entitled, "The Insane Reagan Military Expansion and the Huge Japanese Military Expansion," especially when a later table indicates that as late as 1982 Japan's military expenditures amounted to less than 1 per cent of GNP? More generally, too often in the book statements are made for which no data are presented, tables are inadequately labelled or explained so that the reader can not independently assess them, and at times the data in a table even contradict the text.

Nevertheless, in spite of these and other deficiencies, given the context of recent writing on Japan, this book does make an important contribution by offering an interpretation, *with data*, of the Japanese class system tempering the usual Pollyanna-ish view of that society.

Donald Von Eschen
McGill University

E.L. Wheelwright and Ken Buckley, eds., *Essays in the Political Economy of Australian Capitalism*, 4 vols. (Sydney: Anz Press 1975-80).

UNDER THE BANNER of Marx's premise that "The anatomy of civil society is to be sought in political economy," the editors of this series proclaimed the need for a "History of the Political Economy of Australian Capitalism from the Earliest Times to the Present Day." That was in 1975 and the intention has been to realize this goal progressively through a series of volumes. Such an enterprise coincided with the emergence of the Australian Political Economy Movement — itself reflecting the renewed interest in radical

social science in the early 1970s. This was a period of revitalization of Australian politics, following the decline of the stupor of the long post-war Menzies era (conservative liberal prime minister) and the early 1970s ascendancy of the ideologically moderated Labor Party under the leadership of Prime Minister Gough Whitlam. The nationalism of Whitlam's government (with its concern for a somewhat more independent foreign policy, and invigoration of the arts within Australia) undoubtedly contributed to the mood of national self-analysis. For radical social scientists this took the form of an intense examination of Australian society. Overseas trends and/or fads in radical social science inevitably found their way into the Australian discourse, but the strength of serious-minded Marxist theory was indigenous. This stems from the historic strength of organized labour in Australia, its links with intellectual and academic circles, and the presence of a Communist Party tradition in these links. Nevertheless, while recent Australian intellectual Marxism's early foundations were in political-economic analysis, considerably promoted by this series under review, the range of radical social science has broadened. This is a result of the increasing attention to cultural themes, often departing from Marx's anatomical maxim.

The first four volumes of the series (now five) were published in 1975, 1978, 1978, and 1980 respectively. Subdivided into some three dozen chapters, the contents range from analyses of "phases of capitalist development (colonial, imperial, emergence of industrial capital, welfareism, de-industrialization) through discussions of the role of immigration, nationalism, regionalism, Australian imperialism (in the Pacific Basin), and government policy on the development of Australian capitalism to issues of culture (associated with class, gender, aborigines, education, mass media, urbanization, and legal customs). There is

a wide range of topics covered, and the reader is confronted with a consistently high standard of analysis as well as a reasonable sampling of Australian social reality. These articles represent some of the best work being done in the construction of an alternative approach to conventional understandings of Australian society. Also, to the credit of the editors, the chapters do not as a rule repeat the endless sectarian debates on the left as preambles to the analysis. While there are theoretical perspectives under scrutiny and under reconstruction, these are generally concisely presented. There is, then, a substantial re-conception of Australian society in this series.

Possibly the most integral theme in the first four volumes concerns contemporary political developments in Australia. This includes Connell's pioneering work on class structures and cultures, represented by a chapter (Volume I) linking the success of the Labor Party in 1972 to the fractures in the post-World War II ruling class; two pieces by Catley and McFarlane (I and IV) and one by Catley (II) critically examining the prospects for socialism in Australia via analyses of political cycles associated with phases of capitalist development — and especially the role of labour in government. These represent the authors' well-known critique of the reformism of Labor in power — rationalizing capitalism. Windschuttle's (IV) examination of the management of unemployment by the subsequent Fraser regime (Liberal Party) constitutes an analysis of a series of ruthless policies designed to discipline Australian labour. This, in addition to Utrecht's (IV) piece (research associated with the University of Sydney's Transnational Corporations Research Project), also details the conditions behind industrial "decline" in Australia, associated with Australian capital's participation in the development of free trade zone manufacturing in the Pacific Basin. Canadians will find parallels in these analyses of an economy, both rich in

natural resources and "high-wage," adjusting to a restructured global industrial regime under the exigencies of a federal political structure.

In addition to this contemporary theme there are useful analyses of antecedent periods in the development of capitalist policy in Australia. Roe (I) examines the evolution of social policy towards the poor linking it to the changing class structure; Kemeny (IV), the lack of adequate public housing policy, with its ideological premises and outcomes; Hopkins (II), Lewis (II), McQueen (II), Cochrane (IV), and Beresford and Kerr (IV) all investigate the prominence of the state in securing or mediating capitalist interests internally, and inevitably — given the contingent nature of Australian industrial and banking capital — externally (in terms of protectionist policies and, in the case of Beresford and Kerr, in realigning Australia with the United States after World War II).

A further set of essays concerns the application of concepts and conceptual innovations to analyses of the class-gender nexus in Australia by Cass (III); "internal colonialism" as it concerns the aboriginal people by Hartwig (III); Clark (III) on unequal exchange as it relates to Australia's historic position in the world market; dual labour markets (related to immigration) by Collins (I and III); the sponsoring of a "colonial mode of production" in Papua New Guinea by Australian imperialism by Fitzpatrick (IV); and "primitive accumulation" in the colonies by Buckley (I) and McMichael (IV). And so it goes on.

An obvious problem with this series is thematic coherence. This has been commented on before by earlier reviewers. It has also been acknowledged by the editors in the fourth of their excellent introductions to each volume. One point which is well taken is that there are not that many people in Australia writing from these perspectives. Furthermore, as I have suggested, *there is a growing divergence*

of interest from the political economy framework, and a growing professionalism among radical social scientists. Both factors deplete the available resources. Nevertheless, the standard of writing and the interdisciplinary approach mitigate some of this fragmentation. In addition, the editors have grouped essays in such a way as to claim that volume II concentrates on the state, III on working-class divisions and culture, and IV on crisis.

A further problem with the series, which mirrors the Australian perspective generally, is that there is no substantial comparative analysis of the Australian experience. (It is not surprising, therefore, to find foci on such things as whether or not a national bourgeoisie exists. And we find the inevitable transposition of "foreign" theories and concepts to the analysis of Australia — untempered by a historical perspective on the phenomena under investigation, which might further specify social processes as unique to Australia, but nevertheless deriving from the broader international setting.) While there are a few essays that attempt to see the structural links between Australia and its world context, further systematic analysis in this area, as well as bringing a comparative perspective to bear, would only enhance understanding of the Australian trajectory.

It is only fair to say that the editors called for this kind of approach in the introduction to volume I, where they wrote: "Has capitalism in Australia been different in any respects from capitalism almost anywhere else? What are these differences, and how did they arise; are they marginal, or fundamental?" These are large questions, and although these essays provide pieces of the puzzle (especially those concerned with policy and the culture of class) there is much to be done before an adequate, comparatively-informed understanding of the peculiarities of Australian capitalist devel-

opment and state- and class-formation emerges. My hunch is that this project has been delayed (and it was a conscious project in the minds of early 1970s radicals) while analysts have sharpened their tools (imports and otherwise) on sectoral, topical, or conjunctural analyses. These volumes bear testimony to this activity, which is surely preparatory to a more comprehensive theory and practice — understanding the distinctiveness of the Australian situation through a greater contextualization of Australian history as a settler society.

Philip McMichael
University of Georgia

Mary O'Brien. *The Politics of Reproduction* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul 1981).

THIS VOLUME IS an eye-opener — quite unlike any other book I have read. O'Brien has written a soaring treatise on feminist metatheory (in her own words) which nevertheless finds the roots of male supremacy and the wellsprings of women's revolutionary power in the mundane corporeal labour of species reproduction, most particularly in the process of childbirth. Women universally do this work, and men do not; this is a biological given of a rather obvious sort. What of it? O'Brien argues that the social implications are world-historic, with ramifications for gender relations at all levels, extending even into the rarefied ruminations of philosopher-kings from Plato to Marx. Here, she tracks down the perverse effects of men's ideological attempts to compensate for their alienation from the reproductive process. Does this seem a bit flakey to you? Read the book and draw your own conclusions. I promise you will never think of reproduction, or "malestream thought," in quite the same way again.

We commonly speak "in labour;" but it is rare indeed for birthing to be taken seriously as a labour process with an end-product — children, the future of humankind. Since *Labour/Le Travail* is the name of this journal, I assume its readers are inclined to think hard about what constitutes "the labour process" in diverse historical settings. So ask yourself: what do I include (and exclude) when conducting a wholistic study of labourers, and the labour processes they engage in, in a given community? If you focus only on male workers, as usual, you flunk the feminist litmus test. Where have you been for the past two decades? Ah, but many of us are catching on. Let's include women as workers in goods production. This gets you one small mark for moving in the right direction, but you still fail for ignoring domestic labour, overwhelmingly women's labour, in the service of daily consumption. Oh, all right, throw that in too. What else? The labour of generational reproduction; women's *first* labour, whatever else they may do in the way of goods production and domestic service. You only get full marks from O'Brien when *that* labour, exclusively women's labour, finally takes its rightful place, in on the ground floor, well integrated, as the foundations of a new political economy paradigm are being built.

Harry Braverman toiled as a mechanic in a shipyard, and later wrote *Labour and Monopoly Capital*, a seminal work in the new generation of labour studies. Mary O'Brien toiled as a practising midwife on the industrial Clydeside, and has subsequently written *The Politics of Reproduction*; it promises to have an equally seminal (I should say ovarian) influence in the development of the new generation of feminist theory. As with Braverman, none of the author's past work experiences are directly recounted in her book, but indirectly, they leave an impression on every page. Her argument, of course, should be judged strictly on its merits; but

one cannot doubt that the passion of her prose arises from a wealth of practical experience. O'Brien has the pen of a poet and the temper of a polemicist; in addition to everything else, the book makes exhilarating reading.

What are the social implications of the natural fact that women bear children and nurture them at the breast, while men cannot? In seeking answers to this question, O'Brien moves directly from the concrete universal of gender difference in reproduction to its fullest extension in thought. She wants ultimately to return to the ground of a historical argument, taking account of the considerable cross-cultural variation in reproductive arrangements, but she concentrates, in the first instance, on the logic of abstract universals. In précis form, her argument runs something like this: Men do not labour in are therefore alienated from, the birth process; their reproductive consciousness is shaped by this alienation; theirs is the account of outsiders. There is something very threatening for men about their exclusion, since this is the fragile moment of continuity of the species, when a burst of intensive female labour bridges the generational gap and insures our perpetuation, *beyond personal mortality, through time*. The consequence of male alienation from this moment in the process of reproduction is that it casts into doubt a man's prior contribution at the moment of copulation and conception. While maternity is corporeal and hence undeniable, paternity is not. Fatherhood is thus a social construct which presumes to establish, but never does, a natural connection. Men are thus subject to reproductive insecurity; eager to proclaim with certainty: "here stands the father, this child is mine," while appropriating the real labour of its creation, and reasserting copulation as the vital act; hence the narrowly genital, and aggressive, nature of male sexuality. The social construction of paternity, the proof positive of male potency, is achieved through the regulation of women's sexual-

ity; the genesis of the private sphere, and women's confinement therein, lies here. The ramifications of the male drive to deny this alienation, contain this uncertainty, appropriate the product of this labour and control the labourer in the process, can be read everywhere in the *entrails of western thought*. From this particular angle, O'Brien offers a critique of the masters of malestream thought, showing how women's integrative experience is ignored, denied, trivialized, displaced, inverted, and demonized.

Women have a direct (and in the first place unmediated) experience of the birth process. But this is not only a natural act, regulated by the body. It also takes place within a matrix of social relations (among women in most societies), which lends this labour a shared meaning for women in the community. In giving birth, women have a culturally mediated experience of continuity and integration with the process of natural renewal, from which men are remote. Male cosmologies reflect this distance; as civilizations develop, their productive technologies become increasingly antagonistic to Nature. Women's reproductive consciousness is the repressed moment in the body of western thought; *buried alive, struggling to be born, destined to return*.

O'Brien interrogates a whole array of western thinkers — Plato, Aristotle, Bacon, Hegel, Marx, and Arendt — subjecting their work to a well-directed feminist critique, unmasking the roots of their ideological distortions. She selects both the few passages where these authors have touched on the question of reproduction, and perhaps more importantly, reads the silences, where they have written around the subject, or displaced it, in the process of obfuscation. The crowning achievement of the book lies here, in O'Brien's probing inquisition of western political philosophy. Far from dismissing the best of this thought, and setting out to construct a feminist alternative *ex nihilo*, O'Brien engages with the patriarchs she

criticizes, extracting and reworking the rich, if one-sided, insights of their work, even as she turns their categories upside down. The dialectics of Hegel and Marx are particular sources of methodological nuggets for O'Brien, even as she excoriates their sex-blind ontologies. She also advances a critique of earlier feminist theorists — de Beauvoir, Rowbotham, Firestone, Millett, and Reed — concentrating her fire on their failure to appreciate and/or explore the positive significance of women's reproductive experience for gender relations, and the prospects of revolutionizing the social relations of reproduction.

When O'Brien attempts to put some historical flesh on the bare bones of her universal abstractions, the limits of her particular mode of speculative inquiry become apparent. In order to make a valid transhistorical argument, she has narrowed down the reproductive process to the irreducible core of gender difference, in birth and breastfeeding. Men's alienation is here transhistorical and natural (that is, necessary). But in the subsequent phases of reproduction — infant care and childraising — bodily sex differences have no universal implication; the historical record is correspondingly varied. In some societies, men lie down with their parturient wives in empathetic labour, and thereafter become very involved with their infants. Might we say that they have a low degree of reproductive alienation? In most cultures, however, men and women consider all aspects of childcare to be women's work; they link the naturally female labours of childbirth and breastfeeding with other childcare tasks (cleaning, feeding, safeguarding, and socializing) which are not assigned to women by nature. How is a social division of labour naturalized in this fashion?

This is the kind of question which O'Brien's universal categories make it difficult to address. Women's work normally entails a combination of productive and reproductive labours. How easy or

difficult is it to combine productive and reproductive labours in the course of a day's work? Here surely is a key to women's condition, which is difficult to address with the stark universal polarities of production and reproduction.

Superb dialectician that she is, O'Brien nevertheless sets up several antinomies which hamper the process of historicizing her own powerful insights. One of these is a voluntary/involuntary dichotomy in childbearing. Throughout history, childbearing has been compulsory for women; in the modern "age of contraception," it has become voluntary; this is a world-historic event. Here she sets up a stark alternative: children or no children. I have no desire to downplay the significance of the reproductive technological revolution we are now living through, but it is misleading to imply (as the term "involuntary" does) that women had no control over the timing of conception and birth in the past. Women could influence birth spacing in pre-class societies, through prolonged lactation, coitus interruptus, and postpartum intercourse taboos. There is also evidence of the use of rudimentary contraceptive devices in a broad range of cultures, plus abortifacients. The social regulation of fertility has been the focus of sharp tension, struggle, and repression throughout history. The compulsory/voluntary dichotomy does not help us to analyze, and periodize, these struggles.

O'Brien also invokes the public/private sphere split as a universal, glossing over the immense variation in the spatial configuration of different societies and the sexual division of labour within and between spheres. The author, of course, would grant this, but the question remains; is the public/private realm conception a useful first approximation in a comparative cross-cultural inquiry of this sort? Feminist historians and anthropologists have cast serious doubt on the relevance of the dichotomy in a whole range of pre-capitalist social formations.

O'Brien is aware of the problem of deploying universal abstractions when it comes to shifting the focus of inquiry towards the terrain of historical diversity. She makes repeated caveats throughout the book which recognize the difficulty and alert the reader, fairly and modestly, to the limits of such reasoning. Here is one of them:

In this book . . . the process and relations of reproduction have been isolated with a sort of calculated naivete, designed to rescue the biological reproductive process and its material base from historical obscurity and ascribed unimportance. This artificial isolation must be abandoned where praxis overtakes analysis, as it must. Feminists cannot root out economic determinism with the equally blunt trowel of biological determinism. (161)

I take this as an invitation to further research, discussion, and debate. Particular formulations from *The Politics of Reproduction* will naturally be surpassed, but the book as a whole is fast becoming a landmark in feminist theory. Labour historians would do well to take it seriously.

Wally Secombe
Ontario Institute For
Studies in Education

Deirdre Beddoe, *Discovering Women's History: A Practical Manual* (London: Pandora 1983).

EVERY TERM A month before research papers are due, teachers wish for a book such as this one, a practical manual which inexperienced researchers could keep near to hand to remind them of the essentials of the craft. Beddoe tackles the questions we tutors keep answering, with varying degrees of gusto and precision: When is a topic too big to manage or too small to sustain enthusiasm? What are significant results? When can made-today curiosity set the agenda for questions of the past? When will it no longer suffice?

Beddoe's particular concern is not, in fact, with the needs of teachers and formal seminar participants but with women's and community groups needing down-to-earth and demystifying advice about how to find out about the lives of ordinary women in Britain from 1800 to 1945. She locates and salutes these groups' interest in women of the past, setting the academic and what she calls "practical" grounds for their curiosity on firm and equal footing, and then outlines a "programme of positive action" for future work, an agenda which includes not only finding out about the past but developing realistic strategies for sharing the results. For six topic areas — images of women, education, waged work, family life, sexuality, and politics — she presents a lively and cogent summary of the literature to 1983, a set of questions arising from current appraisals of the historiography answerable from local records, a bibliography of secondary sources grouped by emphasis within each topic, and then — a wonder to behold — a detailed introduction to documentary sources. The discussion of record types describes the provenance and contents of the sources (often citing examples at length), notes where records of various types are likely to be found, how to gauge their limitations and work to their strengths, what in general to make of them, or in the case of interviews, how to make them so that they are generally of use. The chapter on waged work discusses in turn the census, estate records, the records of private business, documents from government and local authority training centres, trade union and criminal records, diaries, parliamentary papers, newspapers, journals, commercial directories, photographs, postcards, paintings, trade union banners, posters, interviews, museums, films, and songs. This is not only an archive guide, it is a sneak preview and a frank briefing by a seasoned traveller.

How useful will this practical manual be to those who are not in Britain and

working on British women's history of the post-1800 era? The synopsis of the existing British literature is valuable even for non-British specialists though not, of course, unique to this volume. The specification of a current research agenda in diction and syntax accessible to new historians is more rare, but less transferable to other times and places, where different parts of the base line have been sketched and different conjunctions of gender with class and race necessitate different research priorities. Would that record-keepers were of similar habits of mind. The most wonderful parts of this book, the introductions to sources which will palliate fears, mark blind alleys, save weeks of time by setting projects on sound documentary footings from the beginning rather than the middle or near the end of the researcher's allotted time — these are hardly transferable at all. In Canada our census and legal records, even our church, business, and union records, are kept in different ways, in different places, by different hands. What we need is someone with an experience with North American and European records as broad as Beddoe's with Britain, and a commitment as deep as hers to make doing history accessible to a wide range of people with a wide range of reasons for being curious about women in the past. Any takers?

Joy Parr
Queen's University

Olive Banks, *Faces of Feminism: A Study of Feminism as a Social Movement* (Oxford: Martin Robertson 1981).

OLIVE BANKS has admirably succeeded in presenting a portrait of feminism as a social movement from the 1840s to the present in both Great Britain and the United States. For the first time, we are

presented with a monograph which covers in quite some detail the usually neglected period from 1920-60, and argues that there was continuity between the earlier feminist movement which culminated in the campaign for female suffrage, the "welfare feminism" of the 1920s through 1950s, and the women's liberation movement of the 1960s. This continuity is due in part to Banks' definition of feminism, and in part because of her insistence that feminism's origins lie in three separate traditions which, in their interaction and in the occasional predominance of one of these traditions, account for the different "faces" of feminism over time.

The three traditions isolated by Banks as having shaped feminism from its inception are the equal rights tradition of the Enlightenment, the moral impetus of evangelical Christianity, and socialism of both the utopian and Marxist variety. It is these traditions (which are often in conflict with one another) that throughout the period covered by the book present differing versions of feminism during various phases of the movement's development, depending on which of these aspects predominated at any particular point in time during the movement's existence. Thus, for example, leading feminists in the 1840s (as in the interwar period of the twentieth century) often argued their case from the belief in the different nature of women from men (which usually involved an insistence on the moral superiority of women) in order to achieve social and welfare reform. Other periods were characterized by a greater degree of emphasis on the similarity of male and female nature characteristic of the Enlightenment tradition. While Marxist feminism never became much of a force in either Great Britain or the United States, the women's liberation movement of the 1960s clearly had some tendencies in that direction. These three traditions, with their fundamentally separate approaches to female social roles and nature were occasionally able to coalesce around an issue that trans-

cended these disparate roots; but on the whole feminism has remained, despite women in trade unions and working-class feminist organizations, largely a middle-class women's movement. By using these three traditions, Banks is able to provide the guiding thread through the labyrinth of feminist organizations covered in this book.

The most interesting and controversial part of the work is the discussion of feminism in the 1920s through 1950s. This period has largely been neglected by other historians, since feminist organizations changed in nature after the vote was attained; in many cases, the energies of women who had been active in the struggle for the franchise were rechannelled into other movements, notably the peace movement and welfare reform. It is the virtual disappearance of the strong pre-war feminist movement and its partial absorption into other causes less clearly feminist or political which has led to the widespread belief that feminism ceased to exist at this time, only to re-emerge in the 1960s without, however, having roots in earlier forms of feminism. Banks is able to argue for some continuity through both the broadness of her definition and the development of her thesis of the three separate traditions. This is both the strength and the weakness of the work: her definition of feminism may well be too broad, since to Banks, "Any groups that have tried to change the position of women, or the ideas about women, have been granted the title feminist, and the great variety of ways in which they have tried to do this has been allowed for by exploring the different varieties, or as the title of the book phrases it, the different faces of feminism." (3) It is this all-encompassing definition which permits her to include the "welfare feminism" of the increasingly conservative women's movement of the 1920s-50s as part of the feminist tradition, even though much of the energy of such organizations as the Women's Joint Congressional Committee

was absorbed in areas not necessarily concerned with women only, but also with protective legislation for children and other social groups. The links between the earlier evangelical tradition and its emphasis on moral reform, which is shared with welfare feminism, are clearly spelled out. Within the three faces of feminism posited by Banks, this era therefore demonstrated the predominance of the evangelical tradition at the expense of the equal rights tradition; in the 1960s mainstream feminism then would demonstrate the predominance of the equal rights tradition. Hence, for Banks, continuity can be shown, since the new women's movement clearly shows its antecedents from earlier phases of the movement rather than introducing an entirely new set of theoretical presuppositions. A narrower definition of feminism such as one which includes only attempts to gain equal rights in all spheres for women rather than merely "changing" the position of women would preclude the acceptance of welfare feminism with its implicit doctrine of the separate nature of women. Nonetheless, the book succeeds well within its framework and definition, and provides the best available survey comparing the two movements.

One wishes it had been more carefully edited; the style at times is cumbersome and repetitive. For example, in two short sequential paragraphs on pages 40-1, the word "however" appears four times, greatly disrupting the flow of the narrative without clarifying the author's intention. Many of the references to quite specific events or organizations throughout the work lack page numbers, and the introduction of a truly bewildering array of feminist groups could confuse a reader not already familiar with women's movements. Despite these flaws, the book is both groundbreaking and a welcome addition to the rapidly growing literature on feminism; and the very broadness of the definition of feminism should open the

door to further debate on what the term *does or could mean*.

Rosemarie Schade
University of Victoria

Lela B. Costin, *Two Sisters for Social Justice: A Biography of Grace and Edith Abbott* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press 1983).

GRACE AND EDITH Abbott are natural subjects for a scholarly biography. It is surprising that no one before Lela Costin, a professor in the School of Social Work at the University of Illinois, had seen that. Typically, in the literature on progressive social reform, the settlement house movement, and the social work profession, there are three or four index references to one or other of the Abbott sisters, usually *in tandem with their friend and colleague*, Sophonisba Breckinridge. A trio of indefatigable reformers known by students at the University of Chicago in the 1930s as A²B, they were part of the inner circle of Hull House in the heyday of the influence of Jane Addams, Julia Lathrop, and Florence Kelley. Scholarly attention has tended to focus on Jane Addams and the obvious community of interests and causes she shared with the Progressive generation of social activists and critics. Lela Costin set out to rescue the Abbott sisters from relative scholarly oblivion in two ways: to document more fully their remarkable, and complementary, public careers; and to release them from the shadow of Jane Addams. In contrast to Addams, the archetypal maternal feminist, the Abbotts saw themselves as professional experts and problem-solvers and made no special claims to expertise by virtue of being female. By and large Costin has served her subjects well: she has brought these exceptional women to life in a way that permits us to appreciate

how separate were their personalities and accomplishments, yet how formidable the influence of their shared commitment to feminism, social research, and the goal of public welfare.

In their family background and Nebraska childhood, Edith (1876-1957) and Grace (1878-1939) Abbott were typical of that generation of university-trained women who were attracted to the settlement house movement. A lawyer father and Quaker mother, both deeply committed to equal rights for women, set a reformist stamp on the girls long before they left for Chicago. Edith, the scholar, attended the University of Nebraska before studying economics, political science, and law (notably non-feminized courses) in the graduate school of the University of Chicago, receiving her doctorate in economics in 1905. A year at the London School of Economics, studying with Beatrice and Sidney Webb, made a profound impression. There she acquired *the methodology of social investigation* upon which she would base both a distinguished research career and a graduate programme in social welfare administration. Her return to the University of Chicago in 1908 began a life-long collaboration with Sophonisba Breckinridge, already assistant dean of women under Marion Talbot. Their joint studies of housing conditions, juvenile delinquency, truancy, woman and child labour, among others, remain classic examples of Progressive social investigation. Together they pioneered university-based graduate education in social work (Abbott served as dean of the Graduate School of Social Service Administration at the University of Chicago from 1924-42). In their commitment to social research and public welfare administration in these years they set the Chicago school firmly against the fashion for social casework training, psychiatry, and voluntary welfare agencies which dominated the emergence of the profession of social work in the late 1920s. Deeply concerned with profes-

sionalism nonetheless, Edith Abbott and her colleagues sustained through the 1920s and 1930s an environmentalist interpretation of social problems and belief in the efficacy of protective legislation characteristic of the early Progressive era.

Grace Abbott, with an MA in political science from the University of Chicago, embarked on a career in public administration as director of the Immigrant Protective League in Chicago in 1908. She moved quickly into the world of sympathetic philanthropists, special interest lobbying groups and club women which would become critically important to her work after 1917 with the Children's Bureau, Department of Labour, Washington.

If Edith was the scholar, Grace was the activist. Whether as an American delegate to the International Congress of Women Pacifists in 1915, an influential observer on the League of Nations Committee on the Traffic in Women and Children in the 1920s, or successor to Julia Lathrope as director of the Children's Bureau, lobbying for the passage and extension of maternal and infant protection legislation, her professional interests embraced the classic causes of Progressive "child-saving": child labour legislation, compulsory schooling, maternal and infant mortality, and mothers' allowances.

Inevitably, there is much that is familiar in this retracing of the Abbotts' careers: the highlights, after all, are precisely those noted in the standard obligatory footnote and index references. However Lela Costin has added an important dimension to many of these familiar stories. In Grace Abbott's case, for example, one gets a clearer notion of the political meaning of women's networks and the practical work of bureaucratic infighting as well as legislative lobbying. From the lengthy discussions of child labour legislation and the Sheppard-Towner Act, the diverse elements, often at cross-purposes,

which are involved in the initiation of social welfare policy, as well as its defeat, come clear. Edith Abbott's University of Chicago differs from that so graphically captured by Rosalind Rosenberg in *Beyond Separate Spheres* and thus extends our notion of the place of women in academia in the 1920s and 1930s. So too, her conception of social work was at least for a time idiosyncratic: there seems to have been no discernible shift "from cause to function."

Inevitably, too, the Abbotts are on the side of the angels. Professor Costin admits, in her preface, to being intrigued by the lingering fascination which colleagues and associates feel for Grace and Edith Abbott. As she puts it, "it seemed that each of the Abbott sisters had in a curiously impressive and lasting way touched the lives of those who came into the orbit of her active world." The affection and respect with which the Abbott sisters were regarded in their lifetime spills over into this intelligent and compassionate study. Neither Abbott sister was as naive as many of her contemporaries in the reform movement, but neither questioned the American standard nor had a fundamental quarrel with the American social and economic system. To the end of their careers they trusted in protective legislation to promote the equity in which they believed so profoundly and, it seems, never imagined that the discretionary power of the state could pose a threat to civil liberties. Neither, one suspects, has Professor Costin.

The bibliography of the published works of Edith and Grace Abbott is especially valuable. It may, indeed, spark a minor Abbott industry. Should this monograph not remain for long the only biographical study, it will be a compliment to Professor Costin's pioneering work.

Susan E. Houston
York University

Marjorie Ferguson, *Forever Feminine: Women's Magazines and the Cult of Femininity* (London: Heinemann 1983).

MARJORIE FERGUSON sets out to answer two main questions in this book: "What is the role of women's magazines in society?" and "Why are fewer women buying them today than formerly?" Her treatment of the first is much more satisfactory than that of the second. Essentially, her argument is that:

women's magazines collectively comprise a social institution which serves to foster and maintain a cult of femininity. This cult is manifested both as a social group to which all those born female can belong, and as a set of practices and beliefs: rites and rituals, sacrifices and ceremonies, whose periodic performance reaffirms a common femininity and shared group membership. In promoting a cult of femininity these journals are not merely reflecting the female role in society; they are also supplying one source of definitions of, and socialisation into, that role. (184)

Although Ferguson admits that there are limits to the parallels between the cult of femininity and the religious cult as delineated by Durkheim and others, nevertheless she pursues the simile throughout, labelling Woman as the totem of the cult (men are its goal), magazine editors the high priestesses, and so on. Her general point is that women's magazines are about more than women and womanly things. They are about femininity, and their self-appointed task is to teach women the skills of femininity. Their editors work from the assumption that femininity is so distinct and different that it requires a separate medium of its own: the medium is the message.

Ferguson specifically concentrates on three British women's weeklies between 1949 and 1981, *Woman*, *Woman's Own*, and *Woman's Weekly*. Although she attempts to present some comparisons with the American women's magazine press, they are so sketchy that they would have been better eliminated. The heart of

the book is in two lengthy chapters of content analysis of the themes, roles, values, and goals portrayed in the three magazines. The first, covering the period from 1949 to 1974, identifies love, marriage, and the family ("Getting and Keeping Your Man") as the dominant theme of these years. Somewhat more surprisingly, the second strongest theme in this era was "Self-Help," that is, how to overcome misfortune and to achieve perfection. Ferguson points out that women's magazines challenged their readers to strive for universally high standards of achievement. The beauty pages were a good example; there the message was that intense personal effort coupled with the step-by-step instructions provided by the friendly, sisterly beauty editor, could overcome all obstacles. The tone was always positive, suggesting "You can do it, and we will help you."

The second content analysis, of the period 1975-80, as one might expect, revealed some changes in these magazines. "Self-Help" now became the most frequent theme, while love, marriage, and the family dropped drastically. Ferguson hastens to point out, however, that this is perhaps a statistical anomaly; marriage and the family remained very important goals of the women pictured in the magazines of the late 1970s, and romantic love dropped only very slightly as a prized value. Although her prose is somewhat murky, Ferguson seems to be arguing that the old values endured into the late 1970s but were dressed in new trappings and placed in a broader framework. A happy family remained not only the goal but the responsibility of the mother — but in the later version she might be a single parent, or even justifiably unfaithful. In other words, by 1980 these magazines were sending an ambivalent message; while there was more emphasis on self-fulfillment and independent careers for women, and while more alternative lifestyles were featured, nevertheless the

dominant underlying values remained the same: home, family, love, and duty.

I found the most interesting part of the book to be the two chapters which discussed the editorial processes of women's magazines. Ferguson does not neglect the commercial orientation of these magazines, or the importance of circulation figures and advertising revenues to the publishers, but she is more interested in the role of the editors, and strongly argues that their dozens of daily decisions are central to setting the "agenda of feminine concerns." Perhaps the best pages in the book are those in which she describes what actually happens day by day in the offices of a typical women's weekly, and how decisions regarding content, layout, promotions, and so on are actually made. Ferguson herself spent eight years as a writer and assistant and associate editor on one of the weeklies she studies here.

All of this said, I must admit that I really did not like this book very much. In addition to irritating typographical errors, poorly labelled charts, minor grammatical errors, and so on, it has two substantive problems. First, it unfortunately still bears the marks of its origins as a doctoral thesis in sociology. The prose is dissertation-dull: dense, stodgy, and occasionally simply incomprehensible. Examples to illustrate arguments are poorly-chosen and poorly-placed. The extraordinary opportunity to tell a few lively "insider" anecdotes is passed by. "The literature" is cited too often and too abstrusely for all but the initiate. In other words, the dissertation has not been transformed into a book. My second criticism relates to the book's structure. Here I return to Ferguson's treatment of the second question she poses at the beginning: why are women's weeklies less read than they were before? Ferguson in the end devotes only a few pages in her final chapter to explicit discussion of this question, compared with well over a hundred pages on her first topic, and what she does say is unsatisfying, to say the least. Indeed,

even after re-reading it several times, I am still not sure quite what her point is. She hints at some interesting notions, such as the many similarities between women's magazines and the women's movement of the 1970s, but does not pursue any of them. Ferguson would have been better off to have stuck with the material she drew from her standard content analysis and editor-interview techniques. The ideas she raises in her final chapter are too obviously tacked on. They leave the reader frustrated and hungry for a different book.

Mary Vipond
Concordia University

Michael Geerken and Walter R. Gove, *At Home and at Work: The Family's Allocation of Labor* (Beverly Hills: Sage 1983).

THIS COMPACT, informative volume has the virtues of clear writing, direct, simple argumentation, and original findings. Geerken and Gove open their study with a recent history of social scientific theories of the family. They identify two sociological approaches — the interactionist and the structural-functional — and one economic approach — the "new home economics" that examines the allocation of market work among household members — which form in turn the context of their own theorizing. Borrowing from the structural-functional framework for family analysis, Geerken and Gove argue that "any study of family structure must take into account the linkages between the external society and the family." (3) In addition, they insist on the importance of the "functional referent" the response to the question "functional in reference to what — the society, the family, the marriage, individual happiness?" Their sociological approach assumes a stable pattern in family allocation of labour over the short run, and conceives it as a response to external societal pressures and demands internal to the family, particu-

larly of children. From microeconomics, Geerken and Gove have borrowed the notion that "the articulation of husband's and wife's roles depends on the potential relative productivities of husband and wife in both the external economic and the internal work system." (20)

Their dissatisfaction with the static nature of the picture of family structure and behaviour derived from these theories leads Geerken and Gove to seek a way to surmount description. Empirical analysis shows, they argue, that families do not respond in a single, fixed manner under similar conditions. Instead, there is a *range* of responses. The dimensions along which they measure variation are attitudinal and functional. They add an interactional angle to their approach by attempting to measure the potential for family stability that different solutions to the problem of division of labour entail. "The interactionists' concern with individual adjustment in marriage, when narrowed to the feeling of the individual toward the marriage, can thus be used to determine empirically the functionality of various kinds of work/household structures." (28)

The analysis, based on interviews with 1,225 married persons, started with a probability sample of 2,248 respondents over 18 residing in the 48 contiguous states. The focus was on both "the nature of the marital role and its psychological correlates," so questions in the interviews (that lasted an average of one hour and twenty minutes each) concerned demographic characteristics of interviewee and spouse, allocation of household tasks, and satisfaction with the marriage. (32) The central question addressed by the two-phase analysis were (1) "How does the family respond, in terms of its work/housework allocation, to external and internal structural demands?" and (2) "Given these external and internal conditions, what are the consequences of those family structural responses for the viability of the family unit itself?" (28)

The information collected as explanatory factors (independent variables) were income, occupation/occupational prestige, education, measures of family life cycle (presence, number, and ages of children living at home), and a sex-role ideology scale (produced empirically by grouping systematically varying responses to 24 questions about sex-role attitudes into two categories that they label "traditional sex-role ideology" and women's independence ideology"). (49-54)

Their findings offer comfort to historians whose sources for understanding family life in the past are primarily structural. "Husband's wage, wife's potential wage, and the demand for child care in the home are the three most important determinants of the wife's choice of role." (154) Sex-role ideology was a much less powerful factor, and it worked mostly through the wife; her attitude had impact; her husband's had little. The wife's decision was also influenced by her search for personal satisfaction and her perception of her husband's preferences, a factor that Geerken and Gove dub the "voice of family utility." (75ff.)

Within the household, Geerken and Gove break down their analysis and findings under two rubrics: *time spent* on housework, and the *allocation of responsibility* for housework. There is a "huge difference" in time spent on housework between wives and husbands. (90) They show, however, that the "double day" of the working wife has been attenuated. Put simply, less housework is done when wives work.

The case of responsibility is more complex, and closely connected to husband's and wife's comparative resources. Here ideology comes into play: educated husbands help more, and working wives' appeal to fairness in the allocation of responsibility has a weak effect on husbands' behaviour. These findings are the most original; they tend to temper the economic determinism of the study as a

whole, for they suggest some influence of attitudes. As is usually the case, however, the *direction* of the linkage of attitudes and behaviour is not known. Although the proportion of working wives has been increasing steadily since the early 1960s, then, "traditions concerning housework seem to die much harder, and there seems to be a lag at present between role allocation in the two arenas" of the labour market and the household. (156)

It is no surprise that the presence of children creates problems for households with working wives, or that wives carry heavy responsibilities for work connected with children in most households. Household resources are crucial here, especially when the outcome of "marital quality" is concerned. Couples with greater resources can deal more easily with a working wife and children; couples with few resources, working wives, and children "face only an array of bad choices." (158) The findings of Geerken and Gove focus heavily, then, on the *problem* of the working wife with children and little on interfamilial or social possibilities for solving it.

The information Geerken and Gove present is valuable because of the conceptualization that went into survey design. They have demonstrated a range of responses in allocation of household labour to labour market and family; economic factors play the central role in this allocation. The range of variation is a sociologically-defined one in which socio-economic status and income are the chief variables, rather than class. Both class and race dimensions are absent, the former by theoretical intent, the latter because of small sample size. Thus, although Geerken and Gove are attentive to power relations in the household in original ways, they neglect such relationships in the economy. One consequence is a passive, descriptive picture of families reacting to the economy (as measured by wages) and the constraints it places on them.

Geerken and Gove close with a contentious statement that further research, like theirs presumably, "should aim to produce something all too rare in academic sociology and economics: a prescriptive theory that is *empirically* rather than *ideologically* based." (159) Their text, indeed, is strictly empirical, although their prose is sometimes defensive. The ideological enemies out there — never identified or confronted — are presumably Marxists and feminists. Their suggestion that neoclassical economics and structural-functional sociology are non-ideological is as far-fetched as the suggestion that feminists and Marxists are uninterested in, and incapable of doing, empirical research. Their conclusion shows little appreciation of the value of theoretically-based social scientific research.

Louise A. Tilly
New School for
Social Research

Tom Bottomore, *et al.*, eds., *A Dictionary of Marxist Thought* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press 1983).

THE *DICTIONARY of Marxist Thought* might perhaps have better been entitled the *Dictionary of Contemporary, Ostensibly Marxist, Thought*. The editors have taken great care to avoid giving the impression that they wish to differentiate between the relative merits of the Marxism of Engels or Fromm, Lenin or Lukács. The claims of virtually everyone from Karl Kautsky to Mao Tse Tung and Herbert Marcuse to the mantle of Marxism are treated, if not sympathetically, then at least agnostically.

This is in one sense a strength of the book — for by adhering to no particular version of orthodoxy, and by drawing on a wide range of contributors (there are over 80), it provides a fairly representative

sample of current trends in academic Marxism. Inevitably some theorists are more popular than others. The omnipresence of Louis Althusser, for example, is striking. One could easily get the impression from perusing many of the entries in this book that his contributions to Marxism are more important than those of Engels. This is a testimony to Althusser's current, or at least recent, popularity — but it also illustrates the limits of this work as a definitive dictionary of Marxism.

The extent of the entries (there are well over 200) is impressive. Subjects covered range from archaeology to aesthetics. Inevitably there are choices to be made with the concomitant sins of omission and commission. For example Islam, Christianity, and Hinduism all warrant entries, but Buddhism does not. Perhaps more importantly, there is a tendency to ignore many of the critical historical events which shaped the Marxist movement. The Paris Commune of 1871 gets an entry but the French Revolution, the Hungarian workers' revolt of 1956, and even the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 do not.

In general, the political dimension of Marxism seems to be of less interest to the editors than the philosophical. Far more attention is paid to the philosophers' attempts to interpret the world than to others' attempts to change it. (Five pages are devoted to the Frankfurt School, but only two to the Bolshevik Party.) There are entries on positivism, empiricism, Kantianism, mediation, negation, knowledge, and ethics whereas subjects such as the popular front, the united front, and the theory of permanent revolution are omitted.

No single volume can hope to cover everything, however, and most readers will find many of the entries useful. For instance, Susan Himmelweit does a neat job of encapsulating the recent dispute on the significance of domestic labour. There is a handy survey of the chronologies of

the various Marxist internationals. Many of the key concepts of Marxian political economy — surplus value, productive and unproductive labour, and the "transformation problem" are outlined succinctly. There is also a selection of biographical sketches of theoreticians and political leaders of the left from Otto Bauer to Ferdinand Lassalle as well as essays on several significant non-Marxist schools of radical thought: feminism, anarchism, and syndicalism.

It would seem that in some cases the editors assigned subjects to people who turned in articles on something else, which were then re-titled. It is somehow hard to imagine that the editorial board actually proposed entries such as "empires of Marx's day," "forms of capital and revenues," or "Marxist economics in Japan." It is even more difficult to conceive of anyone looking up such titles in a dictionary. But this is not really a serious objection, as the book is undoubtedly intended for browsing as much as anything. Given the relative obscurity of some of the topics, it might have been an idea to have included a table of contents (although the entries do appear in boldface in the index). The subjects are neatly cross-indexed in a clear, but unobtrusive fashion. One other nice feature is that there is a short list of related readings following each entry.

This is not really a dictionary of Marxism — or at least of classical Marxism. It is much more a set of abstracts of positions of contemporary theorists on questions debated in the academic left and in the pages of journals such as *New Left Review* (where many of the contributors frequently appear.) It shares many of the strengths and weaknesses of that pedigree. Among the strengths are the considerable erudition and political sophistication characteristic of the British academic left. That alone makes the book worth owning. The crude semi-Maoist "theorizing" which was the dominant tendency among their North American counterparts

never enjoyed much popularity in Britain. This is not to say that Maoism is not represented in the dictionary. It is. The entry on Mao enumerates at some length such "positive contributions to Marxism" as the "mass line" and his alleged war on bureaucracy — things which are not celebrated today as much as they were fifteen years ago. In general, however, there is a more sophisticated sense of what is meant by "Marxism" than the quasi-religious notions of the Red Guards that the Soviet Union was transformed from a socialist paradise to a capitalist hellhole when Stalin's heart stopped beating.

Regrettably the book also has some of the less desirable features of the *New Left Review* as well. Some of the contributors seem to be unable, or unwilling, to provide a useable outline of a subject for the non-specialist. Some write suspiciously as if their chief concern were to maintain their status as one of the cognoscenti, and even to score a point or two in some arcane debate. A related problem is that some of the authors have the irritating habit of larding their prose with ponderous or obscure terms, presumably designed to lend a semblance of greater substance to their contributions. For such individuals it is considered poor form to refer to something as contributing little to our knowledge if one can say that it is "epistemically otiose." One never points to the holes in other's theories — only to the "lacunae." Lucidity is no virtue for those striving for esoteric effect.

The evident intention of the editors to produce a dictionary which goes beyond a simple compilation of quotations from Marx produces some rather peculiar results. The entry under "socialism," surely an appropriate topic for a Marxist dictionary, begins with a recapitulation of what Marx had to say on the subject in his famous "Critique of the Gotha Program." But instead of stopping there, the author (a certain "PMS" who is not listed among the contributors) boldly ventures into the twentieth century and is immedi-

ately confronted with the tricky problem of the nature of the Soviet Union which everyone to the right of Amadeo Bordiga (who unfortunately does not get an entry) agrees is the product of the world's first successful socialist revolution. The question of the relation of the USSR to the concept of socialism is dealt with by listing the four most popular theories propounded by those who claim to be Marxists. It is either: (1) an ideal socialist society as envisioned by Marx (Chernenko); or (2) a bureaucratically degenerated workers' state in which the most important economic conquests remain (Trotsky); or (3) a hideous state-capitalist monstrosity (Mao); or (4) a bureaucratic collectivist society equidistant from both a workers' state and a bourgeois state (Shachtman). That covers most of the possibilities but it provides rather less precision than one normally expects from a dictionary!

While "PMS" was scrupulously fair to all sides, not all of the contributors are so even-handed. There is plenty of room for editorializing and many of the authors make use of it. For example, in the entry under "labour process," Simon Mohun traces the brutality which accompanied Stalin's industrialization programme in the early 1930s to Lenin's earlier endorsement of some aspects of Taylorism. There is obviously an unstated political assumption implicit in this that Stalin was simply a continuation of Lenin. This is, of course, a subject hotly disputed by those who consider themselves to be Marxists.

Tom Bottomore, the chief editor of the dictionary, provides another example of the tendency for political tilt to colour dictionary definitions. He suggests that today "Marxist thought" is "divided between social democracy and communism" — a position which would surely be disavowed as readily by most mainstream social democrats as by most ostensible Marxists. Few contemporary Noskes or Scheidemanns wish to be associated with any kind of Marxism. Bottomore also con-

tends in this entry that "any further movement toward socialism" in the late twentieth century is "most likely to take place through electoral victories and a gradual accumulation of reforms. . . ." It is hard to imagine Marx, who hailed the Paris Commune as "the political form at last discovered under which to work out the *economical emancipation of labour*," placing such confidence in the François Mitterands and Ed Broadbents of our time. But then once again the question is: whose "Marxism?"

This dictionary is not designed for the uninitiated. Some of the entries are probably too specialized to be of much use to the casual reader. Whether or not the negation "in its internal sense, is a process of the development of multiplicity from unity" (as the author on the essay on "logic" informs us) or vice versa is something that many will probably feel unqualified to express an opinion on. There is also not a lot in this volume of special interest to the labour historian. The entry on the working class for example gets barely a page and a half whereas the "theory of knowledge" covers nine. Still, a good reference work must attempt to work on a number of different levels. Even if this volume falls short of being a definitive encyclopaedia of Marxist thought, it is still an ambitious and worthwhile undertaking which should be of considerable use to anyone engaged in any field of socialist studies.

Thomas Rutman
Toronto

Michael Burawoy and Theda Skocpol, eds., *Marxist Inquiries: Studies of Labor, Class and States* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press 1982).

THE LAST HALF of the 1960s saw the radicalization of sociology in North America and its increasing turn towards

Marxism. Marxist-oriented sociologists made more and more contributions to a critical understanding of late capitalist society. These contributions had an impact on politics generally but also upon the direction of sociology as a discipline. Established sociological journals were compelled to publish socialist scholarship because of the increased production of such research and because of the need to maintain their subscription levels. The book under review here is a special issue of the establishment journal, the *American Journal of Sociology*. Two prominent "left-wing" sociologists, Michael Burawoy and Theda Skocpol, served as the special editors of this collection of Marxist articles which should have served as an indication of how far Marxist sociology had come in fifteen years and should have revealed the direction in which it is moving. Unfortunately, the overall volume falls short of such an achievement. For the most part the articles do not really reflect the exciting material that has been generated by Marxist sociologists and they do little to attract non-Marxists to a socialist sociology. This is not to say that the articles are not of a high quality but rather that their subject matter and style of presentation are not very stimulating.

It is always difficult to review a collection of essays because of space limitations and the range of material covered in an anthology. Such is the case here. Thus, I will attempt to offer the reader a general overview and then I will focus on some of those articles which I found interesting or problematic.

The book contains an introductory article by Burawoy, an article on artisan education in nineteenth-century Britain by Julia Wrigley, an article on the class origins of the "new south" by Dwight Billings, an article on citizenship and gender vis-à-vis the labour process in an agribusiness industry by Robert Thomas, an article on American military expenditures by Larry Griffin, Joel Devine, and Michael Wallace, an article on the introduction of

the accident compensation act in New Zealand by Pat Shannon, an article on the proletarianization of the United States class structure by Erik Olin Wright and Joachim Singelmann, an article on dependent capitalist development in Brazil by Peter Evans, an article on the political economy of the international food order by Harriet Friedmann, and an article on the class structure and the new ruling class in eastern Europe by Ivan Szelenyi. Almost all of the pieces are thoroughly researched and presented by very competent authors. Nonetheless, the overall result is a book tedious to read and not all that enlightening as to what the central debates are among Marxists or between Marxists and non-Marxists. The responsibility for this end product lies with the editors and given that one of them (Skocpol) is not really a Marxist (by her own account as well as that of others) then it might be said that the other editor (Burawoy) has lost a round in the political battle of expanding the acceptance of Marxist social science.

Be that as it may let me now turn to some commentary on the articles by Burawoy, Thomas, Griffin, *et al.*, and Szelenyi, with apologies to the others. Burawoy's "Introduction" is a chronology of events and debates which exposed mainstream sociology for what it was and which gave birth to neo-Marxism in American sociology. Burawoy focuses on the emergent critique of Parsonian sociology and the ascendance of four strands of "Marxist" scholarship: the widening appeal of the *Monthly Review* school; the assessment of socialist failure in the United States associated with analyses in *Studies on the Left* and later *Socialist Revolution/Review*; the popularity of the Frankfurt School associated with *Telos* (it is very unclear to me why the contributions of E.P. Thompson, Herbert Gutman, Eugene Genovese, and David Montgomery are linked with this orientation by Burawoy); and the popularity of French structuralism. Burawoy overrates the con-

tributions made by both the structuralists and by critical theorists (Frankfurt School) but I have no quarrel with his argument that these four (or five? Thompson, *et al.*) were, indeed, the main developments in left-wing sociology both in North America and in Europe. Much of the remainder of Burawoy's introduction situates and describes the articles which follow.

The article by Thomas is an attempt to apply the contributions of Braverman and others to a particular labour process in the lettuce industry. Thomas attempts to introduce the perspective of race, gender, and citizenship (political inequality) into the analysis. While he is to be congratulated for undertaking such a task and attempting to broaden the relevance of a Marxist perspective some substantive gaps remain. His general conclusions, however, appear valid. He writes that "these findings suggest quite strongly that it is necessary to connect status inequalities external to the labor process more directly with the way in which activities and positions are structured internal to economic organizations." (109)

Turning to the article on the military expenditures of the American government by Griffin, *et al.*, I must say that I found it to be one of the more stimulating pieces in the reader. The authors examine the thesis put forth by Baran and Sweezy that military spending in the United States emerged, in part, as an absorber of a rising economic surplus and was therefore central to explaining American economic prosperity in the post-World War II period. The authors find only "inconsistent evidence to support" this view. Instead, they conclude, "Military expenditures are used as a countercyclical fiscal tool to regulate unemployment within organized labor and the rate of growth of monopoly profits and not directly to offset aggregate economic stagnation." The conclusion becomes even more interesting in light of recent developments in the

American economy whereby Reagan has increased military expenditures which in turn correlate with America's recent economic "improvement." Thus, the article is not only interesting in itself but its empirical thrust has some implications for left political analysis and activity. Many of the other articles in this collection are not so directly relevant.

The final article in the book and the last one I want to comment on is that by Szelenyi regarding the role of the intelligentsia in state-socialist class structures (his label, not mine). Szelenyi posits "the existence of a class dichotomy between the working class and the intelligentsia" in eastern Europe. He argues against the position which sees the Soviet bureaucracy as the new ruling class (a view associated with Trotskyism and Djilas). "The fundamental theoretical dilemma is whether the bureaucracy can be defined as an ownership class. Such a definition equates the right of disposition with ownership, which is more than questionable." (297) The equation of ownership with the right of disposal makes the concept of ownership too general and its application to capitalist society would make the "technobureaucracy" a new dominating class. (It would seem to me that Wright's discussion of "economic ownership" and "possession" and of contradictory class locations could be creatively applied by Szelenyi here. He cites Wright but it is clear that he makes almost no use of that valuable contribution in this article.)

Szelenyi argues that we must go beyond formal Marxism which defines class relations as ownership relations to uncover the economic foundation of class antagonism. I would certainly agree but the path that Szelenyi then takes seems to me to be highly questionable. He argues that in "state-socialist" societies there is the creation of new mechanisms of economic exploitation and political oppression by a new ruling élite. The roots of this exploitation and oppression are in

state-socialist economic institutions and "in something other than the state ownership of the means of production." (300) He goes on to argue that "we first have to understand the state-socialist institutions of expropriation of surplus and define the principles which legitimate expropriation of surplus and define the principles which legitimate expropriation under state socialism." (300) In state-socialist societies the redistributor of surplus does not mediate between capital and labour but rather replaces the owner of capital, creating an antagonism not between capital owners and wage labourers but rather an antagonism between redistributors and direct producers. This class of redistributors is not bureaucratic in the sense of Djilas or Weber. The new dominant class in eastern Europe is broader than the bureaucracy. Szelenyi argues that "it is composed of all those who have a vested interest in the production and reproduction of a certain type of intellectual knowledge — teleological knowledge — which is legitimating redistributive power under socialist redistributive economies. The new dominant class is composed, therefore, of a type of intellectual, the intelligentsia." (306)

The intelligentsia are *not* the professionals of western society and cannot be equated with them. Szelenyi argues that the mass transformations of intellectuals into professionals in the West did not occur in eastern Europe. "The East European intelligentsia was ready to bypass Western professionalization, which had proved a historical dead end for intellectuals in their long march to power." (309)

There are, of course, real questions that can be raised about Szelenyi's analysis beyond the fact that he makes it all sound like a long-term conspiracy or plot undertaken by intellectuals as a class. He offers no evidence to support his argument (and he even admits this) and allows himself a further exit by saying that we are only at the beginning of such dominance by the intelligentsia and that researchers

might not find such evidence yet even if they looked for it. One is left with the distinct impression that the emergence of the intelligentsia as the new ruling class in eastern Europe is as much wishful thinking on Szelenyi's part as was Galbraith's seeing the techno-structure in power in the West. The editors would have done us all a much greater service if they had published an article on eastern Europe like Erik Olin Wright's excellent one in *Socialist Review* entitled "Capitalism's Futures." In that article, Wright not only details a model for making sense of class relations in the post-capitalist state but also he specifically criticizes a portion of Szelenyi's argument. In part he writes, "For knowledge qua knowledge to constitute the mechanism of exploitation (and thus the axis of the class relation), it would have to be the case that knowledge possession per se conferred the capacity to appropriate surplus, rather than that

knowledge possession facilitates personal recruitment into positions that confer the capacity to appropriate surplus." (97) It follows that possessors of "cultural capital" could increase their surplus appropriation by increasing their cultural capital and that orders given by technical experts would be followed largely because of their "rationality" rather than because of formal sanctions for non-obedience rooted in a legally established bureaucratic structure. These are very unlikely situations. Alas, what is also unlikely is that this book will be of much use to Marxist social scientists in their pursuit of making the world a better place in which to live. It may make some contribution to our world but surely that is not the only goal of socialists.

Paul Stevenson
University of Winnipeg