

## Karl Heinz Roth, ed., On the Road to Global Labour History: A Festschrift for Marcel van der Linden

Neville Kirk

Volume 83, Spring 2019

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1061044ar>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/lt.2019.0012>

[See table of contents](#)

### Publisher(s)

Canadian Committee on Labour History

### ISSN

0700-3862 (print)

1911-4842 (digital)

[Explore this journal](#)

### Cite this review

Kirk, N. (2019). Review of [Karl Heinz Roth, ed., On the Road to Global Labour History: A Festschrift for Marcel van der Linden]. *Labour / Le Travail*, 83, 261–263. <https://doi.org/10.1353/lt.2019.0012>

he asks why these trajectories have occurred, a question that becomes focused as: “why did working class power erode less in Canada than in the United States?” (105) This leads to a review of four competing explanations for this phenomenon focused respectively on political institutions, national characteristics or culture, internal characteristics of unions, and the role of race. Of these, Eidlin disputes the cultural differences hypothesis most vigorously. Opinions will vary on this issue but the question of whether the right indicators have been chosen to gauge this divergence will likely feature in any discussions. As far as the others are concerned, Eidlin concedes some explanatory power to them – institutions matter, union characteristics matter, and race matters. But, in each case, he poses the question of why they matter, how, and why they changed over time. Part 2 of the book is devoted to a fuller exploration of these issues and to spelling out his own interpretation of the political articulation of class interest and the greater strength of the class idea in Canada.

Concretely the class idea is embedded in labour’s connection with the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation, the New Democratic Party, and with social movements that enable it to articulate its demands and policies in class terms. No equivalent connections exist for US labour. As well, he argues that class representation was built into Canadian institutions enabling the state to understand labour issues in class terms, rather than as in the US, in terms of special interests. Here Eidlin puts considerable emphasis on the conciliation functions and tripartite representative structures of Canadian labour boards in contrast to their more adversarial and quasi-judicial equivalents in the US.

These linkages were established in the 1930s and 1940s and the claim they exert influence to the present is based,

although not explicitly, on a path dependency approach. Once institutions and policies are established they tend to persist, as they determine how problems get framed and identify the acceptable range of solutions.

As is the case in the earlier part of the book, the argument is based on a deep and systematic reading of the evidence. That said, the argument is open to criticism on a number of grounds. One is that the nature of the political vehicle with which Canadian labour is allied has, over time, become less and less likely to articulate a class perspective on Canadian politics. Does it really still function, as it may have done in the past in a way that enables a *working-class* voice? Union leaders seem just as likely to talk in terms of the “middle class,” average Canadians, or just “Canadians,” as the Democratic Party and US unions are to express middle class, “American” values perspective rather than a class perspective. According to data presented earlier in the book, such values are much the same on both sides of the border. Similarly, Canada’s tripartite representative institutions may contribute in the way that Eidlin suggests. But are they a product of the class idea, or of institutional and cultural factors associated with the top down Parliamentary system with its roots in an organic concept of society?

The great strength of the book, apart from its detailed and impressive research, is its pursuit of important questions about the nature of our society and the role of labour within it. Its conclusions will have many supporters (and some critics).

STEPHEN MCBRIDE  
McMaster University

Karl Heinz Roth, ed., *On the Road to Global Labour History: A Festschrift for Marcel van der Linden* (Leiden: Brill 2018)

UP TO 2014 Marcel van der Linden was the Research Director at the International Institute of Social History, Amsterdam (IISH). Since September 2014 he has served as Senior Researcher at the IISH. A prolific researcher and writer, distinguished scholar, and generous and valued colleague to many across the world, van der Linden has played a key role for the past 30 years or so in the development of comparative, transnational, and global labour history. Many labour historians, including the editor and contributors to the book under review, convincingly regard van der Linden as *the* inspiration behind the recent and current upsurge of interest in global labour history. Without doubt Marcel has played a pioneering role in writing manifestos and mapping out the promise of a new global history of the working classes and labour relations, especially in its economic aspects. He is also an extremely efficient and enthusiastic organizer and networker. Whether in Europe, Asia, the Americas, or Australasia, he has inspired a new interest in and helped to set up organizations committed to the study of labour history. In terms of theoretical, conceptual, methodological, and substantive debates van der Linden, moreover, has been a leading critic of the allegedly dominant concerns of both “old” and “new” labour history with methodological nationalism, Eurocentrism, and a narrow interest in mainly “free” male and white urban waged workers in industry. He has called for labour historians to cast their nets wider to embrace, for example, studies of the countryside, of unfree labour, of women, of race, of subsistence workers, and semi-subsistence workers since the early modern period. Perhaps most importantly he has called for more studies across national and other boundaries concerned with the ways in which transnational and global entanglements, exchanges, influences, networks, and so

on have developed. Van der Linden’s particular exhortation to study global commodity chains and their attendant social relations over time holds a particular appeal and considerable promise in the eyes of this reviewer.

This Festschrift, splendidly produced by Brill in its Historical Materialism book series, is a celebration of van der Linden’s work in initiating and developing global labour history. As explained by the editor, Karl Heinz Roth, in the Preface, the collection is broken down into four thematic sections. The first, with contributions by Karin Hofmeester, Chitra Joshi, Prabhu P. Mohapatra and Rana P. Behal, David Mayer and Berthold Unfried, and Angelika Ebbinghaus, praises van der Linden’s work as a “scientific organizer and networker.” The second comprises five field and case studies, by Michael Zeuske (slavery in Spanish America), Rossana Barragan Romano (Potosi’s silver and “the Global World of Trade”), Touraj Atabaki (the 1946 strike of oil workers in Iran), Gorkem Akgoz (petitioning as a form of industrial bargaining in a Turkish state factory) and Jenny Chan (working-class power in post-socialist China). These are all well researched, clearly written, and interesting in their own right. At times they draw out the wider, including global, significance of their particular studies. But they are overly descriptive and not linked in a way one would expect in a book highlighting transnational and global connexions. The third section is something of a mixed bag of “Methodological and Conceptual Aspects.” The essays by Peter Alexander, on the importance of comparison in global labour history, Dirk Hoerder, on recent developments in migration research “in a global perspective,” and Christian G. De Vito on the importance of the concepts of labour flexibility and labour precariousness to the historical study of labour relations, are useful and enlightening. Once

again, however, no attempt is made to link these essays. The final “aspect,” that of Andrea Komlosy on “Labour and Value Transfer under Capitalism,” operates at a much higher level of abstraction than the others. As such, and despite its analytical value, it sits somewhat oddly alongside the other contributions. The fourth section consists of an informative essay by Karl Heinz Roth on van der Linden’s intellectual development. The book also lists van der Linden’s impressive publications between 1971 and 2014.

The collection as a whole is useful and instructive. Some of the contributions, however, are insufficiently analytical and critical, while the book is not an integrated coherent whole. Its main weakness lies in the fact that it is a somewhat uncritical *celebration* of van der Linden’s work rather, than as one might reasonably expect, a critical, albeit comradely and respectful, *engagement* with it. In this context, it may be useful to bring to the reader’s attention the following issues and questions. First, what are van der Linden and other global labour historians seeking to describe and explain in addition to establishing the important existence of transnational and global connexions? Do they have an overriding set of questions in mind, an all-important *problematic*? What is the overall *purpose* of global labour history? Is it purely academic, or does it also carry political implications and effects? If they do have such a problematic in mind, then this requires further elaboration and discussion. Second, does van der Linden present a fair and accurate picture of the state of labour history before the advent of his global and globalising concerns? The answer is surely that he has exaggerated his criticisms in order more effectively to make his case. For example, as Dorothy Sue Cobble, Leon Fink, myself and others have argued, labour historians in a variety of places and spaces have *not*, as argued by van der Linden,

confined their studies to the white male urban and waged sections of the working class operating within nation states. For example, the study of slaves, women, rural workers, the unskilled in addition to the skilled, the “producing classes” and the unemployed as well as the employed have long constituted important areas of study. Some scholars, albeit a minority, have also offered transnational and even global as well as national, sub-national, and international perspectives. A firmer sense of definition and observation is in order. Third, van der Linden’s work ultimately tends to be mainly economic or material in character. It arguably pays insufficient attention to the complex ways in which the “economic” is also informed by culture, by norms and values, expectations and forms of human subjectivity and consciousness. In a sense, and despite his wish to depart from Marxist orthodoxy, it smacks too much of economic determinism and would benefit from closer attention to the continuous dialogue between human agency and conditioning, or culture and structure. Fourth, I also feel a sense of unease about describing historical research as scientific or social-scientific in the ways that van der Linden, Roth and likeminded scholars do. While I applaud van der Linden’s determination to avoid empiricism and to be analytical, his research carries with it the danger of a positivist tendency to be too coldly and neatly structural, classificatory, and functional with insufficient attention paid to the ways in which contingency, contradiction, complexity, and the messiness and chaos of human beings and their history inform patterned experience and structure.

In conclusion, to raise these questions and issues is not to cast doubt upon the vital importance of Marcel’s work, his contribution to the discipline and the great debt of gratitude owed to him by many scholars across the globe. It is,

however, to raise the continued importance of critical engagement rather than simply celebration, of shortcomings alongside strengths. Critical engagement is vital to the further development of the exciting and wide-open fields of transnational and global labour history.

NEVILLE KIRK

Manchester Metropolitan University

Joan Sangster, *One Hundred Years of Struggle: The History of Women and the Vote in Canada* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press 2018)

JOAN SANGSTER'S *One Hundred Years of Struggle* is a remarkable inaugural volume on the centenary of the federal extension of the suffrage to white women in Canada. It is an overview of the rich diversity of suffrage histories that led to the final extension of universal suffrage in 1960. Subsequent volumes will treat the topics introduced here in greater depth, but this work will doubtless become a standard text for students of Canadian women's history. At under 300 pages, its length is manageable. It is accurate and historiographically mature, but still readable. The publisher agreed to include numerous images and primary texts, all of which will facilitate classroom integration. Most importantly, Sangster has remembered the primary task of the historian, which is to tell good stories. Every chapter employs biography to tell personal stories of individual suffragists, most of whom have escaped the traditional narratives around Canadian women's history. Because of its decentralized complexity in both space and time, the story of Canadian women's suffrage is especially difficult to tell. I can't imagine anyone having done it better.

The introduction invites us to imagine suffrage as a series of concentric circles. Those in the innermost circle

were focused almost exclusively on the vote, extending their activism beyond the vote only to pursue other, related objectives like expanding women's roles in society. Beyond the first circle lies a group of activists whose objectives were broader. Whereas the first group pursued the women's vote as end unto itself – political equality as a goal with inherent justice and consequent worth – the second group may be thought of as women who viewed suffrage as a means to an end. The justice of women's equality with men, for this group, was tied up with achieving a more just society generally. The third circle looked broader still, its members organizing occasionally around suffrage, but more often around religion or social clubs. All looked to leverage women's talents to improve society. Some envisioned structural transformation that would strike at the root of injustice; others accepted the basic ordering of their society but worked to make less radical improvements.

Subsequent chapters address issues that divided women, like property, race, imperialism, and war. A loose chronology is maintained, making the dense, disparate, non-linear history easier to follow. Suffrage intersected frequently, if not universally, with other struggles. Land, labour, class, religion, language, or race play parts in every story. Party politics favoured women's enfranchisement in some circumstances and hindered it in others. Ideology inconsistently supported or opposed suffrage depending on the political moment. Assumptions around progress, the superiority of white culture and Christianity vis-à-vis Indigenous, Asian, or Afro-Canadian groups, even after assimilation, permeated white discourses about suffrage extensions.

Two chapters help readers imagine the competing worldviews that emerged around the suffrage debate between those who participated in the creation of