

## Reviews / Comptes Rendus

---

Volume 13, 1984

URI : <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/llt13rv01>

[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

(1984). Compte rendu de [Reviews / Comptes Rendus]. *Labour/Le Travailleur*, 13, 198–291.

# REVIEWS/COMPTES RENDUS

- Paul Aubin et Paul-André Linteau, eds., *Bibliographie de l'histoire du Québec et du Canada, 1966-1975*  
by G. Douglas Vaisey / 200
- David H. Flaherty, ed., *Essays in the History of Canadian Law. Volume One*  
by William Wylie / 202
- Susan Mann Trofimenkoff, *The Dream of Nation: A Social and Intellectual History of Quebec*  
by J.I. Little / 205
- Colin Read, *The Rising in Western Upper Canada, 1837-8: The Duncombe Revolt and After*  
by Paul Romney / 207
- Susan Jackel, ed., *A Flannel Shirt and Liberty: British Emigrant Gentlemen in the Canadian West, 1880-1914*  
by W.J.C. Cherwinski / 209
- Grace Morris Craig, *But This is Our War*  
by Glenn T. Wright / 211
- Elaine Bernard, *The Long Distance Feeling: A History of the Telecommunications Workers Union*  
by Paul Phillips / 212
- Lewis H. Thomas, ed., *The Making of a Socialist: The Recollections of T.C. Douglas*  
by Grace MacInnis / 214
- Toby Gordon Ryan, *Stage Left: Canadian Theatre in the Thirties. A Memoir*  
by Terry Goldie / 217
- Bernard Gauvin, *Les communistes et la question nationale au Québec. Sur le Parti communiste du Canada de 1921 à 1938*  
by F.J.K. Griezec / 218
- Jacques Rouillard, *Histoire de la CSN, 1921-1981*  
by Michael D. Behiels / 220
- Benoît-Beaudry Gourd, *Mines et syndicats en Abitibi-Témiscamingue 1910-1950*  
by Jacques Rouillard / 223
- Jean Boivin et Jacques Guilbault, *Les relations patronales-syndicales au Québec*  
by Pierre J.G. Vennat / 224
- François Demers, *Chroniques impertinentes (du 3ème Front commun syndical)*  
by Jean-Marc Pottie / 226
- Fernand Dumont, Jean Hamelin et Jean-Paul Montminy, dir., *Idéologies au Canada Français 1940-1976. tome II, Les mouvements sociaux. Les syndicats*  
by Paul Larocque / 228
- Michèle Savard Baby, *Le syndicalisme patronal dans la construction*  
by Guy Bélanger / 230
- Donald V. Nightingale, *Workplace Democracy: An Inquiry into Employee Participation in Canadian Work Organizations*  
by James Rinehart / 232
- W. Irwin Gillespie, *The Redistribution of Income in Canada*  
by Lars Osberg / 234
- Lars Osberg, *Economic Inequality in Canada*  
by Steven Antler / 235
- F.T. Denton, A.L. Robb, and B.G. Spencer, *Unemployment and Labour Force Behaviour of Young People: Evidence from Canada and Ontario*  
by James Struthers / 236
- Nick Salvatore, *Eugene Debs, Citizen and Socialist*  
by J.H.M. Laslett / 238
- Leslie Fishbein, *Rebels in Bohemia: The Radicals of the Masses, 1911-1917*  
by Michael Fellman / 239
- Kenneth Kann, ed., *Joe Rapoport: The Life of a Jewish Radical*  
by Irving Abella / 241

- Jürgen Kocka, *White Collar Workers in America 1890-1940: A Social-Political History in International Perspective*  
by Anthony Thomson / 243
- George Lipsitz, *Class and Culture in Cold War America: "A Rainbow at Midnight"*  
by Richard Gruneau / 246
- Susan Strasser, *Never Done: A History of American Housework*  
by Bettina Bradbury / 248
- Ronnie Steinberg, *Wages and Hours: Labor and Reform in Twentieth-Century America*  
by Melvyn Dubofsky / 251
- Glenn Porter, *The Workers' World at Hagley*  
by Dianne Newell / 252
- Jennifer Ozga and Martin Lawn, *Teachers, Professionalism and Class: A Study of Organized Teachers*  
by Andrew Spaul / 253
- J.E. King, *Richard Marsden and the Preston Chartists 1837-1848*  
by Dorothy Thompson / 255
- Donald C. Richter, *Riotous Victorians*  
by John Benson / 258
- V.L. Allen, *The Militancy of British Miners*  
by Wallace Clement / 258
- Norman and Jeanne MacKenzie, eds., *The Diary of Beatrice Webb, Volume One, 1873-1892: "Glimmer Around and Darkness Within"*  
by Patricia E. Malcolmson / 260
- John Hughes, *Britain in Crisis: De-industrialization and how to fight it*  
by Colin Leys / 262
- William P.L. Thomson, *The Little General and the Rousay Crofters: Crisis and Conflict on an Orkney Crofting Estate*  
by Ian Ross Robertson / 264
- Margaret Maruani, *Les syndicats à l'épreuve de féminisme*  
by Mary Lynn McDougall / 266
- William Harvey Maehl, *August Bebel. Shadow Emperor of the German Workers*  
by Larry Peterson / 268
- Gary P. Steenson, "Not One Man! Not One Penny!" *German Social Democracy 1863-1914*  
by Larry Peterson / 269
- Denis MacShane, *Solidarity: Poland's Independent Trade Union*  
by David Mandel / 271
- Alain Besançon, *The Rise of the Gulag: Intellectual Origins of Leninism*  
by N.G.O. Pereira / 273
- Anthony F. Upton, *The Finnish Revolution, 1917-1918*  
by Varpu Lindstrom-Best / 275
- Bjorn Gustavsen and Gerry Hunnius, *New Patterns of Work Reform: The Case of Norway*  
by Daniel Glenday / 276
- Jerome R. Mintz, *The Anarchists of Casus Viejas*  
by Adrian Shubert / 278
- Jim Hagan, *The History of the ACTU*  
by Desmond Morton / 280
- Stanley B. Greenberg, *Race and Class in Capitalist Development*  
by Mary Turner / 282
- Maureen Hynes, *Letters from China*  
by Mary Sun / 283
- Paul Connerton, *The Tragedy of Enlightenment*, and George Friedman, *The Political Philosophy of the Frankfurt School*  
by Ian H. Angus / 284
- T.W. Hutchison, *The Politics and Philosophy of Economics: Marxians, Keynesians, and Austrians*  
by Ian H. Drummond / 287
- Robert Lekachman, *Greed is not Enough: Reaganomics*  
by Paul Phillips / 289

Paul Aubin et Paul-André Linteau, eds., *Bibliographie de l'histoire du Québec et du Canada, 1966-1975* (Québec: Institut québécois de recherche sur la culture, 2 tomes, 1981).

THIS BIBLIOGRAPHY REPRESENTS a mammoth effort to collate 22,114 references to books, book chapters, articles, and theses. It attempts to organize a decade of literature with three primary points of access: a systematic classification of material by historical period (with sub-classifications by broad subjects — culture, economic factors, the working class), an analytic section providing access by geographic location and by names of historical personages, and an author index. In Annex I, the compilers supply an English-French glossary of analytic descriptors; in Annex II, there is a list of periodicals surveyed.

In preparing this bibliography, Aubin and Linteau, together with the bibliographic team from the *Revue d'histoire de l'Amérique française*, systematically scanned four hundred journals. They also took an inventory of publications released between 1966 and 1975, paying close attention to material appearing in *Canadiana* and the *Bibliographie du Québec*. References to thesis material were requested from each degree-granting institution in Canada, only one of which did not reply. Much of this material — at least the monographs and journal articles — had already appeared in the "Bibliographie de l'histoire de l'Amérique française: publications récentes," which is a regular feature of the *RHAF*.

The result of these efforts is ponderous. Not since Thibault's *Bibliographia Canadiana* has there been a work of such ambition; historians and researchers should whisper quiet thanks to the compilers for sparing them the mind-numbing tedium of sifting through a decade of abstracts, indexes, bibliographies, and back-issues of journals.

However, the work is not flawless and no one should consider it definitive. This reviewer compared Aubin and Linteau with two Canadian bibliographies dealing with labour history. Of 138 entries examined, the *Bibliographie de l'Histoire...* contained 91 (or 65.9%). In other words, one in every three of the references checked did *not* appear in the Aubin-Linteau compilation. Understandably, a work of this magnitude is bound to contain a few errors. Some indicate a failing in scope on the part of the editors, others a lack of proofreading, and others still an absence of thoroughness. While the compilers have carefully avoided newspaper and magazine articles, their selection of journals could have been more eclectic. While the historical societies of British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Nova Scotia are represented, the New Brunswick Historical Society's *Collections* are mysteriously omitted. Two key journals containing labour material have also been passed over. *Relations Industrielles/Industrial Relations*, despite its numbers of statistical and personnel-related articles, contains several sound historical pieces and should have been selectively indexed. Inexcusable is the omission of *Histoire des Travailleurs Québécois*, which has made such a major contribution to the Quebec literature.

Similarly, I wondered at the selection criteria used to pick articles from *This Magazine* and *Our Generation*. In particular, accounts of the Artistic Woodworkers' Strike, the United Aircraft Strike, and the CEGEP strike — all of which might be termed "history in the making" — were overlooked, while issues of equally contemporary interest (such as the new left in Quebec) were included. If there were conscious reasons for this policy, special commentary in the introduction would have been useful.

Other inconsistencies made me equally uneasy. Note for example that, while there is a critical article discussing Earl Birney's *Down the Long Table* (a

novel of the thirties), the reprint of this work in 1975 is not included. Similar misadventure befalls Nellie McClung, about whom there are several articles but not Mary Lile Benham's 1975 biography. Small presses also fare poorly. Jean-Guy Loisel's *L'Enfer du Mont Wright*, Catherine Vance's *Not by Gods but by People: the story of Bella Hall Gauld*, and Patricia Schulz's *East York Workers' Association* (published by Éditions Québec-Amérique, Progress Books and New Hogtown Press, respectively) find no place in this *magnum opus*.

Despite the very promising opening remarks about how thoroughly all but one Canadian university co-operated in sending thesis information, the lapse in coverage of labour theses from Canadian institutions leaves us wondering precisely which university did not reply. T.E. Collins' *The Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Union* (M.A., Western Ontario, 1975), D.A. Fairbairn's *The British-American Refinery Strike, Moose Jaw...* (M.A., Regina, 1975), and Nancy Stunden's *The Stratford Strikes of 1933* (M.A., Carleton, 1975) should all appear in this work; they do not. There are at least six other omissions, including the important Steele thesis on the Nova Scotia coal strike of 1909-10. One must speculate adversely that if this sample of citations yielded so many omissions, a closer examination might prove more embarrassing.

These are matters of inclusion, matters which cannot jeopardize the magnitude of the *Bibliographie* but which can sow seeds of uneasiness in the user's mind. More annoying and definitely the compilers' fault are the inaccurate presentations of authors' names. Why, for instance, do we see separate entries under "Kealy, Greg," "Kealy, Gregory S.," and "Kealey, Gregory S.," when they all refer to the same Kealey? The learned Rawlyk from Queen's also finds himself presented as "Rawlick" and "Rawlik," while Gerald E. Panting has three spots to him-

self in the author index. After a while, I wondered whether the proofreading was done by a Canadian historian and how anyone not familiar with these mutant spellings would find the authors' works.

The presentation of bibliographic information gave rise to a few anomalies as well. *Women at Work: Ontario, 1850-1950*, which was edited by Janice Acton (a note quite clearly made in the book), is listed in the author index under Linda Kealey, who wrote the introduction. Similarly, although each essay in Paul Knox's *Essays in B.C. Political Economy* is given its own entry by author, no credit or recognition is given to the editor, under whose name not a few librarians might check. These niggling points extend to the Analytical Index, where Gladys Suggitt's article should have found a place under "Baddow, Ontario."

These are fine points, and it might be unfair to the compilers to cite too many of them. Criticisms so far may be taken as a counsel of perfection.

What will annoy many users of this otherwise excellent bibliography is the arrangement of the work. It will confound students, perturb librarians, and perplex the casual user. The compilers use a "Systematic Classification" to organize the bulk of the work. Information is divided into broad historical periods, which are then subdivided into subject sections (e.g., Société-Travail, or Groupes Ethniques); each subdivision is further subdivided into special topics. Under the labour heading, users will find subdivisions for general history, working and living conditions, strikes, workers' movements, political action, and "diverse topics." Thus, for a period such as the 1930s, studies concerning a strike, the union involved, the working conditions which gave it impetus, and its political and social consequences could appear in separate sections. A study of the company against which the strike was aimed will appear in an altogether different place, as will works on police or military interven-

tions. This spreading of resources might have been alleviated had the compilers put more emphasis on the "Analytic Section" (which you may translate as the subject index).

Equally challenging is the exercise of finding an author through the "Author Index." Each entry in the bibliography is given a code number, at the point at which it first appears in the text. The number is never repeated when the citation reappears elsewhere in the bibliography. Therefore to locate the works of an author of eclectic interests and publication, one must fish from beginning to end, guessing where every number might fall within the 1430 pages. Exercise such as this we do not need, and I wondered out loud whether the computer system used to organize these data might not have dictated the final form to the compilers, rather than a frank analysis of the search behaviours exhibited by most students, librarians, and researchers. Having shared these tomes with colleagues, asking for their comments, I regret to report more expletives about the arrangement than praises for the content.

On balance, the *Bibliographie de l'Histoire du Québec et du Canada* represents an awesome volume of labour. To have over 22,000 references gathered in one place and arranged to provide subject access places the Canadian historical community in the compilers' debt. The errors, omissions, and other problems suggest that a supplement, containing addenda and corrigenda, should be issued free to all purchasers. The arrangement may deter rather than encourage use, as will the annoying habit of translating English place names and institutions into French. The problem compounds when Saint John (N.B.) and St. John's (Nfld.) are both translated into Saint-Jean. While I differ with the enthusiastic introduction which suggests that we will want to keep this work near the tools we use every day, there is no denying that Aubin and Lin-teau (and their team) have made a land-

mark contribution to Canadian historical bibliography.

G. Douglas Vaisey  
Saint Mary's University

David H. Flaherty, ed., *Essays in the History of Canadian Law. Volume One* (Toronto: The Osgoode Society and the University of Toronto Press 1981).

LEGAL HISTORY IN Canada has long been dominated by antiquarians and constitutionalists in whose hands it has seemed largely irrelevant to the historical experience of most Canadians. This book, sponsored by the Osgoode Society, represents an ambitious attempt to place legal history in a broader social context. The first of two volumes of essays intended to demonstrate the possibilities for research and writing in the field, it presents ten essays on topics as diverse as the history of the courts, the law and the economy, the genesis of the criminal code, and the position of women and children in the history of Canadian law. While there is much of interest here, this is decidedly a statement of research in progress, and one which reveals several weaknesses about the state of the discipline.

In the first place, the writing of legal history in Canada lacks a focus. Professor Flaherty's lengthy introduction is particularly troubling in this regard. Flaherty rightly argues for an expansive legal history that will place the law firmly in the context of the society which influenced its development. He supports an approach combining empiricism and theory and recommends especially the work of J. Willard Hurst in the United States as embodying these principles. But he fails to identify Hurst's assumptions about law or about American development. According to Hurst, American law was shaped by a prevailing entrepreneurial spirit that encouraged material development. His work displays a consensual viewpoint about history and an instrumental interpre-

tation of the role of law. Instead of touching on such basic issues, Flaherty prefers to range widely over a series of more particular questions about the law and about the relevant American and British historiography. The reader is left without a starting point for approaching the discipline.

This essay will not analyze each contribution to this volume. Rather, by reference to several representative essays, the review will suggest an approach which delineates the possible role of legal institutions within a coherent interpretation of Canadian history. This requires working assumptions about Canadian development generally and about the functions of legal institutions in particular. For the former, the student can draw on the tradition of Canadian writings in political economy. These writings emphasize the primacy of economic interests in shaping experience, but also insist on the importance of human agency in determining events. Furthermore, the history of Canadian political economy, especially after the beginning of the nineteenth century, is largely the history of capitalist development. The Canadian experience involved conflict between the emerging class of proprietors controlling capital, with their helpers in law and government, and opposing groups including small proprietors, and around 1850, the beginnings of a wage-earning class.

For the role of legal institutions, we can draw on the insights in the recent Marxist debates on the role of the state, and more explicitly on the writings in British legal history of E.P. Thompson, Douglas Hay, and their colleagues. These authors suggest a two-sided approach to the function of the law. On the one hand, it served as an instrument in the struggle for accumulation between competing economic groups. But the law was also an important weapon in the battle for the hearts and minds of men. The powerful mythology of the law asserted that the common law embodied the basic rights of

English-speaking peoples to civil liberties, equality before the law, due process, and protection of private property. These principles became rallying cries in the struggle to justify competing social philosophies.

These themes can be discerned in three essays in the volume, chosen mainly because they all deal with the same society at the same time: mid-nineteenth-century Ontario or Upper Canada. Each essay throws a different light on the role of legal institutions and displays different strengths and weaknesses in its understanding of Upper Canadian society. In "The Law and the Economy in Mid-Nineteenth-Century Ontario: A Perspective," Professor R.C.B. Risk summarizes the insights of his detailed work on the substantive law of commerce, business organization, and property law, which facilitated capitalist accumulation. This law, he argues, derived mainly from the English common law, supplemented towards mid-century by a spate of legislation intended to ease the province into the industrial age. Risk emphasizes the limited amount of judicial innovation in Upper Canada in contrast to the United States. Provincial judges preferred to rely on English cases rather than tailor decisions to suit Upper Canadian conditions. Innovation was reserved for the provincial legislature. Risk links the behaviour of the provincial lawmakers to the values celebrating individual initiative and material progress. He makes no attempt, however, to link these ideas to the entrepreneurial-lawyer political coalition which was dominant at the time, nor does he indicate the existence of conflicting viewpoints. This leads to some interesting dilemmas. For example, he cannot convey the clash of egalitarian and liberal capitalist viewpoints on the question of the concentration of wealth. Instead, he postulates a paradoxical consensus situation in which there was considerable opposition to monopolies but few restrictions on their development.

In his essay on William Hume Blake and the judicial reforms of 1849, John D. Blackwell explores the expansion of the centralized superior courts in Upper Canada. While Blackwell does note countervailing opinions, he does not trace them to the structure of political economy. He describes a legal profession interested in expanding the machinery of justice to reduce delays and increase the credibility of the administration of justice. Set against the profession was the public, whose views were obscured by political rhetoric, but who seemed suspicious of the apparatus of the courts. The lawyers prevailed and Blackwell believes that the reforms expedited the administration of justice benefitting the public as a whole. But the question of judicial reform was part of a larger debate about the concentration of power between the leading entrepreneurs and lawyers on the one hand, and the small farmers and artisans of the province on the other. The courts settled relatively few of the economic disputes bearing on this issue. Their major importance was symbolic rather than instrumental. Blake and his legal colleagues assumed that the superior courts comprised the heart of the system of justice. Small proprietors tended to look instead to the local courts of limited jurisdiction for the protection of their interests. They regarded an expanded centralized system as one more step in the concentration of power they deplored. In the dispute over judicial reform, both sides appealed to the principles of equality before the law and due process in legal procedure, but from viewpoints which reflected conflicting conceptions of social improvement.

Professor Craven's article on "The Law of Master and Servant in Mid-Nineteenth-Century Ontario" introduces a new actor to the provincial stage: the propertyless working class. With the appearance of numerous wage-earners, the lines of conflict at mid-century were shifting from the social relations of

exchange to the social relations of production. Craven sketches some of the major features of the law of employment in Ontario and traces them to the common law and to British legislation, the main features of which were confirmed by a provincial statute of 1847. His study underlines the inequality of the employment contract in a society dominated by employers. The situation was exemplified by the fate of the respective parties in the event of a breach of contract. While the employer was liable for the customary civil penalty of monetary damages, the employee was treated as a criminal subject to imprisonment.

Craven's study is explicitly tentative, raising as many questions as it answers. For instance, the provincial legislation of 1847 was apparently made necessary by several judicial decisions which brought into question the legality of the British legislation in the colony. Did this mean that provincial judges were antagonistic to employers? While the author does not speculate, his evidence suggests that the judicial decisions hinged on the interpretation of a single English act: the Statute of Apprentices of 1562. This act was thought inappropriate in Ontario chiefly because its restrictions on entry to the skilled trades — especially that requiring seven years of apprenticeship — were deemed too rigorous given the shortage of craftsmen in the province. It seems significant that the legislature also passed a provincial statute of apprentices in 1851 with the expressed intention of shortening the time necessary for apprenticeship.

But in spite of its insights, there is an air of unreality about Craven's essay: it is almost an attempt to write working-class history without the workers. This is a deficiency which the author recognizes. Superior court decisions and the contents of statutes reveal little about the behaviour and the experience of workers regarding the law. For this it is necessary to study the magistrates' and police courts where legal disputes concerning employment



tended to be resolved, and this Craven intends to do in a forthcoming essay. But it is also necessary to look completely outside of the formal mechanisms of the law. Since most disputes were settled informally, the employment relationship, and hence the law in its broadest sense, was defined in the day-to-day confrontations between labour and capital.

The major failing of this volume and indeed of Canadian legal history so far is probably its elitist bias. The law-making process seems to have involved an ongoing struggle between contending individuals and groups over conflicting conceptions of justice, but the writings tend to equate legal history with the actions of prominent jurists and politicians. Their behaviour is certainly revealing about the strategies of those in power. As several contributors point out, Canadian judges seem to have been reluctant to enunciate new principles, preferring to don the mantle of neutral arbiters articulating established doctrine. They have left the law-making to the parliamentarians who can claim, since they were elected, to represent the people. These can be persuasive legitimizing concepts, but to what extent have they been accepted by persons and groups outside the inner sanctums of power? An answer requires more study of the behaviour of small proprietors and workers in the courts, especially those of limited jurisdiction, and in society generally. Only in this way can a comprehensive social history of the law be written.

William Wylie  
Parks Canada

Susan Mann Trofimenkoff, *The Dream of Nation: A Social and Intellectual History of Quebec* (Toronto: Macmillan 1982).

MUCH OF THE RECORDED history of Quebec is obsessed with the struggle for "la survivance" in a strictly cultural sense. Nationalist heroes, whether they were priests, politicians, or writers, once received the lion's share of attention. But the focus began to shift in the 1960s, until

Quebec now leads the rest of the country in the field of socio-economic history. The recent translation of the excellent *Histoire du Québec Contemporain* by Linteau, Durocher, and Robert has made this much more stimulating and comprehensive interpretation available to a large audience in English Canada. It also reveals the great extent to which Susan Mann Trofimenkoff's *The Dream of Nation* is outdated even as it hits the bookstore shelves.

The problem is not that this sorely-needed English language survey restricts itself to "social" and "intellectual" history, for these two themes can, and do in this case, become all-encompassing. In fact, the book presents a good deal of valuable information on Quebec society, and is particularly valuable in its depiction of women's experience. Unfortunately, it also attempts to pour this new wine into the old bottles of narrative history. The framework remains the chronological, political one, with many pages devoted to tired old topics such as the struggle for responsible government, Confederation, the separate schools question, and the conscription crises. To the Quebec nationalist school of historians each of these issues represents a step toward further political and economic domination by English Canada, and social and cultural domination by the Catholic church. But Trofimenkoff has little time for the nationalist interpretation. She presents the fall of New France as inevitable, downplays the socio-economic impact of the Conquest (making a rather curious allusion to rape), dismisses the Patriotes' dream of independence as misguided and irresponsible, and approves of the collaboration of LaFontaine and Cartier with English Canada.

The economic superiority of English-speaking capitalists becomes an inevitable process, having little to do with the social and cultural values propagated by the church. In fact the author even minimizes the moral influence of the priests, claim-

ing that the people generally went about their daily lives, and the government about its business, despite the jeremiads from the pulpit. The major exception seems to have been the status of women. When compared with the rest of Canada, the female emancipation movement was weakened, in part at least, by the key role which the traditional family played in the minds of the clerico-nationalist elite. The same sort of analysis could have been applied to the labour and farmers' movements, as well as to the welfare and education systems, but the implication of church domination in these fields is seldom pursued very far. The reverse process, especially the impact of industrialization and urbanization upon the corporatist ideals of the early twentieth century, is well documented. But the point of understanding ideology tends to be lost when its importance to social evolution is not demonstrated.

Aside from its failure to synthesize the social and intellectual themes in a meaningful fashion, *The Dream of Nation's* interpretation of the past is frequently debatable, to say the least. The short chapter on New France emphasizes the scarcity of labour as a basic socio-economic weakness, when this has been denied by both Mougk and Dechêne. The period from 1760 to 1850 is covered in a cohesive and well-integrated fashion, being essentially a summary of Fernand Ouellet's work. However, more attention to the publications of Montreal social historians Tulchinsky, Linteau, and Young would have cast a more critical light on the image of the French-Canadian nation fostered by the intellectual elite. Men like Cartier may have paid lip-service to the stereotype that the "French Canadians had a cultural, emotional, artistic, sustaining and civilizing function to play in a country dominated by English Canadian commercial, economic, national, and materialistic activities," (113) but that did not prevent them from grasping for their share of the spoils.

In succeeding chapters, the anti-materialist position of the nineteenth-century church is also highly exaggerated, its political ambitions only slightly less so, and its useful functions are essentially limited to those performed by nuns. The transience of Quebec society during the last century is blown out of proportion; rural family migration to the frontier and mill towns caused an extension of traditional values and institutions, not their disruption. To describe farmers and workers as helpless and uncomplaining pawns, drifting desperately from place to place, does little credit to their strength and resourcefulness. Nor did the nationalist elite's "dream of a Gallic presence across the continent" die with the execution of Louis Riel and the creation of a public school system in Manitoba. These events in fact helped to awaken indifferent Quebecers to the existence of French-speaking minorities in the rest of the country, culminating in the pan-Canadian nationalism of Henri Bourassa. The book also makes the blunder of declaring that Protestant-owned corporations contributed solely to Quebec's Protestant school commissions, when in fact company taxes were divided according to population numbers. Urban Protestant schools did receive more local funding than did those of the Catholics because English Quebecers were more inclined to be property owners, but the vast majority of anglophones in Quebec had no reason to feel particularly privileged. They once constituted a large proportion of the impoverished workers in Montreal, and of the struggling farmers in the isolated Gaspé and Eastern Townships regions. By choosing to ignore this substantial minority group, the author is herself perpetuating an old nationalist myth, the one that associates English Quebecers exclusively with the Westmounts of the province.

As a survey of Quebec history, *The Dream of Nation* does have strengths. It incorporates a considerable amount of relatively recent historical writing in a con-

cise and readable format. Unfortunately, because of the tendency to dramatize issues, and the cursory treatment of many important topics, the book does not present a well-balanced view of the province.

J.I. Little  
Simon Fraser University

Colin Read, *The Rising in Western Upper Canada, 1837-8: The Duncombe Revolt and After* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press 1982).

READ SETS OUT to examine "in detail" (10) the social context, political antecedents, events, and consequences of the insurrection led by Dr. Charles Duncombe in the London District in December 1837. After some contextual preliminaries, he sets the scene of the rebellion: the 33 townships of the London District and the two Gore District townships that bordered it. A sketch of the settlement process, the ethnic and sectarian distribution of population, and the local economy leads to four chapters on the political discontents of the region, just before the rising, and on the rising itself and its repression. Finally, Read tries to explain the insurrection, using numerical and conventional data to build a social profile of the rebels and discussing their motives, chiefly on the basis of their confessions and petitions for clemency.

The narrative chapters are the most successful. Reviewing the antecedents of the revolt, Read notes two events that shocked Upper Canada's reformers. The government's victory in the general election of 1836 was aided by Orange violence at the polls and blatantly fraudulent manipulation of the electoral process. Afterwards, the new legislature passed an act to prevent the dissolution that should constitutionally have followed the King's impending death. When bad harvests and the international depression of 1836-7 brought unusual hardship to the district, the political discontents normal to bad

times were sharpened by the belief that the provincial government was illegitimate and despotic. When William Lyon Mackenzie marched on Toronto in December 1837, this belief lent colour to the rumour that the authorities planned to arrest all of the colony's leading radicals, including Duncombe, and were unconstitutionally preventing the people from petitioning the monarch for redress of their grievances. The further rumour that Mackenzie had taken Toronto, or was about to do so, ignited the tinder of alienation.

The rising was stillborn. The rebels learned of Mackenzie's flight while mustering to march on Brantford and chose to flee themselves. Afterwards the government faced few obstacles in routing out treason. Read contends that the central authorities acted leniently during this phase, especially in view of the raids launched from the U.S. throughout 1838. I wonder how hard they tried to stop the persecution of suspected rebels, and reformers generally, by vindictive local officials. Was there a "good cop-bad cop" aspect to their tactics of conciliation?

Who were the rebels? Read tells us they were mostly mature men (average age 30.2), married (84 out of 128), fairly prosperous by local standards, and either American-born or British North American-born of American antecedents (about 80 per cent). His profile uses conventional as well as numerical data, however, since the latter are scanty: he has identified 197 rebels (out of perhaps 500, he suggests), but the data even on these are far from complete. Thus Read's quantitative analysis of sectarian affiliation is vitiated because he has data for only 44 rebels and 25 sympathizers and has chosen not to expand them by using the nominal census of 1842, since "denominational and sectarian lines were crossed with some frequency." (185) I think his caution excessive and regret it the more because I have found the census useful in analyzing the Toronto parliamentary poll book of 1836. As to socio-economic

status, Read's data on proprietorship are too vague to reveal much. His occupational profile of 140 rebels is more interesting, since it shows that only 64 were farmers, 27 were labourers, and that the other 49 were mainly engaged in professional, commercial, or artisan pursuits. It would be useful if this were matched with the occupational profile of the region as a whole.

Given his limited data, Read is probably right to eschew systematic cross-tabulation. Still, his use of what he has is sometimes questionable. To test the sensible theory that the sixteen townships that produced rebels were worse hit by the Depression than their rebel-free neighbours, he looks for variation between the two sets of townships in their rate of growth of population in 1836-7 compared with 1831-6. I wonder whether anything short of fire, sword, or famine could have made a big difference in this indicator in one year. Agrarian populations are tenacious; they do not quit their land lightly. And Read does not say when his data for 1837 were compiled: was it a whole year after distress began?

Doubts also arise when Read discusses the rebels' motives. It seems redundant to speculate on why many captive rebels, in petitioning for mercy, claimed to have been misled by "wicked and designing men." (206) Surely it was an obvious plea to offer. Noting the hostility between American and British settlers, Read plausibly suggests that the "Yankee" rebels may have been inspired by anti-British and anti-colonialist sentiment; but he ignores the importance of the fact that most of the British immigration was recent. How far was the rising a reaction to a sudden and apparently unending flood of alien immigration, which threatened the old settlers with cultural engulfment? How far was it a response to hard times by established settlers who were more involved in market relations than the newcomers?

Read's neglect of such questions

reflects his narrow frame of reference. The literature on agrarian social structure, mentalité, and insurrection is vast. Read ignores it all, apart from two citations of *Captain Swing*. Had he known of it, he could hardly have called his useful little sketch of London District society an examination "in detail." Still less could he have dismissed the role of class conflict in the rising in a single paragraph. "Those whose livelihood did not directly depend on agriculture," he writes, "none the less understood that their prosperity depended on the fortunes of the farmer, a realization which militated against the development of classes and class-consciousness." (44) Later (72) he quotes a piece of class-conscious rhetoric from a newspaper without noticing that it contradicts his assumption of a non-class society.

Read's account of the political context is oddly old-fashioned. It takes little notice of the important revisions advanced over the last twenty years by Graeme Patterson and S.F. Wise, among others. Labels such as "Tory," "Moderate Reformer," and "Radical Reformer" abound as if in an unsubtle version of Aileen Dunham's sterling but dated monograph on *Political Unrest in Upper Canada*. Read contradicts the idea that Mackenzie was "the acknowledged leader of the Reformers," observing that "steadier and more moderate men, individuals such as Marshall Spring Bidwell, Dr. William Warren Baldwin and his son, Robert, had better claim to that honour." (7-8) Would it not be truer to say that there were several reform "constituencies," partly socially, partly regionally, partly ethno-culturally defined, and that Mackenzie was the chief spokesman of one of them? The capsule definition of responsible government offered on p. 8 is hardly state-of-the-art.

This, then, is a useful narrative of the western insurrection, but its analysis, interpretation, and contextualizing of the event are exiguous. The presentation is also deficient. Two or three errors of style

recur which competent copy-editing would have corrected; in the statistical tables, main and subtotals are presented in the same column; the nine appendices presenting the material for Read's quantitative analysis would have been more useful if presented in tabular form.

Paul Romney  
Toronto

Susan Jackel, ed., *A Flannel Shirt and Liberty: British Emigrant Gentlewomen in the Canadian West, 1880-1914* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press 1982).

HISTORICAL WRITING ON transatlantic migration to Canada has traditionally stressed the dispossessed, whose reasons for leaving home were simple and immediate. Deprivation and persecution caused an almost desperate search for alternatives among Irish peasants in the mid-nineteenth century and urban workers squeezed by business cycles and the ravages of industrialization. Most recently the pauper immigrant child has received considerable attention in such books as Joy Parr's *Labouring Children* and Kenneth Bagnell's *The Little Immigrants*.

As recent attitudes take a brief but significant shift to the right the upper levels of society have received attention as well. Not only are members of the social and economic elite portrayed less as exploiters and more as social and economic motivators, but their predecessors have also become the objects of considerable historical curiosity, Patrick Dunae's *Gentlemen Emigrants* being the best known recent work of this genre. While the reasons for the well-heeled to leave the "Old Country" may not have been as pressing as for the needy, nevertheless the search for social and economic improvement also lay behind their departure from a society which found increasing numbers of the well-bred and well-educated to be redundant. They aimed, like most other

migrants after 1890, for the Canadian west and, once established there, most of them managed to succeed at whatever they chose to do.

Less fortunate were their genteel sisters. Yet their prospects were worse because there was a surplus of women in nineteenth-century Britain due to wars, differing infant mortality rates, and excessive male out-migration. Hence respectable marriages were increasingly scarce and alternatives in the work force were meagre because they were educated but lacked the skill and disposition to meet the needs of industry. It is to this hitherto unpublicized problem group that Susan Jackel's *A Flannel Shirt and Liberty: British Emigrant Gentlewomen in the Canadian West, 1880-1914* is dedicated.

Since migration seemed to be the only reasonable solution for many women of genteel birth, a considerable literature appeared in the three decades before World War I designed to familiarize those considering this option with what to expect from and how to prepare for the empire across the sea. The high degree of literacy which these women shared has given Professor Jackel a wide and varied written legacy upon which to draw. The result is a good example of scholarly excerpting. Not only does Dr. Jackel expose the variety of contemporary comment on the subject of well-bred British spinsters and their efforts to adapt to, a new and often hostile environment, but she also skillfully weaves their recollections and commentaries with introductory comments which demonstrate both careful research on each contributor and an intimate comprehension of pre-war British and western Canadian social history.

The excerpts in the book are grouped to conform to the three main periods of western Canada's settlement and development before 1914. The earliest, which deals with settlement in Manitoba in the 1880s, is the shortest. Unfortunately, it is also the slimmest in content. A descriptive piece taken from Mary Georgina Hall's *A*

*Lady's Life on a Farm in Manitoba* conveys vividly the impact the frontier had on a sensitive woman, but is followed by a tedious, repetitive CPR questionnaire testifying to the opportunities for women that existed in the Canadian northwest. While Jessie Saxby's convincing argument for emigration as a potential benefit to both Britain and Canada ("Women Wanted") is more interesting, it does not salvage the section.

Part II, entitled "Doldrums: the 1890's," consists largely of a negative statement by one J.R.E.S. called "The English Ranchwoman," and Agnes Shire's rebuttal, "A Lady's Life on a Ranche." In essence these two women sum up the debate on the west at the time. The first writer measures the new world by what it lacked, the second by what it had to offer to those with initiative, resourcefulness, and imagination. By comparison, the final offering, Elizabeth Lewthwaite's "Women's Work in Western Canada," contains simple, pragmatic advice on what a woman could expect by way of amenities when she arrived on the prairies.

The last and the longest section, "The Wheat-Boom Years: 1905-1914" provides the reader with the greatest variety of selections both in source and substance. The reason is that between 1905 and World War I an emerging, insatiable popular press took it upon itself to create a myth of an imperial garden by unabashedly focusing upon the prairie west. Professor Jackel has selected some of the better material directed at genteel women out of the voluminous body of popular literature intended to entice almost the entire English population to emigrate.

Some of the pieces in this section are by women who experienced the farm first-hand, like Georgina Binnie-Clark, who purchased land and made it produce for several years. Her recollections, drawn from her extensive journalistic endeavours, demonstrate what single

women could accomplish despite the Canadian prohibition against them acquiring homesteads. A similar pride in accomplishment is repeated by Ella Sykes in a chapter from her book *A Home-Help in Canada*, and by Marion Cran from *A Woman in Canada*, among others.

While the rural way of life is still considered important in the third section, there is a decidedly urban orientation to the pieces selected. Now domestic service to farmers was not the only alternative because as prairie society matured it offered limitless opportunities for women who were quick (British women were considered slow as a rule), sensible, skilled, and ambitious to pursue careers as secretaries, phone operators, nurses, teachers, and milliners as well. Nevertheless, until the right situation presented itself they had to be prepared to start modestly as domestic servants or home-help if need be. They also had to remain adaptable and, like their rural counterparts, be willing to accept the levelling nature of Canadian society where there was little time for class-oriented conventions.

Unfortunately, the observations of journalists-turned-workers often do not ring true because the reader is aware that these women indulged in work simply to relate the highlights of their experiences. Most telling in this regard is Ella Sykes' complaint that her time spent as a clandestine home-help had been extremely difficult since "I had to work from morning till night without any time to cultivate my mind."

As a consequence, the earlier selections from writers who for one reason or another worked on farms appear to be more genuine. Here the reader feels the grinding monotony of prairie life and work as cooking, mending, cleaning, laundering, gardening, and tending poultry took their toll on women's spirits. Mary Hall, in "A Lady's Life on a Farm in Manitoba," for example, became obsessed with the need for clean linen as a sign of civility in the face of the primitive

conditions with which she had to contend. Nevertheless, there is also evident in many of them a growing admiration for the region and its prospects. Not only was there opportunity for work and self-improvement but also a certain informality, a freedom from restrictive conventions, and an enduring beauty in this harsh environment for those with the imagination to appreciate it. It is to these converts, the ones who saw the merits in both the flannel shirt and the liberty, rather than to the hucksters, that the region owes its debt and to whom this book is devoted.

W.J.C. Cherwinski  
Memorial University of Newfoundland

Grace Morris Craig, *But This is Our War* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press 1981).

GRACE MORRIS WAS BORN in the early 1890s and raised in an upper-middle-class family in Pembroke, Ontario. Her father was a successful civil engineer, and the Morris family was, without doubt, a part of Pembroke "society." Her two younger brothers, Ramsay (born in 1894) and Basil (born in 1896) were destined for professional careers; Grace herself had professional aspirations but in 1910, when she attempted to enter the University of Toronto's School of Architecture, she was discouraged from doing so on account of her sex. Unfortunately, Grace and her brothers belonged to the generation of young Canadians that had to come to grips with World War I and as so many others did, they took up the challenge with gusto in 1914, although subsequent events cast a long shadow over their entire lives. Mrs. Craig's memoir reveals with poignancy the tragic impact of the war on herself, her family, and her generation. She has skillfully woven her own reminiscences around and through a generous sampling of letters sent home from the front by her brothers, relatives, friends, and loved ones.

Mrs. Craig begins her story with the almost standard description of life during the few months immediately preceding the war. Perhaps because the ensuing events were so dramatic and tragic for those who experienced them, those last few months before August 1914 always seem to be remembered for their peace and serenity. For Grace Morris, this was certainly the case: life was idyllic — the summer was filled with socials, picnics, tennis, and young love, "the sun was shining and the world was at peace. . . ." (24)

When war was declared, Grace, her brothers, and friends reacted in a manner that was typical throughout most of English-speaking Canada — a sense of wonder at what was happening and impatience to get involved. At the time, Basil Morris was an undergraduate at the University of Toronto where he was studying civil engineering. He immediately joined the First Canadian Tunnelling Company and was posted overseas by the end of January 1916. As his letters home reveal, Basil's perception of the war as a great adventure was quickly dashed. As early as February 1916, he expresses the hope that "this old war will be over soon"; he wants all the news from home, but tells his father, "please do not write anything about the war. . . as I see enough of it. . ." (39, 47) The other Morris brother, Ramsay, joined the 38th Infantry Battalion and spent the first six months of the war in Bermuda, but in June 1916 he was transferred overseas. As a lieutenant in the infantry his task was both difficult and dangerous. Soon after arriving in France, Ramsay suffered a severe case of shell shock and temporarily lost his sight.

Life on the homefront for the people of Pembroke was also filled with demands because of the town's proximity to the Petawawa military camp. The social life of the town was completely transformed: the young men were gone but soldiers flocked into Pembroke for entertainment at open houses offered by many townspeople on weekends. It was in this milieu

that Grace Morris did her bit too. From the very beginning of the war, she threw herself into volunteer work as did so many other women. She organized teas, prepared hospital supplies, worked at the local canteen, and made up parcels of food and clothing for the men overseas.

When Ramsay was hospitalized in fall 1916, Grace and her mother made the perilous journey across the Atlantic to be with him. When he was released from hospital in December, Basil took leave from the Tunnellers and the four of them had a marvellous time for eight precious days. For Grace, the feverish activity in and around London was exhilarating but after a few months of being that close to the war, she became aware that the adventure and glamour of it all were illusory, and that war meant horrors and discomforts that seemed endlessly wretched.

Early in 1917, Basil resigned from the Tunnellers for the more attractive life of a member of the Royal Flying Corps. In spite of misgivings from his family he joined the 6th Squadron, RFC, full of enthusiasm and glad to be rid of the mud and trenches. But Basil's airborne career came to an abrupt end in March 1917: his plane was shot down and he was killed. The Morris family was stunned, the war had come to Pembroke, and especially for Grace, it was a rude reminder that the war was a terrible waste of young lives. Grace had also corresponded during the war with an officer in Basil's company, a Major Stuart Thorne. He survived the war, returned to Canada and he and Grace planned to marry. But suddenly, just prior to the wedding, Thorne died from complications arising from an earlier bout of trench fever. Grace was shattered again; first the war took her brother, and now it took her future.

*But This is Our War* is more than a collection of letters from the front. First, it is the story of the Morris family and how the Great War affected them, how it altered their lives. Second, it is a comment on the experience of an entire gener-

ation seen through the eyes of a perceptive and articulate woman. The war was the single most important event in Grace Morris's life, just as it was for so many others. In a sensitive and compelling manner, Grace and her correspondents speak for their generation.

This is a fine complementary book to Barbara Wilson's *Ontario and the First World War* and to other first-hand accounts such as Daphne Read's *The Great War and Canadian Society*. It tells us about the homefront and life in the trenches and it is above all else a touching commentary on the impact of World War I on the people and the society that experienced it. Viv Nelles provides a brief introduction and a list of suggested readings and the book includes a number of photographs from Mrs. Craig's personal collection.

Glenn T. Wright  
Public Archives of Canada

Elaine Bernard, *The Long Distance Feeling: A History of the Telecommunications Workers Union* (Vancouver: New Star Books 1982).

BRYAN PALMER. IN HIS well-known, somewhat contentious article reviewing Canadian labour historians, distinguished between the first generation of *union* historians who were primarily interested in the history of labour organizations, and the second generation of *social* historians whose preoccupation was not with unions and their leaders but with the workers, the workplace, and working-class culture. Though Palmer may have drawn the lines of demarcation too sharply while implying an intellectual superiority to the work of the second generation, there is merit in making this distinction between organizational and social history. It is also important to recognize, however, that they are both aspects of labour's response to the evolving face of industrial capitalism — different but related. The most intriguing question, of course, is what those relations are.



Until recently, little attention has been paid in labour studies to technology, not as it has affected the growth and decline of certain occupations and industries with the consequent cataclysmic effects on certain groups of workers and their organizations — both types of labour historians have readily dealt with this — but rather at the more subtle level of how technology affected the workplace and, consequently, the relations among workers within individual places of employment. Further, in assessing the impact of technology, the tendency has been to treat it as exogenous to labour-management relations, something that arrives from without, and not an integral element or management-controlled weapon in the struggle for the workplace.

This has, of course, changed markedly in recent years, in part the heritage of Braverman's classic, *Labor and Monopoly Capital*. Increasing attention has been directed at the skilled worker and the craft union in the early phases of industrialization when artisans fought, on balance unsuccessfully, the attempts by management to wrest control of the workplace from labour through the introduction of new technology and new forms of work organization. Braverman did not deal with the workers' collective response, for which he has been quite unjustly criticized since it was not his intent. Nevertheless, a whole new literature has appeared on the organizational response of labour to this form of technological warfare.

In this context, there have been few monograph-length studies in Canadian labour history. This makes the publication of *The Long Distance Feeling*, an historical study that attempts to integrate the history of technology, the workplace, and workers' struggles with the organizational history of the telephone workers employed by British Columbia Telephone, a welcome addition. Though the subtitle says it is a history of the Telecommunications Workers Union (TWU) it is, in fact,

much more than that. (The TWU was only officially founded in 1977, whereas its predecessor, the Federation of Telephone Workers dates from 1944 and the history of B.C. Telephone goes back to 1878, with periodic union organization to 1901.)

Bernard begins with the early origins of telegraphy and the coming of the telephone, its very rapid evolution, and the emergence of local, then regional, telephone systems. In B.C. the telephone appeared in the 1870s and by 1880 the first local company was established in Victoria. Within a decade companies were springing up on the mainland, but it was not long before the capital requirements and the technical characteristics of telephone systems resulted in the growth of monopoly capital organization. By 1901, B.C. Telephone had been established and had gained control of telephone companies on Vancouver Island, the mainland, and in the interior of the province. The transition to corporate capitalism was completed within two decades of the birth of the industry.

The transformation of the labour process was no less rapid. As in many of the new industries, child labour (young boys in this case) was initially used extensively because it was cheap. But very quickly the cost of the constant supervision necessary to maintain discipline induced management to switch to young, inexperienced, women operators who were more docile and willing to work harder though they received no more pay. From the 1890s, telephone operators became one of the major female job ghettos that resulted from the new technology.

The labour force that erected and repaired the lines and installed and maintained the equipment, however, was of a very different nature. Even here, though, there was a major market segregation. The linemen's work was heavy and dangerous but also irregular and it would appear that it was done, at least initially, by semi-skilled men often recruited from the telegraph industry. At the same time,

there were smaller numbers of permanent craft workers who installed and maintained the equipment or acted as cable splicers. Only somewhat later, as the demand for service increased and with it the size of the company, did a fourth labour group emerge, the clerical staff. In 1904 there were only two female office workers. By the late 1920s this number had grown to several dozen.

Unionization among the craft workers and linesmen came early in the form of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (IBEW). Founded in 1901-2, the IBEW was based, like many similar craft unions, on a combination of interest in mutual craft education, providing an employment agency, and mutual insurance in an unstable labour market. More surprising, in 1902, the women operators in Vancouver formed a sub-local of the IBEW.

The formation of a union and the growth of large-scale capital set the stage for a battle for control similar to that which swept North America with the advance of the second stage of the industrial revolution. While the telephone workers won the first skirmish in 1902, they were increasingly less successful, their demise culminating in the destruction of the unity of the work force after the general sympathy strike of 1919. Most important, evolving technology and management strategy split the craftsmen from the operators and clerical workers in what had become a familiar pattern of "divide and conquer." Indeed one of the most interesting facets of Bernard's account is the many ways in which management segmented the workers, rendering impotent or preventing organization among the operators, sugaring the pill with a coat of corporate paternalism.

Effective unionization did not return until World War II and the formation of the Federation of Telephone Workers in 1944. Even here, the segmentation of the union into three virtually independent units — traffic (operators), plant (craft),

and clerical — is indicative of the continuing success of management's strategy. However, once again technological change, automation of the exchanges, and speed-ups brought a new harmony of worker interests in the late 1950s and the 1960s as it had a half century earlier. The issue was layoffs and the intensification of work. In 1969 the workers struck B.C. Tel for the first time in half a century. Eleven years later the workers combined spontaneously to occupy B.C. Tel and take over management, albeit temporarily:

After a confrontation lasting 536 days, including a four-month selective strike, a seven-day occupation in Nanaimo, a five-day province-wide occupation of telephone exchanges, a one-day general strike in Nanaimo, and the intervention of the federal labour minister, the provincial leader of the opposition and half a dozen mediators, the telephone workers had concluded another collective agreement. (222)

Bernard's book also, of course, contains the usual chronicle of internal rifts and internecine union politics that is standard in labour histories, though she perhaps makes too little of the importance of male chauvinism and lack of concern by male trade unionists with women workers and women's issues, at least until quite recently. There is also very little attempt to relate the struggles of telephone workers with the wider issues of the working class and trade unions. Still, these are not serious criticisms within the context of the study's intent. As a study of the interaction of technology, conflict at the point of production, the labour process, and the organized response of workers, it is remarkably successful.

Paul Phillips  
University of Manitoba

Lewis H. Thomas, ed., *The Making of a Socialist: The Recollections of T.C. Douglas* (Edmonton: University of Alberta Press 1982).

THIS IS THE STORY of a man who has used his life to work with others toward

the creation of a better world for themselves and the future. In the process astonishing things have happened, particularly in the province of Saskatchewan where T.C. Douglas was Premier for seventeen years.

Based on a series of interviews in 1958 with political journalist Chris Higginbotham, the book is Tommy Douglas talking informally of events and impressions from his childhood (he was born in 1904) until three years before he left Saskatchewan, undefeated, to become the first leader of the New Democratic Party. The editor, Dr. Lewis H. Thomas, briefly fills in the gap since then, for Tommy Douglas, now retired from elective office, is still active in the Douglas-Coldwell Foundation and the New Democratic Party.

Most of the book is given over to the fascinating account of Douglas's major achievement — leadership in laying the foundations for a democratic socialist society in a Canadian province deep in the heart of capitalist America, thereby providing a pilot project from which the federal government has drawn concrete examples for social security and other Canada-wide legislation.

Space will not permit even the complete listing of these accomplishments among which were hospital insurance, medicare, protection for farmers against mortgage foreclosure, rural electrification, car insurance, wider educational opportunities for children in scattered communities, legislation to guarantee the rights of trade unions, and a host of other measures to improve the well-being of people.

It is significant that although Tommy Douglas realized from the outset the importance of developing new resources to supplement a wheat economy, he began with legislation to safeguard the health and security of the citizens of Saskatchewan. In the process he incurred the enmity of many powerful financial, commercial, and professional groups. But he managed

to keep public opinion on his side.

During his second term of office he initiated the creation of a broader economic base through the development of industries such as oil and potash, measures which helped to turn Saskatchewan from the drought-stricken province he found into one of the "have" provinces of today.

The magnitude of Douglas's achievement in Saskatchewan is amazing. Researchers in many fields will find this book a valuable source of reference, not only for this period but also for his earlier years in Ottawa as the member of parliament for Weyburn. From 1935 to 1944 — tumultuous years — he battled, first against depression conditions, then against the insidious drift to war, and finally against the shipment from Canada of scrap metal to the allies of Hitler. He remembers these years in vivid detail.

Many who have followed his public career closely will find their greatest interest in the earlier part of this book, his origins and youth. They will find some answers about the sources of his strength and of how he was able to inspire hope and confidence in the people of Saskatchewan to the point where they forgot their fears and worked with him consciously to create new thinking and new institutions. They will catch glimpses of the formation of his remarkable mixture of the visionary and the practical, his love of people, his boundless flow of energy, his irresistible sense of humour and, above all, his unswerving dedication to the ideals of Christianity and democratic socialism which for him were as one.

Tommy Douglas came from Scottish ancestry which included on both sides of the family those devoted not only to their own breadwinning, but also to community leadership. His father was an iron-moulder. Tommy speaks of his uncompromising integrity and his hatred of class distinction. He recalls his mother's love of good literature and her dramatic abilities. Of course the poetry and philosophy of

Robbie Burns were with him from his childhood. Constant reading and vigorous discussion augmented by a number of uncles sharpened his wit and knowledge.

The family emigrated to Canada twice, the first time just before World War I, the second just after it. In both cases they settled in North Winnipeg where, Tommy recalls, "I was tossed into the middle of what was a tower of Babel," the great mass of immigrants from Europe. He went regularly to All Peoples' Mission where J.S. Woodsworth directed many activities for the newcomers, young and old, and helped them become a part of the Canadian fabric. Tommy experienced the essential oneness of human beings and their needs. He also learned much about the makeup of western Canada.

In the period of unrest and readjustment at the end of the war which culminated in the Winnipeg General Strike, fourteen-year-old Tommy and several companions watched the parade on Bloody Saturday, saw the police charging the crowd, and witnessed the fatal shooting of one man. Says Tommy: "Certainly, as the years went by, the Winnipeg General Strike left a very lasting impression on me."

After a few temporary jobs Tommy became an apprentice printer and at sixteen was the youngest linotype operator in Canada. He had other interests, notably in boys' work and in the Baptist Church of which he was a member. Gradually he came to the decision that he wanted to become a Baptist minister. That led to six arduous years of training at Brandon College during which he supported himself precariously, partly by preaching assignments as a supply for the regular pastor. From this period dates his close friendship with Stanley Knowles, a fellow-student.

Following his ordination in 1930 Tommy married Irma Dempsey, a young woman from a nearby town who was interested in youth work. The couple became deeply involved in the many activities of Weyburn Baptist Church

where Tommy was the pastor.

From the beginning the Great Depression hung like a pall over everything. Weyburn was in one of the hardest-hit areas. From 1929 to 1938 the province faced a situation in which, as Tommy puts it, there was "no rain and no crop." The effect on families and individuals was devastating. The young folk could get no jobs and there was no money for education beyond high school. Suffering from their misery the pastor began to question: "Why did this society break down? What was wrong with it?" Yet he remembers: "At no time did I make a definite decision to go into politics."

That decision was precipitated by events. In fall 1931 he organized the unemployed. Farm organizations began to involve him in their efforts to get government action. Finally he wrote to J.S. Woodsworth, who had been his pastor in Winnipeg and was then a member of parliament. The result was that he was put in touch with Alderman M.J. Coldwell of Regina and that both men later addressed meetings in Weyburn. One thing led to another but Tommy says he "didn't think of politics at all" until 1934 when the Farmer-Labor Party was looking for a candidate for the provincial election. Nobody wanted to run. Tommy was persuaded. He ran and was defeated but came a good second.

Then came the search for a federal candidate to run in the election of 1935. Tommy was approached again. While he hesitated he was visited by the western superintendent of the Baptist Church who told him bluntly that if he ran again he would be struck off the church rolls and never get another pastorate. Tommy's hesitation was over. He replied: "You've just given the CCF a candidate." And with that challenge Tommy Douglas made the decision to use politics as his means of working toward a more just and more humane society.

Grace MacInnis  
Vancouver

Toby Gordon Ryan, *Stage Left: Canadian Theatre in the Thirties. A Memoir* (Toronto: CTR Publications 1981).

THE PUBLICATION DATA for this volume reveal many things. To begin, there is that triple-barrelled title. *Stage Left* is perhaps an overly cute phrase which combines a theatrical stage direction and a comment on the politics of the groups which Ryan describes.

The next part of the title denotes the nationality and the period of theatre to be examined. One might argue, however, that the phrasing here promises much more than it gives, for the vast majority of productions in the 1930s are not mentioned in this book. These were essentially bourgeois escapist pieces, most done by the burgeoning Little Theatres. On the other hand, earlier histories of Canadian theatre in the 1930s, such as Betty Lee's *Love and Whisky*, the history of the Dominion Drama Festival, went too far the other way. From them, one would get the impression that Canadian theatre wasn't so much love and whisky as it was milk and cookies. And certainly never the placards and banners which Ryan notes.

The third aspect is "a memoir." In most cases this would suggest very personal recollections by a famous participant in the activity being examined. This is usually done when the author has reached what might be called his or her "anecdote," and usually requires resurrection by an able ghost-writer.

The introduction, by the publisher Don Rubin, gives the impression that at least the "famous participant" applies. CTR stands for *Canadian Theatre Review*, the journal of professional theatre in Canada. CTR Publications was created to produce books on Canadian theatre which would not be published by a mainstream publisher. The whole operation is political in one sense, in that it is avowedly nationalist and its bias is towards the fringe or the avant-garde, both in its publication of works on contemporary theatre and its

examinations of Canadian theatre history.

But it is not political in the sense of being overtly socialist or even radical. The introduction notes that the book began when Rubin was making a series of interviews with Canadian theatrical pioneers. Of the names he notes, only three are exponents of this type of political theatre. One of these is George Luscombe, of Toronto Workshop Productions. The other two are Oscar and Toby Ryan.

I made reference above to "anecdote." This word most certainly does not apply to Toby Ryan. But it fails to apply for both positive and negative reasons. The positive is in Ryan's great personal skill as a researcher. She does not rely on vague memories which have sifted through the years. To her own recollections as an actress in the Theatre of Action, she adds a great number of documented references, often to newspaper reviews and articles from the period.

Still better, she shows great skill as an oral historian. With the aid of a Canada Council grant, Ryan interviewed a large number of people who had participated in radical theatre in the 1930s. Ryan herself had been involved in only Winnipeg and Toronto but she recognized the need to describe a larger picture and so also interviewed members of groups from Vancouver and Montreal.

Which perhaps begins to suggest the negative. Ryan is obviously concerned that this not become autobiography. In the few moments when her personal experience comes to the fore, as when she describes how she was given the lead in a Theatre of Action presentation, she seems apologetic. She wishes to avoid blowing her own horn, which is very strange for a memoir.

As is the absence of anecdotes. I don't know whether this reflects a conscious choice by Ryan or simply her lack of ability as a raconteur but there is none of those sprightly vignettes which fill up most examples of the genre. Admittedly, such portraits often approach egomania

but they can also be very entertaining. I am reminded of Lilli Palmer's encounter with the Duchess of Windsor in *Change Lobsters and Dance*.

Not that anecdotes must be limited to humour. The repression of *Eight Men Speak* when its first production was banned in Toronto in 1933 should be one of the more compelling episodes in Canadian theatre. My doctoral dissertation was an examination of Canadian drama from 1919 to 1939 and *Eight Men Speak* was easily the most interesting piece I read. Even if one were not attracted to its left-wing message, about the imprisonment of the Canadian Communist leader, Tim Buck, its use of Brechtian and collective theatrical devices was incredibly innovative for its period. Such things would not become common in Canada for more than 30 years. And yet Ryan's account lacks the edge which it should have. She includes interviews with various participants as well as reactions in the contemporary press but things never come alive. This is especially surprising given that her husband, Oscar, was one of the authors of the play.

The absence of vitality seems related to the absence of Toby Ryan's personality in the book, something which is quite possibly a political decision. The theatrical groups which she examines were ardently egalitarian in that 1930s way which always seems so naive today. People often talk of the simplicity of the campus radicals of the 1960s but there was a wide-eyed innocence in the North American reaction to Spain in the 1930s which far exceeded that to Vietnam in the 1960s.

Ryan's book often reflects this. She doesn't bring her own personality alive, nor those of her comrades, but there is always a hint of the glow they felt in their poverty, working collectively to bring out the art of the workers. A number of the interviews suggest the youthful vigour of the participants, as well as their political quandaries, such as the uneasiness some of the more bourgeois elements had in

their devotion to the working class. Then there are a few like Johnny Wayne and Frank Shuster. It's amazing to see it but they seemed to have almost no concern for the politics of the Theatre of Action: "You see, all we wanted to know was about acting. We wouldn't give you a nickel for class-consciousness, social things, alternative theatres."

Toby Ryan has given much more than a nickel for these things. She has given her life to them. But I don't think this book evokes that experience as well as it might. What it does do is a more than reasonable job of describing what happened in the radical theatre of the 1930s. When I was working on my dissertation I found this aspect of research the most difficult. Archival resources tended to be limited to perhaps a few issues of *Masses*, the radical arts magazine. A work like *Stage Left*, with its newspaper references and many interviews, would have made my job much easier. Everyone who is interested in radicalism in the 1930s or in the development of Canadian theatre should read this book. But there is a livelier version of the story that remains to be told.

Terry Goldie  
Memorial University of Newfoundland

Bernard Gauvin, *Les communistes et la question nationale au Québec. Sur le Parti communiste du Canada de 1921 à 1938* (Montréal: Les Presses de l'unité, 1981).

CE LIVRE, RÉDIGÉ À partir d'un mémoire de maîtrise, étudie la politique du Parti communiste du Canada concernant la question nationale canadienne-française pendant les dix-sept premières années de son existence. L'ouvrage, illustré de quelques photographies et d'un tableau, est bref. La thèse de l'auteur est que le PCC a adhéré au nationalisme bourgeois, et qu'il n'a pris conscience, par ailleurs, ni de l'existence de la nation canadienne-française, ni de son droit à l'autodétermi-

nation. En fait, même si le PCC proclame qu'il appuyait ces notions, il faisait tout pour les nier. Voilà comment il se trompe sur sa propre histoire. De plus, Gauvin suggère que le PCC était par dessus tout incapable de comprendre les Canadiens français, leur culture, leur moeurs ou leur histoire.

Les paramètres de l'ouvrage sont basés sur une division chronologique: 1921 à 1931, 1931 à 1934, 1934 à 1938. Avant de commencer, Gauvin discute, sans trop de vigueur, les théories de Lénine et de Staline sur la nation et le droit à l'autodétermination. Les théories de ce dernier s'appliquent au Québec, car ils admettent le droit d'un peuple à sa langue maternelle dans une nation "centrée mais pas fédérée" dont ils peuvent se retirer pour établir leur propre nation. Les communistes canadiens suivaient-ils cette ligne? Pas du tout. Pendant la décennie qui a suivi la fondation du PCC, et dès l'instant où ils ont abordé la question nationale, ils se sont préoccupés de la grande nation canadienne et de son indépendance de l'Empire britannique. Ils n'ont abordé la question que de cette façon et ils ont mal compris la situation canadienne où ils croyaient que la bourgeoisie canadienne serait le fer de lance contre les Britanniques. En outre, le PCC a connu des problèmes internes qui ont débouché sur une scission et un changement de chef. Après quoi, le PCC a commencé une valse hésitation qui a duré des débuts de la grande crise économique jusqu'en 1934, en tentant d'attirer au parti les Canadiens français qui n'étaient pas nombreux dans ses rangs. Dans ce but, ils publièrent le journal *l'Ouvrier Canadien* qui, pour plusieurs raisons, n'eut pas de succès. Toutefois, la réussite ou l'échec de ce journal n'aurait rien changé, car le PCC ne pouvait pas dialoguer avec les Canadiens français. Quand il leur parlait, c'était toujours en référence à la grande nation canadienne, sauf une fois où le PCC suggéra que les Canadiens français forment une nation sans leur accorder le droit

à l'autodétermination. Pire encore, les dirigeants du PCC répétaient les mythes traditionnels sur les Canadiens français: régressifs, analphabètes et dans le giron de l'Église. Pour le parti, les exploités anglais n'existaient pas. Avec justesse, Gauvin les critique pour leur myopie. La dernière partie est consacrée à la façon dont le PCC, en pleine guerre contre les fascistes et le gouvernement Duplessis, désavouait l'existence de la nation canadienne. Les communistes canadiens ne pouvaient accepter l'idée d'une nation canadienne-française, et, à plus forte raison, son droit à l'autodétermination. Ils ne se sont donc pas rendu compte qu'en prenant cette position, ils évitaient "la question nationale... le dernier château-fort du nationalisme bourgeois." Voilà ce qui a rendu les Canadiens français réfractaires au PCC.

En dépit de cette interprétation intéressante, l'étude présente encore quelques problèmes. Le plus important est celui remarqué par Robert Comeau dans le préface: l'ouvrage néglige "l'analyse des positions de Staline et des directives de la 3<sup>e</sup> Internationale." Les auteurs ne les ayant pas consultées, il leur est difficile de savoir si le PCC a pris telle ou telle position seul ou s'il a suivi aveuglement les directives soviétiques? C'est possible, même probable, que l'URSS ait orienté ces politiques. La question aurait pu être solutionnée en consultant les documents de Jane Degras, éd., *The Communist International 1919-1943*, Vol. III, ou les biographies de Staline qui sont nombreuses. En outre, pourquoi Gauvin n'a-t-il pas tenté de recueillir les témoignages de militants vivant au Québec ou ailleurs? Il y a aussi le problème que comporte l'analyse des seules déclarations publiques? Reflètent-elles la vérité ou sont-elles de la propagande? Il faut savoir distinguer entre les deux. L'auteur qui aurait pu appuyer sa thèse sur les ouvrages mentionnés plus haut, a également oublié de consulter d'autres livres importants tels que W. Rodney, *Soldiers of the Interna-*

tional, *A History of the Communist Party of Canada, 1919-1929* et M. Fournier, *Communistes et Anticomunisme au Québec (1920-1950)*. À une autre niveau, Gauvin n'est pas juste envers le PCC; il l'accuse d'"opportunisme" et il a sans doute raison, sauf que tous les partis politiques font de même; pourquoi exiger davantage du parti communiste? Néanmoins, le livre nous renseigne sur le PCC et il corrige les assertions du parti lors ou elles contredisent sa propre histoire.

F.J.K. Griezec  
Carleton University

Jacques Rouillard, *Histoire de la CSN, 1921-1981* (Montréal: Confédération des Syndicats Nationaux et Éditions du Boréal Express 1981).

AT LONG LAST Canadian labour historians and students of French-Canadian history have at their disposal a general survey of the origins and evolution of the Confédération des travailleurs catholiques du Canada. When, in 1960, the CTCC was renamed the Confédération des Syndicats Nationaux (CSN) this was merely a belated affirmation of a process which had started in 1943. Jacques Rouillard, labour historian at l'Université de Montréal and author of the award-winning *Les Syndicats Nationaux du Québec de 1900 à 1930* (1979), accepted the challenge presented to him by the CSN executive to complete, in a relatively short time frame, a survey history of the CSN to commemorate the movement's 60th anniversary. While the text was reviewed by a CSN committee the final product cannot, in any sense of the term, be construed as an official history. Even a superficial reading of the text reveals that the author was allowed full interpretive freedom. As CSN president Norbert Rodrigue indicates in his preface, he and his colleagues turned to Rouillard because they found the revisionist thesis presented in his *Les Syn-*

*dicats Nationaux du Québec* to be a balanced and accurate assessment of the origins and development of the Catholic labour movement in Quebec. They liked his contention that the CTCC was not merely "l'instrument docile de la hiérarchie catholique pour assurer les luttes ouvrières et instaurer un idéologie de collaboration entre la classe patronale et la classe ouvrière," (2) but that the CTCC had roots also in the non-confessional national unions, an influence which led some of its locals and federations to adopt collective bargaining strategy and tactics remarkably similar to those of the international unions. Rodrigue perceives Rouillard's interpretation to be a scientific confirmation of what had always been an integral element of the CSN's oral historical tradition. The only constraint laid down by the CSN committee, it appears, was that Rouillard be as comprehensive as possible since the text was intended primarily for CSN members as an educational tool. In short, all the various components of the CSN had to be acknowledged. As a result there is considerable descriptive and non-analytical coverage of the CSN's numerous professional federations and central councils. Unfortunately there has been insufficient research in these areas to allow the author to draw any enlightening conclusions as to their importance to the overall development of the CSN. The space could have been used more profitably to provide a broader socio-economic context in which to place the CSN, especially the more important strikes.

This survey is organized into five chronological chapters with ample illustrations and a small selection of documents to highlight the central arguments in each section. Chapter one on the origins of Catholic unionism, 1900-1920, draws heavily upon Rouillard's early work thereby laying the groundwork for his revisionist interpretation of the CTCC in the 1920s and 1930s. Rouillard demonstrates quite convincingly that the Catholic union movement only became



viable after World War I when it joined forces with the remnants of the non-confessional national unions. In doing so the Catholic unions moved away from their exclusive concentration on the ideology of social Catholicism and began to perceive of themselves first and foremost as defenders and promoters of the professional and socio-economic interests of their members. The national unions, contends Rouillard, "ont apporté à la CTCC leur forte conscience syndicale et leur tradition de combativité." (48)

Chapter two, entitled "La CTCC en difficulté (1921-1934)" deals with the trials and tribulations of the movement struggling to compete with the powerful internationals, especially difficult during the recession of 1921-23 and then the Depression of the 1930s. The CTCC responded to the situation, contends Rouillard, by stressing its pan-Canadian nationalism and by adopting the same organizational structures and bargaining strategies and tactics, including recourse to the closed shops and strikes, as the internationals. In the 1920s Catholic unions organized 32 strikes, including the Quebec City shoe workers strike of 1926 which was the most important labour conflict in the province up to that point in time. As a result, concludes Rouillard, "il s'est ainsi établi un désaccord entre les pratiques syndicales de la centrale et le discours qui restait entaché de l'idéalisme de la doctrine sociale de l'Église." (102) Nevertheless, the CTCC could not wander too far from its stated commitment to social Catholicism because the Catholic Church provided the movement with approximately \$20,000 annually in direct aid, not counting considerable amounts of indirect support.

The decade extending from 1934 to 1945 was an era of expansion for the CTCC under the leadership of Alfred Charpentier. The CTCC grew from 121 locals with 15,587 members in 1931 to 338 locals with 62,960 members in 1946.

Rouillard argues that the CTCC owed its growing success to three factors.

The movement had a fairly flexible infrastructure especially at the federation level. As a result the CTCC was able and willing to incorporate the rapidly expanding industrial unions, especially in the clothing/textile, pulp and paper, and metallurgy industries. The CTCC, unlike the internationals, was well established outside of the metropolitan Montreal region, and was able to capitalize on this factor since much of the industrial expansion took place in Quebec's smaller urban centres and resource communities. Finally, although there exists little evidence to support his claim, Rouillard maintains that the 1934 "loi d'extension juridique des conventions collective," which allowed the provincial government to apply a collective agreement arrived at by one local in an industry to the entire industry, encouraged many employees to join a union so that they could participate in the negotiation process.

In fact, as Rouillard mentions somewhat later, Duplessis amended the 1934 law in 1937 to allow the provincial government "d'abroger ou de modifier un décret sans consulter les parties à la convention." (134) From then on the CTCC's relations with Duplessis and the Union Nationale were all downhill. This would account, in part, for the growing militancy of the Catholic labour movement. The gap between ideology and practice accentuated during this decade as the CTCC gave its official sanction to the ideology of social corporatism being articulated by the Jesuits and lay Catholics in the École Sociale Populaire. The ideology's fascist overtones and the growing secularization of Quebec society would eventually bring the CTCC to abandon its commitment to social corporatism and advocate a more secular and liberal ideology, namely that of industrial democracy.

Consistent with his thesis Rouillard argues in chapter four that the most signif-

icant development in the CTCC during the decade and a half after World War II was not in the area of practice but rather in the movement's ideological outlook. Concurrent with its decision to abandon social corporatism, the CTCC's new leaders, Gérard Picard as president and Jean Marchand as secretary-general, stressed the reform of the workplace through such measures as co-management, co-ownership, profit-sharing and improved industrial hygiene. In short, all workers regardless of their race, colour or creed were to have a greater input into all the decisions affecting their lives and this input was to begin on the shop floor.

This commitment to liberal democracy accentuated the secularization process of the CTCC which had begun in 1943 when non-Catholics were admitted as full members with all the rights and privileges of Catholics. In 1960, the movement renamed itself the Confédération des Syndicats Nationaux (CSN) and dropped all references to the social doctrine of the Church. The CTCC also undertook affiliation talks with the newly-formed Canadian Labour Congress but these foundered not because of the divergence in union ideology but for nationalist reasons. Pan-Canadian nationalists in the CLC wanted to integrate and eventually assimilate the CTCC union central and its locals. Growing numbers of Québécois neonationalists in the CTCC saw their organization as a their organization as a powerful institution in the struggle to preserve and develop a modern secular French-Canadian majority society in Quebec.

Again, being consistent with his thesis, Rouillard does not see the Asbestos strike of 1949 as a major watershed in the history of contemporary Quebec. He does nevertheless admit that the strike did have certain unique features which made it an important conflict in the CTCC's history. Its demand for a degree of co-management, whether voluntary or compulsory, was certainly a radical departure from its past and constituted a serious

challenge to industrial capitalism. Second, the strike had a political dimension aimed at undermining the reactionary anti-union proposed labour code of the Duplessis government. The Church's decision to back the strikers created a serious rift between the Church and the state and changed forever the dynamic of labour management relations in Quebec. Henceforth the government would or could no longer rely upon the Church to exert a moderating/mediating influence on organized labour. This became quite evident in Louiseville (1952), Dupuis Frères (1952), Arvida (1957), and Radio-Canada (1959) strikes. Only a close scrutiny of Church-state correspondence in the 1940s and 1950s will reveal the true import of the Asbestos strike.

The book's final chapter, "Vers un nouveau projet de société (1961-1981)" is perhaps the most disappointing. The author simply has too much to cover in too little space. The CSN had, in 1981, nearly 1,500 locals and approximately 225,000 members, with the public and para-public unions constituting 56.3 per cent of the membership while blue-collar trade and industry workers made up the rest. Under the leadership of Marcel Pépín, president from 1965 to 1976, the CSN "définit, en effet, son nouveau projet de société par le socialisme; elle caractérise son action dans les entreprises comme un syndicalisme de combat, et elle s'est reprochée du nationalisme québécois." (227) Given the CSN's strong commitment to a radical change of the existing political and economic system it was little wonder that the movement, with the support of the militant teachers' union and the FTQ, planned and carried out the 1972 Common Front strike, a form of direct action to obtain job security and a minimum weekly salary of \$100 for public employees. As is normally the case in such circumstances the results were both positive and negative. Once forced to return to the negotiating table many of the unions involved obtained solid financial settlements and

improvements to job security clauses. The CSN's decision to defy the government's emergency legislation suspending the worker's right to strike brought to light serious ideological divisions within the movement. Three members of the executive refused to defy Bill 19 and resigned, taking with them nearly 70,000 members. About half of these members formed a new central, the Centrale des syndicats démocratiques (CSD). The vast majority of CSD members were from private sector industry and trade unions. "Les dissidents," according to Rouillard, "ont reproché à la CSN de ne pas refléter l'opinion de ses membres, d'être contrôlée par un groupe d'intellectuels activistes, de se livrer à l'action politique partisane au détriment de l'action syndicale et de proposer une idéologie marxiste ou 'le moteur de son action est la lutte des classes.'" (239) In short, the CSN's utopian Marxist vision and its active support for the separatist-oriented Parti Québécois had driven the liberal elements from the movement and provided a further manifestation of the growing polarization of Quebec society. Given the crucial role of neo-nationalism in contemporary Quebec it is surprising that Rouillard devotes only three paragraphs to the question of the CSN's perception of the national question and its role in the PQ's achievement of power in 1976 and subsequent re-election in 1981. The nature of the PQ and its power base is presently a hotly debated topic and the reader is left with the feeling that the full story of the CSN's recent past has been left untold.

Rouillard's *Histoire de la CSN, 1921-1981* is thus a highly readable and informative survey of one of Quebec's important socio-economic institutions. The CSN has contributed immensely to making the transition from a rural/clerical to an urban/industrial society less traumatic and more humane for hundreds of thousands of French-Canadians. In so doing, to use the words of Rouillard, "les travailleurs ont acquis un certain poids

dans notre histoire." (307) This text does full justice to that contribution.

Michael D. Behiels  
Acadia University

Benoît-Beaudry Gourd, *Mines et syndicats en Abitibi-Témiscamingue 1910-1950*, Cahiers du Département d'Histoire et de Géographie, travaux de recherches, no. 2, (Rouyn: Collège du Nord-Ouest 1981).

LA CRÉATION DES CEGEP et des campus de l'Université du Québec ont suscité un intérêt nouveau pour l'histoire régionale. Des équipes de recherche ont été mises sur pied dans la plupart des régions de la province. Elle commencent à produire des travaux de qualité, tel ce cahier de Benoît-Beaudry Gourd sur les mines et les syndicats en Abitibi-Témiscamingue. L'auteur est un enseignant au Collège du Nord-Ouest à Rouyn et sa recherche est publiée par le département d'histoire et de géographie du collège. Ce département qui montre beaucoup de dynamisme possède déjà à son actif la parution de plusieurs travaux d'histoire régionale.

Ce cahier consacré au développement minier et à la syndicalisation des mineurs est très bien fait: le texte s'avère bien charpenté et la présentation claire. Même s'il s'agit d'un survol rapide de 40 ans d'histoire, le lecteur possède les éléments essentiels à la compréhension du développement minier et syndical de la région. L'auteur se penche d'abord sur le contexte économique entourant l'activité minière, puis il s'attarde aux travailleurs en décrivant leurs efforts de syndicalisation.

Le développement minier de l'Abitibi-Témiscamingue s'est fait dans le prolongement de celui du Nord ontarien de sorte que pendant la période étudiée la région a davantage de liens avec Sudbury et Toronto qu'avec Mont-Laurier et Montréal. Ce sont des compagnies ontariennes qui mettent en exploitation les gisements miniers de la région et les communications s'avèrent

pendant longtemps meilleures vers l'Ontario que vers Montréal. Ainsi, la route qui relie Val d'Or à Mont-Laurier n'est parachevée qu'en 1939.

Au début, la main-d'oeuvre qui provient largement du Nord de l'Ontario se compose surtout d'anglophones et d'immigrants européens. Leur présence demeurera très forte parmi les travailleurs jusqu'aux années cinquante. Ils introduisent le syndicalisme dans la région et maintiennent des liens étroits avec les syndicats de mineurs du Nord de l'Ontario.

Trois vagues de syndicalisation touchent le Nord-Ouest québécois: les syndicats communistes dans les années trente qui disparaissent pendant la guerre; les "Mine-Mill" en 1944 qui sont victimes de l'antisyndicalisme et de la chasse aux communistes des compagnies et du gouvernement; et les Métallos qui prennent leur place en 1951. Contrairement à d'autres régions du Canada, il n'y a pas eu au Québec de conflits entre les "Mine-Mill" et les Métallos car les "Mine-Mill" avaient déjà quitté le Nord-Ouest québécois en 1950 pour se replier sur Sudbury.

L'étude met en relief certains faits intéressants qui conduiront à nuancer ou à confirmer certaines affirmations sur le syndicalisme québécois. Comme à plusieurs endroits de la province, les militants communistes ont joué un rôle actif dans les campagnes de syndicalisation des années trente et quarante; l'intervention du gouvernement fédéral dans les relations de travail pendant la guerre incite les compagnies à reconnaître les syndicats; et la compagnie Noranda Mines qui oppose une farouche résistance au principe de la retenue syndicale en 1945 et lors de la grève de 1947 amorce une longue histoire d'antisyndicalisme.

Le lecteur aimerait parfois que certains thèmes du cahier soient développés plus abondamment. Mais il faut comprendre que l'étude n'est qu'un survol rapide et qu'il appartient à d'autres de poursuivre la recherche sur des questions particulières. Les chercheurs sur l'Abitibi-

Témiscamingue et sur le syndicalisme minier doivent néanmoins s'estimer chanceux de pouvoir compter sur un travail de base aussi sérieux.

Jacques Rouillard  
Université de Montréal

Jean Boivin et Jacques Guilbault, *Les relations patronales-syndicales au Québec* (Chicoutimi: Gaëtan Morin, éditeur, 1982).

C'EST PEUT-ÊTRE un hasard mais au moment même où je m'apprêtais à rédiger les premières lignes de cette recension, mon fils m'aprit qu'il comptait prendre un cours en relations de travail dans le cadre de sa dernière session de CEGEP avant de s'inscrire à l'université en sciences politiques.

Instinctivement, je lui ai recommandé de lire *Les relations patronales-syndicales au Québec*, que viennent de publier conjointement Jean Boivin et Jacques Guilbault.

Dans un sens, c'est une preuve que j'accorde une valeur certaine à cet ouvrage. Mais de l'autre côté, cela traduit également le malaise que j'ai eu à tenter de le lire en entier. *Les relations patronales-syndicales au Québec*, en effet, constitue davantage un ouvrage de référence, un ouvrage de vulgarisation pour quelqu'un désireux d'apprendre rapidement, sans suivre un cours spécialisé en relations industrielles, qu'un ouvrage littéraire ou socio-politique.

Bref, il s'agit davantage d'un ouvrage qu'on lit parce qu'il peut nous être utile, que parce qu'il est intéressant. C'est sans doute pourquoi, pour dire vrai, que j'ai passé par-dessus des pages entières qui, en autant que j'étais concerné, tenaient davantage des "notes de cours" que d'une thèse à défendre ou d'une opinion exprimée.

Je ne serais toutefois pas surpris que tel soit justement le but recherché par l'éditeur Gaëtan Morin, de Chicoutimi,

lequel, paraît-il, se spécialise dans l'édition d'ouvrages de référence du genre, qu'on me dit très bien faits.

Il faut dire cependant que le mariage entre Jean Boivin et Jacques Guilbault m'a paru curieux.

Je connais bien Jean Boivin. C'est un universitaire, professeur de relations industrielles à l'Université Laval depuis dix ans, ancien directeur du département du même nom, auteur de nombreux articles sur la négociation du secteur public et qui s'intéresse beaucoup à l'histoire et aux structures syndicales, à la négociation collective et aux systèmes de relations industrielles. Dans le duo, c'est évidemment le théoricien.

Jacques Guilbault, lui, est le praticien. Je ne le connais guère, sauf de réputation. Il fut pendant quinze ans (1966 à 1981), directeur des relations industrielles à la Commission de transport de la communauté urbaine de Montréal (CTCUM).

Je n'ai nullement l'intention de lui en faire le reproche, mais le moins que l'on puisse dire, c'est que son règne fut fort mouvementé, que son approche fut très contestée. Encore qu'il est bien possible qu'elle lui ait été imposée par les dirigeants politiques de la Communauté urbaine de Montréal qui contrôlent la CTCUM.

De toute façon, le transport en commun à Montréal, pendant ces quinze ans, fut perturbé par des arrêts de travail plus souvent qu'à son tour. En conséquence, la CTCUM peut difficilement être citée comme un exemple de relations de travail harmonieuses. Ceci dit, j'avoue que personne d'autre, face aux mêmes syndicats, n'aurait peut-être fait mieux, comme le signale le rapport de l'enquêteur Bastien nommé, en 1982, par le gouvernement du Québec pour faire la lumière sur les raisons du pourrissement des relations de travail à la CTCUM depuis environ vingt ans.

M. Guilbault et M. Boivin font donc un curieux mariage. Je dis curieux car je n'aurais pas imaginé deux hommes extérieurement si différents mettre ensemble

leur expérience pour rédiger conjointement un livre. J'ignore si l'idée est de l'un d'eux, des deux, ou de l'éditeur.

Quoiqu'il en soit, cela donne un ouvrage davantage utile qu'intéressant.

Pour atténuer mes propos, je serais peut-être prêt à dire non seulement utile mais nécessaire, du moins à tous ceux qui n'ont pas le temps d'aller poursuivre des études universitaires en relations de travail mais qui, soit pour leur formation personnelle, soit dans le cadre de leur travail, soit encore dans le cadre d'un cours optionnel au CEGEP, ont besoin, rapidement, de faire le tour de la question.

En effet, à ma connaissance, il n'existe rien de tel, du moins rien de tel aussi bien fait, au Québec. Il s'agit donc d'un ouvrage de vulgarisation très bien rédigé.

Mais un ouvrage peut être utile, peut être essentiel, sans être pour autant un ouvrage littéraire. Qu'on pense aux manuels utilisés en génie, par exemple, ou en comptabilité. L'ouvrage de MM. Boivin et Guilbault est un peu de ce type. Je dirais même qu'il fait manuel scolaire, un manuel scolaire pour gens de niveau collégial à tout le moins, cependant.

Seuls les chapitres trois et quatre, traitant le premier des grandes étapes de l'évolution du mouvement syndical québécois et le deuxième des structures et idéologie des organisations syndicales et patronales sont de l'ordre de ceux généralement recensés dans une revue comme celle-ci.

Probablement rédigés par Boivin, ils sont fort intéressants, bien faits, et résument mieux que les ouvrages récents de sociologues, historiens ou politiciens que j'ai lus, ces deux thèmes.

J'aime bien par exemple cette remarque où l'on dit que même si la FTQ, pendant un certain temps, avait épousé partiellement le langage idéologique de la CSN et de la CEQ, "l'élection du gouvernement du Parti québécois démontra hors de tout doute que la FTQ était loin d'avoir des visées radicales sur le plan socio-

politique. Le discours actuel de la FTQ se situe dans la même perspective que la social-démocratie vers laquelle tend le PQ, même si formellement aucun lien d'affiliation ne réunit ces deux organisations."

On peut y lire aussi au sujet des initiatives intéressantes que lance la Centrale des syndicats démocratiques (CSD) depuis quelque temps que cette position est peut-être commandée par la stricte nécessité de survie, qui sait? Mais que peut-être également l'avenir nous révélera-t-il que la CSD, en agissant ainsi et en se démarquant du syndicalisme plus traditionnel des autres centrales, aura fait preuve, en mettant l'accent davantage que ses rivales sur la qualité de vie au travail, d'une grande clairvoyance.

Ceci étant dit, les chapitres en question n'occupent que 85 pages dans un ouvrage qui en compte 300.

Lequel, j'ai bien l'impression, sera davantage utile à mon fils qu'à moi.

Pierre J.G. Vennat  
Chroniqueur politique à *La Presse*

François Demers, *Chroniques impertinentes (du 3ème Front commun syndical)* (Montréal: Nouvelle Optique 1982).

BIEN ÉCRIT ET TRÈS informé (François Demers était le journaliste attiré du comité de négociation de la CSN lors du 3ème Front commun) les *Chroniques impertinentes*<sup>1</sup> constitue un important ouvrage de consultation pour quiconque veut réfléchir sur le syndicalisme des travailleurs de l'État durant la dernière décennie.

L'auteur, avec honnêteté et modestie, définit dans sa préface la portée et les limites de son point de vue descriptif et critique. Dans le corps de l'ouvrage, il dévoile avec une impudeur moqueuse et provocante les manques, les travers, les ambivalences et les contradictions du

mouvement syndical. Puis il conclut son exposé par un appel à la recherche d'un modèle alternatif.

Qu'un renouvellement de la stratégie et de la problématique syndicales soit indispensable, que cette renaissance exige un regard froid, lucide et distancié sur le syndicalisme que nous avons vécu depuis la crise d'octobre, voilà une approche à laquelle je souscris entièrement et dont la nécessité, démontrée encore par l'expérience du dernier Front commun, devrait s'imposer à tout syndicaliste. Malgré cette concordance avec les positions de François Demers, la lecture de son livre m'a plongé dans un profond malaise. Une seconde lecture, aussi attentive mais sans doute plus analytique, m'a permis de sortir de cet embarras en me révélant ce qui l'avait suscité.

François Demers est, dit-il, "désabusé" et "cynique": les actions humaines ne seraient mues que par "des intérêts étroits et des calculs mesquins" alors qu'il aspire incurablement à une société égalitaire, à salaire unique, qui serait le fruit "d'une qualité morale et d'une lucidité politique exceptionnelle des acteurs." Cette vision a la cohérence du manichéisme: face à l'espoir céleste et béat de l'auteur, toute réalité humaine ne peut être que basse, vile, bestiale.

Je ne mentionnerais pas la morale de l'auteur, aussi naïve soit-elle, "vestige," comme il le dit, de son éducation "d'avant 1960," si elle n'avait des effets non innocents sur ses analyses. Car que reproche Demers aux revendications égalitaristes des Fronts communs? D'être le fruit de compromis entre différents groupes de syndiqués, de correspondre à leurs intérêts, de s'inscrire dans une vision stratégique où l'appui de l'opinion publique est sollicité, ... comme si les luttes pour la réduction des écarts de salaire, les hausses de salaire minimum et l'égalité entre les hommes et les femmes ne devraient pas correspondre aux intérêts des travailleurs en lutte et s'inscrire au sein d'un rapport de forces très concret.

<sup>1</sup> *Nouvelle Optique*, 1982, 170 p.

Evidemment, les gains syndicaux sont fort éloignés du salaire unique prôné par Demers, objectif que n'a d'ailleurs jamais partagé le mouvement syndical. Mais il faut se souvenir de l'immense travail accompli au début des années '70 pour amener les syndiqués des trois Centrales, habitués jusque là à militer dans une perspective strictement locale, non seulement à penser leurs propres intérêts à travers ceux de l'ensemble des syndiqués de l'État, mais aussi à les intégrer à une politique salariale progressiste pour comprendre que s'est joué là un changement majeur, une transformation qualitative de la pratique syndicale. La scission de la CSD — et non son expulsion, comme le dit *erronément* l'auteur — n'est que le symptôme de ce bouleversement: des syndiqués du secteur privé, surtout parmi les plus démunis, résignés à leur exploitation, soumis au capitalisme et à ses maux, et habitués à déléguer leurs pouvoirs à l'appareil syndical suivirent leurs permanents et dirigeants qui, au nom de la tradition, se dissocièrent du discours progressiste et de la pratique contestatrice des nouveaux militants.

Avant les années '70, l'objectif de réduction des écarts salariaux était pratiquement absent des préoccupations syndicales, y compris parmi ceux qui fonderont la CSD. Et ce n'est évidemment pas le patronat toujours partisan du "au plus fort la poche," ni les gouvernements, ni les partis politique, ni les fabricants d'opinion qui ont imposé comme débat public une politique salariale progressiste. Si nous pouvons aujourd'hui nous disputer sur les retombées de la politique salariale du mouvement syndical, discuter de la plus ou moins grande réduction des discriminations et des écarts salariaux et questionner les effets des gains des syndiqués de l'État sur ceux du secteur privé c'est, qu'au préalable, les syndiqués des Fronts communs ont pris l'initiative et ont eu la capacité de poser comme enjeu social une politique de réduction des disparités de revenus.

Que la politique salariale ait été établie en dépassant dans une unité supérieure les intérêts corporatistes de chaque secteur et de chaque profession, que cette politique corresponde aux intérêts des travailleurs impliqués, tout cela m'apparaît normal et sain. Pourtant François Demers s'en désole au nom d'une éthique du sacrifice datant d'avant la révolution tranquille. On ne peut comprendre les gens de ma génération si on méconnaît la morale masochiste dont on nous a abreuvée durant notre enfance comme on ne peut comprendre un québécois si on ignore l'hiver. Mais j'aurais espéré que Demers dépasse cette morale d'antan. Car si on doit aimer les autres comme soi-même, il faut, au préalable, pour que ce précepte puisse fonctionner, s'aimer soi-même. Le don, la générosité, sauf s'ils s'inscrivent au sein d'une martyrologie, impliquent toujours un certain calcul où le soi se retrouve dans l'autre.

François Demers juge très sévèrement les résultats des Fronts communs à la lumière du projet social qui les animait. Je ne questionne pas l'utilité d'une telle approche, mais sa partialité. Car ce projet et son actualisation doivent être inscrits dans le temps et comparés à la réalité qui les précédait si on veut les évaluer historiquement, ce que néglige notre téléologique auteur.

Ainsi Demers a raison d'affirmer que, dans certains syndicats, les conseils syndicaux se sont coupés de leur base par un radicalisme tout azimut. Mais même dans ces syndicats subsistait toujours au sein des conseils une tendance minoritaire qui pouvait s'opposer au groupe dominant et espérer la renverser grâce à l'Assemblée générale: ce qu'elle a d'ailleurs fréquemment réussi. Le conseil syndical, en élargissant la participation des membres, en favorisant un plus grand accès à l'information et en diffusant le pouvoir, a accru la démocratie syndicale. Or l'auteur, qui privilégie la structure syndicale traditionnelle, oublie qu'elle était formée d'un exécutif étroit, dépositaire du savoir-faire

et le plus souvent homogène, exécutif qui recevait ses mandats d'une Assemblée générale qu'il arrivait à peine à réunir. Cette structure n'est sûrement pas plus démocratique que la structure syndicale à double paliers où l'exécutif, entre les assemblées générales, est contrôlé par les délégués des divers départements ou disciplines: le conseil syndical.

Ainsi, Demers — qui était conseiller à l'information de Marcel Gilbert, négociateur en chef de la CSN lors du 3ème Front commun — oppose le "Ça" revendicatif et débridé des militants au "Surmoi" répressif et rationnel des négociateurs. Ce conflit réel, symptôme d'un discours qui n'arrive plus à unifier ces deux moments de l'action syndicale, s'il est bien perçu par l'auteur, même si c'est en valorisant le "surmoi" au détriment du "ça," l'empêche de voir et de reconnaître les changements bénéfiques qu'ont apporté les Fronts communs par rapport à la pratique syndicale antérieure. Car la différence entre mobilisation et négociation traverse, sous des noms différents, l'ensemble de l'histoire syndicale: elle est indépassable comme celle qui lie et oppose projet et réalisation. Et le syndicalisme de combat a démocratisé ces deux moments et leur interaction en exerçant une surveillance plus serrée et continue sur les négociateurs et les responsables à l'action qui, auparavant, n'avaient de compte à rendre à aucun militant et à personne, sauf aux assemblées convoquées irrégulièrement.

Malgré son moralisme et son finalisme qui pervertissent ses analyses historiques et politiques, le pamphlet de Demers a l'indéniable mérite de secouer les partisans du syndicalisme de combat dans leurs dernières certitudes et de les rappeler à une nécessaire réflexion.

Jean-Marc Pottie  
Université du Québec à Montréal

Fernand Dumont, Jean Hamelin et Jean-Paul Montminy, dir., *Idéologies au Canada Français 1940-1976*, tome II,

*Les mouvements sociaux. Les syndicats* (Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval 1981).

POUR ABORDER L'ÉTUDE des idéologies de la période 1940-1976, les responsables de la collection *Histoire et sociologie de la culture* ont choisi de partager en trois tomes l'abondant matériel que pouvaient mettre à leur disposition un nombre impressionnant de collaborateurs. Le premier a été consacré à la presse et à la littérature; le troisième aux partis politiques et à l'Église catholique. Le second, dont il sera question ici, traite des mouvements sociaux et du syndicalisme. Il est déjà loin le temps où les responsables d'un séminaire de second cycle confiaient à leurs étudiants, la tâche de dépouiller diverses publications et de rédiger, à partir d'une grille assez homogène, une série de textes qui couronnaient souvent une première initiation à la recherche fondamentale. Le tome que nous avons sous les yeux procède non pas d'un rite initiatique plus ou moins collectif, mais de démarches individuelles menées à terme par des universitaires de carrière opérant sur un terrain déjà familier. La plupart ont étudié à l'Université Laval. À l'exception d'une historienne, tous ont reçu une formation en sciences sociales. On ne s'en étonne pas: la période couverte est très contemporaine et les thématiques retenues ont été jusqu'ici privilégiées par des sociologues.

Le recueil comporte onze articles au total. Six ont été consacrés aux "mouvements sociaux": condition féminine (Micheline Dumont-Johnson), professions libérales (Gilles Dussault), coopération agricole (Claude Beauchamp), idéologies étudiantes (Gilles Pronovost), idéologies du loisir (Roger Levasseur), et de la contre-culture (Jules Duchastel). Cinq textes tentent de circonscrire la question syndicale: Bernard Solasse en a rédigé pas moins de quatre (Fédération des travailleurs du Québec-Confédération des syndicats nationaux; Fédération des professionnels salariés et cadres du Québec; Cen-



trale des enseignants du Québec; Centrale des syndicats démocratiques) tandis qu'André Turmel (pratiques universitaires) signe l'autre.

Soulignons d'abord la solidité et le caractère original de toutes ces contributions. Elles ont le rare mérite de bien couvrir la période étudiée et d'aborder ainsi franchement une transition majeure, celle qui marque l'effritement de la "pensée traditionnelle," opposée ici à l'ère de "modernisation" et de "pluralisme" qui l'a suivie. Nonobstant quelques variantes temporelles, la juxtaposition des textes permet d'identifier trois phases plus ou moins successives.

1) Au cours des années quarante, les transformations sociales et idéologiques ne sont pas encore substantielles. Les pratiques syndicales, d'envergure limitée, ont encore une saveur corporatiste, notamment chez les syndicats qu'on peut qualifier de nationaux; les professions libérales et leur clientèle étudiante défendent sans trop de peine leur fonction sociale et leur territoire; la coopération agricole est encore perçue comme une école de vie sociale et une troisième voie viable; la privatisation des oeuvres de loisir est encore absolue et solidement encadrée au plan moral; les publications de regroupements s'adressant aux femmes de milieu rural constituent encore les principaux foyers de solidarité féminine.

2) Puis, en gros à compter des années cinquante, s'ouvre une phase ponctuelle de changements. Une nouvelle polarisation idéologique se dessine désormais avec plus de netteté, préconisant un "rattrapage," une meilleure adéquation des comportements — on souhaite ici la symbiose harmonieuse des idées libérales et technocratiques — et des transformations infrastructurelles partout visibles, propres à l'"affluent society." Les tenants du changement n'ont toutefois jamais fait l'unanimité. L'opposition souvent feutrée du début des années soixante se traduira à la fin

de cette décennie, par un éclatement à divers niveaux.

3) Cette troisième phase, moins connue et plus controversée que les précédentes, traversée par un fort courant nationaliste, sera ainsi marquée par un "pluralisme" sans précédent. La CSN et la CEQ opposeront par exemple un syndicalisme de combat et une volonté de rupture au syndicalisme d'affaire et au réformisme de la FTQ. La nouvelle division du travail et l'intervention de l'État entameront les prérogatives des professionnels (y compris les universitaires), partagés dorénavant entre leurs corporations et d'autres formes associatives, y compris le syndicalisme. Le monde étudiant, foyer des groupuscules et de la contre-culture, se fractionnera lui aussi à un point tel que Gilles Pronovost a remis en cause l'existence même d'une idéologie étudiante. L'univers du loisir, point de mire de l'État, accaparé pour le reste par une privatisation qui laisse loin derrière le loisir-oeuvre, sera le terrain d'un affrontement entre les nationalistes et leurs opposants. Des groupes radicaux dénonceront l'attentisme ou le réformisme des politiques relatives à la condition féminine.

Voilà pour les généralités. Soulignons par contre — et comme il faut s'y attendre — l'absence d'unanimité sur quelques points. Comment définir l'idéologie? En s'inspirant de Fernand Dumont (Gilles Dussault), de Touraine (Roger Levasseur, Bernard Solasse), de Marx, d'Althusser ou de Poulantzas (Jules Duchastel)? Et à partir de là, comment caractériser la société québécoise: en soulignant le primat culturel ou en renvoyant aux formes de la production? D'un point de vue épistémologique, on trouve dans ce volume tous les éléments d'un débat qui persistera longtemps encore, ce qui n'est pas la moindre de ses qualités.

Autre débat en gestation: l'évolution récente de la société québécoise. Certains,

dont Bernard Solasse et Roger Levasseur, fournissent les éléments d'une intéressante comparaison entre le Québec actuel, où prolifèrent les discours soulignant le besoin d'une forte identification tant sociale que culturelle, et le Québec des années quarante, dont le message moins laïc aurait été jusqu'à un certain point analogue. Il faut toutefois se garder de conclusions trop hâtives. Ainsi les seules publications officielles de la CSN et de la CEQ ne permettent pas de traduire fidèlement les aspirations des membres de ces centrales. Elles constituent plutôt une courroie de transmission plus ou moins fidèle à la réalité. Il y a là un important problème de méthode. À nos yeux, l'utilisation d'une source unique de renseignements réduit un peu la crédibilité des efforts de généralisations de certains auteurs. Il n'est pas certain que la revue *Mainmise*, le journal *Le Carabin*, la revue *Forum Universitaire* ou les encarts de la Coopérative fédérée dans le journal ucéciste *La Terre de Chez Nous* aient rendu adéquatement compte de la démarche suivie par l'ensemble des tenants de la contre-culture, du mouvement étudiant, des universitaires ainsi que des coopérateurs agricoles. Bref, les démarches qui ont conduit à la production de cet ouvrage demeurent parfois limitées, même si plusieurs collaborateurs ont bien mis en rapport une solide connaissance de l'époque et les mouvements d'opinion qu'ils ont étudiés.

Paul Larocque  
Université du Québec à Rimouski

Michèle Savard Baby, *Le syndicalisme patronal dans la construction* (Montréal: Éditions coopératives Albert Saint-Martin 1980).

CET OUVRAGE EST la version remaniée d'une thèse de maîtrise en sociologie, déposée à l'Université Laval en 1978. Michèle Savard Baby consacre sa recherche à l'analyse des luttes interpatronales dans l'industrie de la construction au Qué-

bec, de 1968 à 1975. Au cours de cette période, la construction est le théâtre de violents conflits inter-syndicaux, qui provoquent notamment la création de la Commission Cliche.

Selon l'auteure, la Commission Cliche a confiné son analyse aux luttes inter-syndicales, sans tenir compte de l'état des relations de travail dans la construction. Or, le patronat n'est pas à l'abri des conflits d'intérêts qui divisent le mouvement syndical. Cet ouvrage tente de pallier à l'absence d'études sur les conflits interpatronaux, afin de dévoiler l'envers de la médaille.

Aux fins de sa recherche, l'auteure adopte une grille d'analyse marxiste, qui s'appuie sur l'étude théorique des contradictions du mode de production capitaliste (MPC). À ce cadre théorique, se greffe une analyse empirique des contradictions du MPC dans la construction. Cette démarche permet à l'auteure de formuler quatre hypothèses de recherche reliées aux conflits interpatronaux.

Une première hypothèse constate l'inégal développement du capitalisme dans la construction, selon les entreprises et les régions. Deux principaux facteurs expliqueraient cet inégal développement: l'intensité des luttes ouvrières dans la région de Montréal et la pénétration massive de capitaux en provenance de secteurs monopolistes.

La Révolution tranquille entraîne un accroissement remarquable des dépenses gouvernementales de construction, ce qui crée un contexte favorable aux revendications des travailleurs. Les luttes ouvrières sont particulièrement intenses dans la région de Montréal, où la construction a connu sa plus forte expansion. Ce militantisme pourrait s'expliquer par les rivalités inter-syndicales ou la prédominance de la FTQ. Mais, l'auteure ne peut trancher entre les deux hypothèses, car elle manque de données. De cette combativité accrue, découle en écart salarial entre la région de Montréal et les autres régions du Québec.

Par ailleurs, le développement économique accéléré des années 60 accentue la division du marché de la construction entre les grandes firmes, concentrées à Montréal, et les petites et moyennes entreprises, sinuées en province. Parallèlement, on note la pénétration massive de capitaux en provenance de secteurs plus développés. Il s'ensuit une concentration horizontale et verticale des grandes entreprises de construction.

La seconde hypothèse de l'auteure soutient que la loi 290 a catalysé les conflits intra-classes, en amorçant un processus de dérégionalisation des conventions collectives. Avant 1966, la concurrence entre capitalistes et entre travailleurs était réduite au minimum. La construction était régie par des conventions régionales, conclues en vertu de la loi d'extension juridique de 1934. Cette loi avait favorisé les monopoles de chantier et de région, de telle sorte que la FTQ, s'était surtout implantée à Montréal, alors que la CSN, s'était installée en province. Comme l'extension ne s'étendait pas à l'ensemble de la convention collective, les conditions de travail différaient d'une région à l'autre.

Mais, à partir de 1966, la construction accuse un ralentissement marqué qui touche surtout la région de Montréal. Comme la loi de 1934 freine la mobilité inter-régionale, le gouvernement québécois doit intervenir dès 1968. En vertu de la loi 290, l'État reconnaît officiellement cinq associations patronales aptes à négocier les conventions collectives. En outre, la loi promouvait le pluralisme syndical, ce qui entraîne l'abolition des monopoles de chantier et de région.

La troisième hypothèse de l'auteure fait état de l'incapacité des patrons à s'entendre sur une convention collective, de 1970 à 1976. Il y a "crise d'hégémonie" dans le bloc patronal, en ce sens qu'aucune fraction ne parvient à imposer sa direction. Enfin, la quatrième hypothèse relie l'absence de fraction hégémonique dans le bloc patronal aux luttes poli-

tiques entre les différentes fractions de la classe dirigeante au Québec, de 1960 à 1975. L'auteure rappelle que le rôle de l'État est de résoudre les contradictions du MPC, afin d'assurer sa reproduction élargie.

D'une part, l'État se charge de l'organisation réprimande de la classe dominante. Pour ce faire, il adopte une série de mesures dans le but de rétablir l'harmonie patronale sous la direction d'une fraction monopoliste. Ces mesures conduisent à la loi 47, qui crée une association patronale unique: l'Association des entrepreneurs en construction du Québec (AECQ). Grâce à l'AECQ, l'unité patronale est en voie de réalisation.

D'autre part, l'État tente d'affaiblir les forces syndicales en assurant la désorganisation/protection de la force de travail. Ainsi, la loi 290 abolit les monopoles de chantier et de région, ce qui pave la voie aux conflits inter-syndicaux. Certes, la loi 9 (1973) accorde le monopole des négociations à la FTQ. Mais, l'État adopte aussitôt une série de mesures pour affaiblir cette centrale, dont la Commission Cliche (1974) et l'Office de construction du Québec (1975). Néanmoins, l'État doit préserver la force de travail d'une trop grande exploitation. C'est ainsi que la loi 290 rend l'adhésion syndicale obligatoire.

Enfin, l'auteure relève des incohérences et des contradictions dans les politiques de l'État visant à restaurer une fraction patronale hégémonique. Les attermoissements de l'État sont reliés aux luttes politiques qui opposent diverses fractions de la classe dirigeante au Québec, suite à la montée d'une fraction nationaliste.

Michèle Savard Baby fait oeuvre utile en étudiant un sujet aussi négligé que les luttes inter-patronales. Ainsi, elle parvient à établir un lien organique entre les conflits inter-patronaux et inter-syndicaux. L'existence de ce lien démontre que les divisions internes ne sont pas le lot exclusif des syndicats et que le cohé-

sion parfaite du groupe patronal est un mythe.

Cet ouvrage stimulant débouche sur plusieurs voies de recherche. Il faudrait étudier à fond les structures de la CSN et de la FTQ, afin de mieux saisir la nature des luttes inter-syndicales. En outre, l'intervention de l'État dans les conflits inter-syndicaux revêt des formes diverses, qu'il convient de définir. J'ajouterai que l'hypothèse qui relie la situation dans la construction à la crise politique de l'État québécois mériterait d'être vérifiée en rapport avec d'autres secteurs névralgiques de l'économie. Enfin, il est souhaitable qu'un nombre croissant de chercheurs s'intéresse à l'histoire du patronat. Toutes ces questions n'infirmant en rien la qualité de l'ouvrage de Michèle Savard Baby. Elles renforcent, au contraire, son intérêt en soulevant de nouvelles perspectives de recherche.

Guy Bélanger  
Montréal

Donald V. Nightingale, *Workplace Democracy: An Inquiry into Employee Participation in Canadian Work Organizations* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press 1982).

"IN THE MODERN work organization the employee's freedom is suspended in many important respects, justice is limited, obedience to superiors is demanded, and the workplace is permeated with symbols of authority, deference, and subordination." Democratization is proposed to remedy these oppressive conditions and the resultant demoralization and discontent of workers. Strong stuff from a member of a business school, but, true to the human relations tradition in which Nightingale was trained, the reforms he advocates pose no real threat to the authority structure or purposes of the capitalist firm. The author insists there is no contradiction between workplace democracy and the firm's need to

accumulate capital. Genuine reforms are simply a matter of human preferences and values.

The core of this book presents the results of a comparative study of 1,000 upper management, middle management, and subordinate employees in ten "democratic" enterprises and ten hierarchical organizations (matched for technology, size, location, unionization, etc.). The findings purportedly support the author's preference for workplace democracy. Employees in "democratic" firms were more likely than their counterparts in conventional firms to be satisfied with the terms and conditions of work; to feel free from managerial surveillance; to exercise personal initiative; to report more cohesive interpersonal relations at the workplace; and to perceive that they participated in important decisions relating to work. These differences, while often statistically significant, were minute. For example, on a seven-point scale measuring perceived management surveillance, workers in "democratic" firms scored 3.69 and those in hierarchical firms 4.22. This difference was statistically significant but hardly meaningful. Since most of the attitudinal variation reported was of this magnitude, advocates of workplace reform will not be heartened by the results.

Critics of corporate despotism can take solace from the fact that the ten enterprises defined as "democratic" represented such a hodgepodge of participatory forms and in some cases were so questionably democratic that it is surprising that even small attitudinal differences were detected. (Although an analysis of variance was not performed, I suspect that attitude differences within each general type of organization were as large as those which prevailed between employees of the two types of firms.) The non-conventional companies represented five types of "democracy": 1) board-level representation (Tembec Forest Products); 2) Scanlon Plan (Hayes-Dana); 3) works council

(Canadian Tire, Club House Foods, Lincoln Electric, Supreme Aluminum); 4) producer co-operatives (Les Industries du Saguenay, Harvey Transport); 5) autonomous work groups (Laidlaw Lumber). The tenth firm, The Group at Cox, featured a combination of several of these institutions plus its own special participatory structures. (The ten hierarchical enterprises were not identified.)

To characterize all of these participatory forms as democratic is to render the term meaningless. Only three of these companies had unions. Four of them had a works council, the functions of which appear identical to the employees representation plans or company unions of the era of corporate welfare capitalism. Like Nightingale, capitalists and their apologists of the earlier period heralded company unions as legitimate organs of democracy, although they were implemented to forestall the formation of genuine unions. The anti-union character of works councils is of no concern to the author, who views them as "an effective means of enhancing employee participation in decision-making." Autonomous groups are promoted because they fit with Canadian values and practices and do not contest management's right to manage ("ownership rights and the control of organizational policy are not questioned by the concept"). Profit-sharing and the Scanlon Plan are recommended because they facilitate harmonious relations between labour and capital and harness employees' efforts to the attainment of corporate ends. All three of these participatory mechanisms are dubiously democratic. Autonomous groups restrict workers' decisions to matters pertaining to their jobs and immediate work areas — and then only as long as the decisions are the "right" ones. The Scanlon Plan and profit-sharing are more appropriately regarded as group incentives for boosting productivity than as forms of democracy. Producer co-ops do differ in fundamental respects from all other firms of the sam-

ple, but Nightingale sees little future for them, and he provides no information at all on the two Canadian co-ops of his sample. Finally, the author opposes board level representation. It does not reduce adversarial orientations (an important desideratum for him), and it allows worker representatives to get their hands on confidential information that might be useful in wage negotiations. The limits of Nightingale's reformism also are betrayed by his discussion of an Opel plant in West Germany where militant workers replaced timid ones on the board of directors and no longer routinely approved decisions. This, Nightingale laments, "reduced the effectiveness of the board."

The author's position on organized labour is reminiscent of Mackenzie King's distinction between good and bad unions. He recognizes the inevitability of workplace conflict but believes labour unions needlessly adopt an adversarial stance. Unions tend to discourage "the pursuit of common objectives," and they operate with a "win-lose mentality" and "low-trust dynamic." Strikes are an irrational and increasingly inappropriate means of settling disputes. This orientation impedes the development of the participatory forms proposed in the book. However, unions which are prepared to focus on matters of mutual concern and to collaborate with employers and their agents can facilitate the creation of "democratic" milieux. Nightingale claims to understand the antipathy of many unionists to participatory schemes, but he believes there is little substance to their fears. In taking this position, he denies the rational foundation of class struggle at the point of production. He is also oblivious to historical evidence which supports the reluctance of unions to engage in class collaboration. Union-management co-operative agreements often led union officials to reinforce management controls, relax their defence of workers' rights, and endorse work

methods and technology which threatened the security of the rank and file.

Despite these caveats, there are worthwhile features of this book. The vigorous condemnation of workplace autocracy is laudable. (A friend of mine uses the book as an undergraduate text because the author's business school credentials legitimize the critical approach he takes in the classroom.) The discussion of the relationship between unionism and participation is insightful. The description of the "democratic" firms provides useful information on a phenomenon which has received little attention in the Canadian industrial relations literature.

James Rinehart  
University of Western Ontario

W. Irwin Gillespie, *The Redistribution of Income in Canada* (Toronto: Gage 1980).

IRWIN GILLESPIE'S BOOK, *The Redistribution of Income in Canada*, appeared in 1980, but was based on research largely completed by 1974 using data drawn from 1961 and 1969 (with revisions in 1977 to estimate redistribution over the period 1971-1976). Whether the Canadian state, on balance, transfers economic resources from rich to poor, or vice versa, is always a topical issue, but economic policies, economic theories, and economic events have all changed since. It is fair to ask now whether Gillespie's book stands the test of time. Have new data or new theories emerged which would contradict his conclusions for the periods under study? Have new events or new policies since that time reversed the basic trends he discerned? I think not, and for that reason I think that Gillespie's work will remain an invaluable reference for some time to come.

Gillespie's work examines the net impact of the tax, transfer, and expenditure activities of government on Canadian families in different income brackets. This requires a great deal of painstaking

work since although it may be clear what cash transfers families receive from government, it may not be so clear how much each family benefits from government expenditure. Not everyone, for example, has a car, so we do not all benefit to the same degree from expenditures on highways, yet the net benefit we receive from government expenditure is composed of *both* cash transfers and government-provided services. In addition, not all government expenditures have specific beneficiaries. Some, like defence or pure research, are "public goods" whose benefits, such as they are, cannot be withheld from any member of the community. To assign to families a value for the government services they receive, one must examine in detail the elements of government spending and assign each of them to each income category.

Many assumptions are required in assigning expenditures to income groups (e.g., who benefited, in practice, from DREE?), but Gillespie demonstrates that, in practice, many of these alternative assumptions do not make much difference. Many assumptions are also required in assessing the burden of taxation since many taxes are in fact shifted from those who initially pay them — e.g., part of the corporate income tax is shifted onto consumers in the form of higher prices, and payroll taxes paid by the employer, such as UIC contributions, are typically shifted onto workers, in the form of lower wages. After making all these adjustments, the "net fiscal incidence" of government on each income group is calculated as Transfers *plus* Benefits *minus* Taxes.

There have always been problems with this method of analysis, notably in the assumption that factor incomes from labour and capital do not themselves depend on government expenditure. In addition, in recent years many new issues have been raised and many old issues re-emphasized. Who actually bears the burden of the property tax? Should government expenditure be valued at its cost or at

the value of its benefit to the recipient? What allowance should one make for family size? Shouldn't we try to measure impacts on the distribution of well-being, or utility, rather than money income? Isn't it preferable to examine inequality among people over their lifetimes, rather than just a single year? Aren't many redistributive activities of government (e.g. the Canada Pension Plan) redistribution between people of different ages or between different ages of the same person's life rather than redistribution between rich and poor? How much has government affected inequality of opportunity and the inter-generational transmission of economic status?

But one can also ask, is it likely that these factors, or others, would overturn Gillespie's basic conclusions? I think not, although any such opinion must remain a judgement call in the absence of an even more comprehensive study. Gillespie concludes that the lowest income categories benefit substantially from government expenditure while benefits from expenditures are proportional to income over most other income categories. With regressive taxes such as sales taxes balanced by a progressive income tax, the total tax structure is proportional over much of the income distribution. The net effect is a fiscal system which unambiguously redistributes purchasing power from higher income to lower income groups.

Of course whether such redistribution is due to the beneficent workings of the liberal democratic state or due to the necessity of capitalism to buy off potential proletarian discontent is another issue.

Indeed, the major focus of Gillespie's work is on the trend in government redistribution of resources. He begins and ends his book with the comment that the myth has become entrenched in the body politic that governments have increasingly redistributed resources from rich to poor in the post-war period. His conclusion is that "during the 1960's the total fiscal system became somewhat more beneficial to the

poor and considerably more beneficial to the rich, mostly at the expense of upper middle income family units. . . . Between 1969 and 1977, the quintile distribution of family money income became less favourable for the poorest fifth of Canadians. Given the changes in taxes and government expenditures during the 1970s, it is extremely unlikely that there was any improvement in fiscal incidence for the poor relative to the rich from these sources." (171)

Unfortunately, the myth is still alive and well. As recent budgets have indicated upper income groups continue to benefit from the perception that our economic ills can at least partially be blamed on governments which, in the past, "favoured redistribution rather than growth." Gillespie's work retains its value.

Lars Osberg  
Dalhousie University

Lars Osberg, *Economic Inequality in Canada* (Toronto: Butterworths 1981).

FOR ECONOMISTS, equality is a special word with a volatile meaning. In the context of equations on the blackboard, the word relates to the cold universe of proofs, measurement, and correct vs. incorrect statements. In a somewhat different context — that of the simple phrase, *economic equality* — the word conjures up far different images. Economic inequality is the focal point of the most fundamental disputes (of this as well as the last century) within the entire economics discipline. Is there some economic function performed by economic inequality? Is increased inequality — or its opposite, increased equality — some sort of "natural," "long-range" trend of market economies? Does the existence of inequality prove the market system is non-viable — or does the market mechanism rely upon inequality? These are only

a few of the questions raised by the mere mention of the phrase.

These are also questions raised by Lars Osberg's impressive book which might be described as a 236-page encyclopaedic treatment of Canadian economic equality and inequality.

Starting from the simple premise that an "up-to-date description of the extent of economic inequality in Canada" is a useful tool, Osberg presents an extremely well-documented survey of the following literature: analytical tools for the measurement of equality/inequality of wealth, income, and opportunity (chapters 2-4); social and economic models of inequality as varying with class (chapter 5); models of inequality as varying with elements such as sex, ability, or simple chance (chapter 6); the fundamental economic models of inequality (e.g., neo-classical, institutional, and radical — chapters 7,8); as well as a proposed model of the determination of Canadian economic inequality (chapters 9-11) and the role of government (chapter 12). Immediately before the book's 21-page bibliography, Osberg allows himself a "personal conclusion":

Inequality may not be necessary for the production of economic growth but is growth necessary for the toleration of economic inequality? Marxists and conservatives alike have emphasized that capitalism's historic justification has been the increase in material wealth it has produced. But, in 1980/81, after half a decade of "stagflation" and with almost universal pessimism for the immediate future, it appears that the prospects for ever-rising average standards of living under capitalism have become rather remote. And when the engine of growth falters and individuals can no longer expect to become better off in absolute terms year by year with a constant share of a larger pie, will there not be increasing pressure for larger shares of a constant pie? And if existing economic institutions cannot satisfy the economic aspirations of much of the populace, if indeed some groups are net losers in the increasing struggle over distributive shares, will there not be increasing pressure for changes in existing economic institutions?

One is tempted to answer the last question cynically: "no — not if these groups don't know they are net losers." But of course that is just the point; it is what makes Osberg's book more than a very impressive annotated bibliography and survey of this very important field. Presumably, the very dissemination of knowledge of this sort is in and of itself an important factor leading to pressure for social change.

The book is not without its shortcomings. Some sociologists and political scientists may find the economic theory — especially the treatment of the neo-classical approach — overbearing and needlessly detailed. (And economists, of course, will sneer at the sociology.) The occasional well-laid typographical error can be a source of serious confusion (e.g., on page 205 we learn: "Where available, however, [such measures] show a higher degree of inequality than inequality in annual incomes...")

Perhaps most serious to Canadian scholars, however, is the book's reluctance to address the regional dimension of economic inequality in Canada. Wealth owners and income earners are dealt with as individuals of gender, class, educational achievement, urban/rural dweller, but never as citizens of any geographical region other than Canada. To some, this begs some of the most important questions regarding economic inequality in Canada.

Steven Antler

Memorial University of Newfoundland

F.T. Denton, A.L. Robb, and B.G. Spencer, *Unemployment and Labour Force Behaviour of Young People: Evidence from Canada and Ontario* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press 1980).

IN THE 1960s, education was widely touted as the best guarantee of a steady job. Today the most educated generation



in our history is suffering from a catastrophic youth unemployment rate of almost 25 per cent. This book provides a sophisticated demographic analysis of the phenomenon of youth unemployment in the 1970s. Using statistical data obtained from the 1976 census and labour force survey microdata released for the first time, the authors describe the characteristics of the jobless under twenty-five.

Some interesting conclusions emerge from their study. Most significant is their discovery that unemployment among young people is intensifying as a proportion of the overall unemployment rate. Compared to the 1950s, almost one-quarter more males under 25 and two-thirds more women are jobless than would be expected from the rise in the total unemployment rate alone. Why this is so the authors are unable to explain. Although the under-25 proportion of Canada's labour force grew by 86 per cent between 1954-77, there is no convincing explanation why this baby boom generation necessarily implied higher youth unemployment. Britain and Italy also experienced similar youth jobless rates in the 1970s even though the proportion of their young workers was declining. Attempts to explain youth unemployment from changes in unemployment insurance or minimum wage legislation are also inconclusive, the authors argue.

The feminization of the labour force does provide some hints, however. The participation rate of women under 25 jumped from 40 per cent to 69 per cent over the past two decades. According to labour force survey data, moreover, young women are more prone than men to leave rather than lose their jobs. In 1976 61 per cent of unemployed men between 20-24 lost their jobs, compared to only 21.5 per cent who left voluntarily. For women in the same age group the corresponding figures were 34 per cent and 31 per cent respectively. The implication is that the changing sexual composition of the youth labour force is partly responsi-

ble for structurally higher youth unemployment rates.

Education, according to this study, is no passport to job security. Despite the optimistic predictions of human capital theorists in the 1960s, the propensity to be unemployed, at least among the young, seems to bear little relationship to years of schooling. "The returns to education in terms of reduced *unemployment* probabilities are very small," the authors conclude. (159)

A final point of interest is this study's estimate of the macroeconomic cost of youth unemployment. Although their calculations are admittedly rough, Denton, Robb, and Spencer argue that if the number of those jobless under 25 in 1977 could have been cut in half, Canada's GNP could have been boosted by almost 4 per cent or by \$8 billion in 1977 prices. A corresponding figure in 1983 prices would be staggering.

Since the book offers no firm explanations of why youth unemployment is intensifying as a proportion of the overall unemployment rate, it has little to offer in the way of policy prescriptions. In the absence of an overall macroeconomic attack on unemployment, the authors argue, existing youth programmes which offer employers subsidies for hiring those under 25 may well result simply in "a reduction of employment in other groups." (202) As demographers, Denton, Robb, and Spencer can offer today's young unemployed only one cold comfort. "[B]arring unforeseen major shocks to the economy," they conclude, "they will likely be absorbed into the labour force . . . as have other generations before them. It seems entirely probable that the relatively high unemployment rates of this group will come to an end as the group ages." (203) From the grim perspective of the early 1980s, it's an ironic statement.

James Struthers  
Trent University

Nick Salvatore, *Eugene Debs, Citizen and Socialist* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press 1982).

THIS IS IN almost all respects an excellent biography, one that is fully deserving of the accolades that it has already received, including the 1983 Bancroft Prize. In it, Nick Salvatore eschews both the sentimental hagiography that has characterized the biographies of a number of important American radical leaders, while providing us with considerably more insight into the private life of his subject than Bernard Johnpoll's life of Norman Thomas, or Melvyn Dubofsky's and Warren Van Tine's *John L. Lewis*. Instead, Salvatore has given us a probingly analytical, as well as a thoroughly personal biography that goes well beyond the "life and times" genre. Arguing that Debs can only be understood by comprehending the small town business milieu from which he came, the author devotes considerable space to describing the social structure of Terre Haute, where Debs made his home. This enables Salvatore to anchor Debs more securely in his social context than any previous biographer. It also permits him to articulate the origins of Debs' peculiarly American brand of socialism, an enterprise which constitutes the core of the book. In the 1860s and 1870s the small railroad town of Terre Haute was redolent with the cultural values of a republican, pre-corporate America where democracy, equality of opportunity, evangelical Christianity, and an assumption of perpetuity in the shared rewards of economic enterprise were accepted by all social classes. This harmonious vision was shattered by the brutal suppression of railroad and other strikes in the 1870s and 1880s. Salvatore argues that it was the threat posed to these values by the emergence of corporate capitalism that both turned Debs into a socialist, and enabled his critique of American society — to a greater degree than that of any other U.S. radical — to secure the rela-

tively widespread degree of acceptance that it later enjoyed.

At first a socially conservative official in the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen, it was the Burlington railroad strike of 1888-9 that acted as the catalyst for Debs' later views. Angered by the employers' response to the Burlington strike, as well as by the use of state power to repress the Great Upheaval of 1886, Debs saw the need for greater working-class unity than either the separate Knights of Labor assemblies or the Railroad Brotherhoods could afford. Thereafter, Debs slowly proceeded down the path towards industrial unionism and democratic socialism, influenced in turn by the Pullman strike, Woodstock gaol, the People's Party, and disgust at the intransigent craft unionism of the AFL. By about 1900, he had become the political champion of a brand of socialism that was as American in character as Ferdinand Lassalle's statist Marxism was German, or Keir Hardie's ethical socialism was English. Debs and Hardie, indeed, shared much in a common Anglo-American tradition, including both Christian socialism and a certain moral ambiguity in their personal lives. In Debs' case, Salvatore makes this comprehensible by his sympathetic account of Gene's sterile marriage to Kate, which led him into an illicit love affair with Mabel Curry towards the end of his life.

Beyond this, the author reveals little that is new about Debs' political career as four-times presidential candidate of the Socialist Party of America, or about his subject's relations with the IWW, the AFL, or America's involvement in World War I. A possible exception is his compelling account of the pathos of Debs' last years in 1919-26, as the movement to which he had literally devoted his life crumbled around him. The core of the book, and its most controversial element, lies in its "social biographical" character, and in the definition of Debs' socialism outlined above. One reviewer considers the

"social" approach to biography to be a contradiction in terms, arguing that it is inherently unsuited to recreating the life of a unique individual.<sup>1</sup> Given Salvatore's purpose, I do not find that this is so. It is true that the author devotes excessive attention to the overall development of the American labour movement. In chapter three, to quote only one example, he tells us more than we need to know about the origins of the AFL. This makes the book longer than it need be, and at times hard going. He also dwells more than his predecessors have done on the frailty of Debs' ego, on his occasional self-deception, and on his unwillingness to engage in the bureaucratic infighting that characterized much of his relationship with the SPA. But as I have argued elsewhere,<sup>2</sup> it was probably a net advantage to the SPA to have as its presidential standard-bearer a man who, in typical American fashion, stood above the party battle instead of taking sides in ways which Norman Thomas was later to do. For me, also, Debs' personal weaknesses, like Jefferson's love affair with the slave Sally Hennings, render him more human, rather than less. They do not detract from his courage during and after World War I, when he went to gaol for his beliefs, or from the true nobility of soul which he revealed in his celebrated speech to the court at the time of his conviction for anti-draft activities in September, 1918.

Nick Salvatore's analysis of the content of Debs' socialism is more problematic, not because of any inaccuracy in describing its wellsprings, or because of any distortion in Debs' own efforts to promulgate it. The difficulty arises, rather, from a temptation which Salvatore, somewhat like Staughton Lynd in his

*Intellectual Origins of American Radicalism*, has not been wholly able to resist. This is the temptation to forget that because the roots of Debs' radicalism are to be found in the American revolutionary tradition of Paine, Adams, and Washington, this tradition is at bottom a laissez-faire-liberal one, not a Jacobin-revolutionary one which can readily be adapted to the overthrow of modern capitalism. It is, of course, true that the English revolutionary tradition (or the Canadian one, for that matter), is also a liberal one, and that the intellectual transition from left-wing liberalism to some form of right-wing social democracy is by no means impossible. But to argue this alone is to forget the presence of those stubborn, clichéd structural features of American society — the elastic party system, social fluidity, the ethnic and racial fragmentation of the labour force — that have always made the translation of socialist beliefs into political action so difficult, and which also profoundly affected Debs' career as a Socialist presidential candidate.

It is not, of course, the task of a biographer to re-analyze these structural features in detail. As a subtle re-creation of the life and beliefs of the man who has always, deservedly, been the most beloved exponent of the indigenous American radical tradition, Salvatore's book can be praised unstintingly. But when this reviewer, at least, put down *Eugene Debs, Citizen and Socialist*, he found that indigenous tradition to be where it has always been — uneasily poised between acceptable reform, and root-and-branch social transformation.

J.H.M. Laslett  
University of California/Los Angeles

<sup>1</sup> L. Glen Seretan, "Biography and Autobiography, in *Reviews in American History*, 11 (September 1983), 394-8.

<sup>2</sup> J.H.M. Laslett, *Reluctant Proletarians: A Comparative History of American Socialism* (Westport 1984), 94.

Leslie Fishbein, *Rebels in Bohemia: The Radicals of The Masses, 1911-1917* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press 1982).

HOLLYWOOD'S POWER HAS implanted forever in our brains, as America's cutest radicals, the cuddly Warren Beatty and the darling Diane Keaton as John Reed and Louise Bryant. *Reds* was but a recent mass-media depiction of the pre-World War I Greenwich Village left which had already been turned into a sort of American Bloomsbury set by many literary historians, beginning with Henry F. May in *The End of American Innocence: A Study of the First Years of Our Own Time, 1912-1917* (1959). Since May, much has been written on such topics as birth control, marital experimentation, feminism, jazz, and all that among the likes of John Sloan, Max Eastman, Mabel Dodge, Randolph Bourne, Floyd Dell, Hutchins Hapgood, Reed, and Bryant.

Leslie Fishbein focuses on these and other topics and personalities mainly through close readings of the chief publication of the bohemian left, *The Masses*. In her preface she writes that "despite the naïveté — and neuroses" of the group she finally became devoted to them because of their "utter sincerity." (xiii) Fishbein's best and most original chapters grow out of her sense of the personal and cultural tensions in which the group worked: her less attractive passages come from her tendency to preach socialist discipline to these dead bohemian radicals. Fishbein's hidden agenda includes an unstated critique of later generations of American radicals, although the New Left of the 1960s is nowhere mentioned openly.

Let me give but the most egregious, if typical, example of the soap box of discipline. Writers in *The Masses* were among the first to advocate free love, Freud, and birth control. Fishbein points out that "The sexual revolution did not bring in its wake the social revolution." She then blames *The Masses'* writers for failing to discern that the latter would not come from the former. The group "lacked intellectual discipline. Most of them had read little of the works of Marx and Engels and so were easy victims of distortion and

simplification." They thus explored psychoanalysis more often "with the zeal of converts than with any attempt at objectivity. The reason for their blindness was simple: they were more interested in personal salvation than in ascertaining truth." Consequently they remained in the "vanguard of middle-class reform," failed to make "a socialist critique of everyday life," and "permitted the fatal distinction between the personal and the political to arise once more." (111-12) After the war most of them became mere private bohemians, many of their programmes absorbed by that bourgeoisie from which they had merely been deviants after all.

Unfortunately, the sectarian Fishbein keeps reappearing in the text to remind us of the many failures of *The Masses'* writers to create a coherent and therefore presumably triumphant socialist ideology. Fortunately, there is another part of Fishbein, far more subtle and dialectical, that may be found in her approach to the ideals and roles of these intellectuals. She does emphasize that these were revolutionaries lucky enough to live before the revolution and that they therefore could engage in a free exchange of ideas that became difficult in leftist circles after World War I and the Russian Revolution. (64) When she writes in this context, Fishbein is able to deal in a more sophisticated manner with the inner and cultural tensions of these writers. In a splendid chapter, "The Road to Religion," Fishbein shows the writers revising Christ into that "workman-agitator" who was such a central figure to Eugene V. Debs at the same time. (126) Debs and the *New Masses'* writers may not have understood *Das Kapital*, but they all sought to make the best revolutionary case with the available cultural material, meanwhile re-working their own religious backgrounds in a sincere fashion. In another fine chapter, "Art in the Class Struggle," Fishbein analyzes the tensions these writers expressed between aesthetics and politics, disdain and sympathy for the masses, fear of popular

superstition and attraction to "proletarian vigor," (192) a desire for literary realism, and a drive to make art serve explicit political ends.

In these parts of *Rebels in Bohemia* the sometimes didactic and judgemental Fishbein does enter the world of choices available to her characters. When she explores their inner tensions within the difficult environment of their times, she lends dignity to their struggles. This much esteem, if I may preach, should be granted to any progressive intellectual living in twentieth-century America.

Michael Fellman  
Simon Fraser University

Kenneth Kann, ed., *Joe Rapoport: The Life of a Jewish Radical* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press 1981).

WHY SHOULD THE autobiography of a Jewish chicken-farmer from Petaluma, California, be of interest to a Canadian social historian, I wondered when I was invited to review this book. Within the first few pages, however, it became clear that Joe Rapoport was no ordinary farmer and that his life story had much to tell us about the origins and nature of ethnic radicalism in North America. His is the fascinating, often moving, always compelling story of a Jewish revolutionary who first came to political consciousness defending his little village from marauding Ukrainian anti-semites during the years of World War I and the Russian Revolution, and who, for the rest of his life, remained preoccupied with the fate of his people in the Soviet Union, America, and the Middle East.

Joe Rapoport was born in 1900 in the tiny "shtetl" of Stanislavchik in the Ukrainian portion of the notorious Pale. From Vilna on the Baltic to Odessa on the Black Sea, running through parts of Lithuania, Poland, Byelorussia, and the Ukraine, a relatively narrow, but lengthy belt of land — the so-called Pale of Settle-

ment — had been set aside by the Tzarist governments as a territory in which Jews could live, if they could survive. The rest of Russia was barred to them. But, even in the Pale, Jews were not left alone. Though by 1900 four million Jews lived there, they made up only 10 per cent of the population. The remaining 90 per cent, were, according to Rapoport, all anti-semites.

Pogroms became the order of the day. By law, Jews were forbidden from owning or even renting land, and thus had to eke out a marginal living at petty commerce, artisanry, and service occupations. As middlemen, storekeepers, millers, and money-lenders they were easily identified as the exploiter and enemy of the farmer. Thus, when domestic policy dictated, it was a relatively simple matter for the Tzarist regime to turn these peasants loose against the Jews to massacre, rape, and pillage. All of this took place with the support of a Church which portrayed the Jews as killers of God, as poisoners of wells, and as people who used Christian blood for their Passover rites.

Thus Rapoport's early years were spent in almost constant terror as the "Black Hundreds," The Cossacks, and other pogromists cold-bloodedly attacked Jewish towns and villages, leaving death and destruction in their wake. Only the arrival of the Bolsheviks saved Rapoport and thousands of other Jews from the murderous hands of the Ukrainian nationalists: between 1918 and 1920 over 100,000 Jews were butchered by these gangs. It was in these years that Rapoport began his life-long love affair with the Soviets. The Red Army was his liberator, his salvation. For him, as for many other Jews of the time, the Communists could do no wrong.

An enthusiastic Rapoport became actively involved with the new Soviet authorities in his home town, helping them introduce their new revolutionary policies. He was no longer only a Jew; he was now a Soviet citizen, part of the new

order. Only reluctantly, therefore, was he convinced by his family to join his brothers in America; the alternative, they warned, was compulsory service in the Red Army.

In 1921 the young Jewish radical landed in New York, and like so many others before him, began work in the garment industry. His shop now became his new home; his fellow-workers, his family. They eased his integration into an alien world, protected him while he was learning the rudiments of his trade, and most importantly, introduced him to the trade-union movement. Rapoport now had an outlet for his newly-found radicalism. Within weeks he was involved in his first strike. For the young immigrant, it was an exciting, wonderful experience. He was once again fighting for the oppressed. Rapoport had found his *métier*. A natural leader, indefatigable and eloquent, he was appointed as union picket captain even though he spoke no English. Soon — with an interpreter who translated his earthy Yiddish into English — he was visiting shops on the Lower East Side organizing a general strike in the knitting industry. Unfortunately, but predictably, his first union experience ended in failure; the strike was lost and the union destroyed.

But for Rapoport this was only the beginning. To him as to thousands of other immigrant Jews, socialism was the only hope. Their corner of American radicalism was shaped by the communal life of "shtetl" and the ghetto of the old world. Their radicalism was born in burning resentment against anti-semitic persecution and petty capitalistic exploitation, in revolt against religion and tradition, in fervent idealism to create a just new world. Their ties were cemented through working together in shops, living together in Jewish neighbourhoods, fighting to build a trade-union movement, and sharing a vibrant Yiddish culture. They met constantly, sponsored lectures, organized literary and drama groups, founded summer camps, agitated, and organized,

They were beaten, harassed, arrested, and jailed. But they never gave up.

Rapoport became an organizer for the Trade Union Educational League, and helped found the National Textile Workers Association, which later merged into the Needle Trades Workers' Industrial Union. While busy fighting the bosses, Rapoport soon found that he was even busier fighting his union colleagues — the Trotskyists, Lovestonites, Bundists, to say nothing of the conservatives who were in leading positions in various garment unions. Rapoport writes from the dual perspective of someone who is familiar with left-wing organizations and ideologies, but who remained throughout his union career with the rank and file. The unique value of his perspective, writes the editor of this memoir, Kenneth Kann, "grows out of Rapoport's lifelong attempts to translate ideas into action with all the joys and frustrations of the struggle, with all the contradictions of theory and practice, and with all the demands to formulate new understanding out of past events."

In the 1930s, with the onset of the United Front, Rapoport loyally joined his erstwhile anti-communist enemies in the dominant International Ladies Garment Workers Union. There, while doing yeoman service for the workers, he became a thorn in the side of the union leadership. Like other left-wing activists of the period Rapoport played a central role in organizing an industrial union movement. With the rise of Hitler he became involved in the efforts to save European Jewry. He describes how his attitude towards Zionism changed as it became apparent that without a Jewish homeland to provide a haven, the Jews of Europe were trapped. Jewish radicals in this period opposed Zionism as a nationalist movement that served the interests of the bourgeoisie and western imperialism. But many changed their position as a result of the holocaust, and Rapoport takes pride in pointing out that the state of

Israel came into existence largely because of the support, political and military — it was Czech guns and planes that helped the Israelis beat back five invading Arab armies — of the Soviet Union and its allies. Though Rapoport is critical of some policies of the Israeli government, he is still a strong supporter of the Jewish state. In the same way, though he still sees himself as “a friend of the Soviet Union” he is disturbed by many of its policies, particularly those directed against its Jews.

Following the war, Rapoport was victimized by the anti-red purges in the labour movement and found himself without a job. Deciding to build a new life with other radical Jews, he settled in northern California and set up as a chicken rancher. Petaluma became his new lower east side. The cultural vitality of the Jewish left with its books, lectures, theatres, and newspapers rapidly took root in the lush soil of California. The old debates over Zionism and Marxism continued, but now these old-time radicals became active in the struggles for native rights, agricultural unions, and the environment. In his seventies, Rapoport participated in rallies against the Vietnam War, stood with Cesar Chavez against the agro-industrialists of the Imperial Valley, and joined in various civil rights demonstrations throughout the south and west.

This is a captivating account of one man's life. But it is much more. Rapoport succeeds in setting his life story against the great forces and events of this century. His recollections of his early life in the “shtetl” become the story of Jewish life under the Tzars, in war and revolution, and then under the Soviets. His escape to America becomes the saga of countless immigrants arriving lonely and desperate in an alien culture, and an exploration of old world continuities in the new world. His description of his years in the garment industry burgeons into the moving drama of left-wing attempts to build industrial trade unionism and socialism in America.

His preoccupation with his Jewishness, with the holocaust and with Israel, becomes the epic of Jewish destiny in the twentieth-century world. He reminds us of the invaluable contribution of Jewish radicals to the American left, and he fleshes out better than anything else I have read the story of a rank-and-file soldier in the ranks of the Communist party. Finally, his exodus from New York to rural California in the 1940s was part of the important back-to-the-land movement that swept through sections of the radical communities in these years, as thousands moved to the American south and west, or took up new lives on left-wing kibbutzim in Israel.

Kenneth Kann has done an important service to the historical community in preserving and presenting Rapoport's story. For several years he had Rapoport sit in front of a tape recorder telling his tale. From these hours of tape Kann has carved an eminently readable, evocative book. As much as possible he has kept himself out of the story, adding only his own notations at the end of the book which put Rapoport's story into an historiographical perspective. This is one oral history which works. It is a model that Canadian historians might usefully adopt — quickly — before our own Joe Rapoport disappears.

Irving Abella  
York University

Jurgen Kocka, *White Collar Workers in America 1890-1940: A Social-Political History in International Perspective*, translated by M. Kealey (London: Sage 1980).

IT IS AN OLD and elegant argument that associates the rise of fascism in Germany and Italy with the response of distressed middle classes faced with a loss of their relative privileges. Fascism, in this view, is essentially a reactionary petty-bourgeois response to capitalist crisis, which unites ideologically the old proper-

tied middle class with the new salariat. This bold assertion, which has become a standard argument in orthodox Marxism, has been vigorously debated. The work under review is a significant contribution to this controversy as well as an important substantive text in the study of the American middle classes.

Jurgen Kocka's *White Collar Workers in America* is a powerful demonstration of the fruitful relationship between social theory and historical scholarship. Comparative history is used to test the utility of a "received thesis" which emerges from a general body of theory. The experience and response of white-collar workers in the United States between 1890 and 1940 is addressed in the context of a comparison with American blue-collar workers and with white-collar employees in Germany.

Kocka argues that the development of industrial capitalism in the U.S. and Germany was "remarkably similar" with respect to their chronologies and general characteristics. Not only did the transformation of class relations proceed in parallel directions in the two countries, resulting particularly in the emergence of a white-collar salariat, but during the 1930s the two countries experienced "similar economic challenges." Given these conditions, economic determinism would lead one to expect both countries to exhibit similar social, psychological, and political developments. This was not the case. In Germany politics was "perverted to fascism" (iv) while in the U.S. there was very little potential for right-wing extremism. Consequently, Kocka argues, these disparate responses raise fundamental questions about two "general social-historical" hypotheses: the class basis and origin of fascism as a protest of new and old middle classes seen as the primary victims of twentieth-century capitalist development, and the general connection between capitalism in crisis and the political ascendancy of right-wing movements. The different responses in the two

countries is attributed to disparities in their respective social development: to "diverse pre-industrial, pre-capitalist, and pre-bourgeois traditions." A brief review of the response of white-collar workers in Britain and France corroborates this argument.

To test his general hypotheses, Kocka concentrates his analyses on sales employees in retail and wholesale trade and on commercial and technical clerks in private sector firms. (23) He argues that their experience should be seen as separate from that of the propertied petty-bourgeoisie, which has been linked most closely with right-wing collective protests, and also separate from state employees who may be the most susceptible to pro-statist politics.

Kocka's critique of the "received thesis" linking fascism universally with the "status panic" of the middle classes begins with an appreciation of the different national meanings which are associated with similar stratification arrangements. The meaning attributed to the collar-line is powerfully shaped by social and political factors and the existence of alternate lines of social differentiation may form more salient reference groups for individuals. In Germany, pre-industrial traditions created a number of differences in the experience of social stratification. Corporatist traditions generated a bifurcated labour movement sharply divided between the working class and the new middle class. The job and educational structures reinforced this distinction by limiting opportunities for social mobility. The ideology of corporatism shaped legislative policies which entrenched disparities. All these factors differed considerably from the American case where employee organizations tended to be along occupational or industrial lines, where mobility chances were greater and were incorporated into an ideology of individualism, where the fluid image of the class structure led to the formation of a less crystallized class struc-



ture, (121) and where state policies differentiated on bases other than the collar-line. These economic differences were exacerbated by the heterogeneity of the American work force which was divided along racial and ethnic lines, divisions which were solidified by discriminatory laws. (265)

The distinction between economic and social factors which Kocka draws is useful in historical explanation, yet the pre-bourgeois traditions he cites as fundamental in shaping fascism in Germany were linked in numerous and subtle ways with the economic structure of the society. Traditions arose within specific economic circumstances and within political expressions which were largely complementary with them, and they survived in tandem with the vestiges of these structures. While their German counterparts argued from a tradition of guilds and corporatism, small businesspeople in the United States responded within the framework of a tradition of liberal capitalism.

To some extent the economic conditions were not similar in Germany and the United States. (19) Germany in the 1930s experienced the "culmination of a lengthy period of misery and insecurity particularly for the lower middle class." (253) The real earnings of white-collar workers were beneath their pre-war level in 1929; in the United States the employers' offensive of the 1920s had restored much of the income differential. (176-7) Between 1913 and 1929, Kocka notes, real income increased much more in Germany than the United States. So even if the dislocation was equally great in terms of the loss of purchasing power and rate of unemployment. (193) each society began the descent from a distinct base.

Kocka's basic point, however, is that the differences in the economic context are insufficient to explain the rise of fascism in Germany and its virtual absence in the U.S. (194-7) More fundamental than the fact of economic dislocation was the political context in which the crisis oc-

curred. In Germany, economic crisis was accompanied by a breakdown in political authority. Although Germany had a "liberal-democratic system" in the inter-war years, (16) the political system was not stable. Economic failures were more readily attributed to the existing political form and contrasted with the pre-industrial, authoritarian, bureaucratic state. (21) In the United States, it was assumed that economic problems were solvable and that there were still "unused remedies for economic change in the political system." (242)

Kocka's argument accepts elements of the received thesis in the German case, such as the distinction between class and status consciousness, the middle classes' fear of proletarianization, and their use of the working class as a reference group. He accepts that there was an important difference in voting patterns, with the middle class supporting the NSDAP while the working class voted socialist or communist. (30) For Kocka, although fascism had "many roots," the "susceptibility of the new middle class to right-wing extremism... facilitated the triumph of Nazism in Germany." (282-3) Research such as that by Hamilton and Childers, however, has questioned the accuracy of the "received thesis" with respect to voting patterns in the German case. The symmetrical equation linking economic interests, political representation, and social behaviour is generally problematic.

Fear of proletarianization is different from fear of the proletariat. The former is specifically economic; the latter is powerfully political. Kocka suggest that the American working class was basically non-radical and fragmented. (282) and had a business union orientation that made for overt militancy but confined protest to economic conditions. In Germany, a "traditional elite" resisted even economic reforms and in addition there existed a "radical egalitarian socialist protest." The polarization of the labour force in Germany, which had economic, political, and

social determinants, mutually reinforced class divisions. The definition of the interests of the middle class developed within the context of a threatening social movement. The question is not only why the American middle class was not attracted to fascism, but why the Socialist Party in the U.S. failed to consolidate its early political gains.

The general picture Kocka presents of the American middle classes between the war is a familiar one. The collar-line is seen as becoming an increasingly important social division as white-collar workers in the U.S. suffered some degree of relative proletarianization, but responded economically in terms of the traditions of American unionism, and politically by supporting the reformist "New Deal." Yet how accurate is this image of the proletarianization of the American middle class in the inter-war years? How important was the feminization of the office in creating a segmented labour force and enhancing the mobility chances of white-collar men? These questions remain controversial and the answer to them would likely modify the interpretation of the white-collar experience offered by Kocka.

For all the respect that is due Kocka's comprehensive and theoretically informed analysis, the final point is that much remains to be done to explain the experience of the American middle classes in the twentieth century. The comparative focus is a powerful tool, but it must be incorporated in more rigorous analyses of the experiences and responses of new middle-class groups in national societies.

Anthony Thomson  
Acadia University

George Lipsitz, *Class and Culture in Cold War America: "A Rainbow at Midnight"* (New York: Praeger Publishers 1981).

THIS IS AN immensely suggestive book. Beginning with the argument that a great

deal of contemporary American life has been significantly influenced by the events in American industrial communities during and after World War II, Lipsitz attempts to "uncover the relevant legacy of that period." His starting point is a description and explanation of the unprecedented rank-and-file militance characteristic of early post-war American labour.

Lipsitz notes how major job disruptions and strike actions (often initiated by seemingly trivial events) during this time were manifestations both of fundamental social cleavages between capital and labour and a long-standing desire by American workers to control their own destinies. Yet, the war emergency and its aftermath created a unique set of conditions which made these cleavages even more apparent and stimulated working-class desires for independence. Particularly relevant was the highly ambiguous atmosphere of hope and fear characterizing American cultural life immediately after the war. There was a widespread hope that the years of death and sacrifice would not be in vain and that a new era of peace, security, and freedom might emerge. But there was also great fear that the despair of the Depression years might return, and that wartime gains made by labour (as a result of government pressures on employers to ensure full production for the war effort) might be lost in post-war reconstruction. In addition to these cultural factors, post-war working-class life was also influenced by major structural social changes. Wartime military spending, taxation policies, and research and development funding all helped to concentrate economic power, and created conditions for the ideological ascension of corporate liberalism. Expanded bureaucratic powers in the state, government support of monopolistic enterprise, and increased regimentation of the workplace, had so well served the war effort that they became the corporate liberal model for the post-war industrial

future. In the face of this, competitive sector capitalists, the small company owners, pushed for a withdrawal of government from the economy and a return to pre-war standards of labour relations.

Having set this stage, Lipsitz devotes a considerable part of the book's early chapters to descriptions and explanations of various working-class strategies of independence. He adopts a case study approach to labour unrest, focusing in each instance upon the complexity of the dispute and the successes and failures of various strategies of action (some of which were quite racist and sexist) in securing workers' demands. These case histories, however, merely provide the background for the book's central focus — the *response* made by capital and the state to the wave of post-war labour militance.

What made the strikes and other work disruptions of the late 1940s so dangerous to capital was their spontaneous and often illegal character. In their resort to mass action, workers were able to rely both on micro-social forms like neighbourhood or shopfloor groups too small to be effectively controlled by management, and on mass demonstrations too large and unstructured to be easily policed by the state. In some instances such actions occurred without consent of the local union and often had widespread community support. Fearing the rank and file were actually becoming "more radical than their leaders," and faced with the difficult challenge of maintaining high levels of production and employment in the post-war years, corporate liberals in the state structure responded with two significant policies: the Taft-Hartley Act and the Marshall Plan. Taft-Hartley sought to "stabilize" collective bargaining not by weakening unions but by strengthening them. Collective bargaining became institutionalized, but in a way that overtly bureaucratized unions and made them complicit in policing rank-and-file militancy in exchange for modest reforms.

The Marshall Plan sought to use government loans abroad to create a favourable economic and political climate for American business. The expansion of American capital abroad came to be seen as a necessity for post-war affluence and full employment, and this provided a compelling rationale for an aggressively expansionist economic policy. By equating freedom and democracy with the international success of American business, competition from Soviet communism came to be seen as the greatest threat to the American "way of life" in the post-war era. The red-baiting that flourished in the early 1950s had its roots in this rationale and was not initially generated out of opposition to American labour. However, red-baiting and the incorporation of anti-communist clauses in the Taft-Hartley legislation proved to be effective in eliminating militants from the American labour movement and in exacerbating divisions within the working class itself.

Lipsitz goes on to show how the results of all this could be measured in the 1950s by a growing separation of unions from the construction of working-class identity. Denied political and cultural expression in organized labour, working-class aspirations for independence surfaced in the "politics of everyday life, on the shop floor, in the community and in the home." Furthermore, working-class cultural forms in film, language, sports, and music moved into the spheres of mass culture and came to symbolize the search for freedom, independence, and community in American society. As examples, Lipsitz focuses upon film noir, bop language, roller derby, car customizing, and rock and roll, commenting on the contradictory features of these cultural products as commodities implicated in the reproduction of capitalist social relations, yet holding out the possibility for articulating oppositional conceptions of social life. His conclusion is that today's movements of popular protest (for example, the women's movement, student

movements, and struggles waged by blacks) owe a great deal to the resonances of earlier forms of protest that still surface in mass cultural products and offer us glimpses of a better future.

Not everyone will buy these arguments completely and it seems fair to say that Lipsitz's ambitious and provocative synthesis of political economy, social history, and cultural analysis does not always hang together. The cultural material in particular is somewhat detached from the rest of the book and there are times when one suspects Lipsitz overstates the extent to which post-war mass cultural forms rooted in working-class experience have expressed an oppositional character. It may be too much, for example, to argue that "what the mass demonstration and wildcat strike provided in political life, rock and roll music realized in culture." Neither led to a revolution, Lipsitz reminds us, but "both embedded themselves between the power of the system and popular resistance." Perhaps so, but wildcat strikes are not produced by record companies and obviously have much different oppositional features than those found in rock music. The issues surrounding the differences between such overt struggles and the politics of mass cultural forms require a fuller treatment than they receive in this book. Nonetheless, by simply raising such issues Lipsitz has opened the door to analyses seeking to explore more closely the relationships between contemporary class and popular struggles, and mass and working-class culture. Such an opening is a valuable corrective to the mass culture theories of the 1950s and 1960s which overly emphasized cultural incorporation and ignored the possibilities of continuing working-class resistance. By looking into these possibilities, Lipsitz implies that the revival of the American labour movement in the future may well be first and foremost a cultural project.

Richard Gruneau  
University of British Columbia

Susan Strasser, *Never Done: A History of American Housework* (New York: Pantheon 1982).

HOUSEWORK WAS "NEVER DONE" for the nineteenth-century housewife. Its history had never been done until feminist historians and sociologists began to turn their attention away from women in the public spheres of political struggle, work, and social movements to the more private sphere of the home. In the 1970s discussion about domestic labour was dominated by the highly theoretical "domestic labour debate," centering around the kind of value produced by women's work in the home and its function in a capitalist society. While scintillating at times, such debate did not advance our knowledge of what women were actually doing in the home and how it changed over time. In 1974 Ann Oakley's *Woman's Work: The Housewife Past and Present* began the definition and description of the housewife's role, focusing largely on England and predominantly on the present. In Canada, Meg Luxton's *More than a Labour of Love: Three Generations of Women's Work in the Home* used the experience of women in Flin Flon, Manitoba, to describe changes in housework there. Susan Strasser's *Never Done: A History of American Housework* goes further than these works. She carefully documents changes in household technology, and its production, promotion, and use. In so doing she not only writes the history of most women's work in America, indeed in advanced capitalist societies, but also brilliantly documents fundamental changes in the basis of society, the family, and daily life over the last two centuries.

Strasser highlights three major phases of women's work in the home, phases that appear to coincide broadly with the dominance of commercial, industrial, and monopoly capitalism. In the colonial era the household fulfilled the functions of home, factory, school, and welfare institution. Women produced goods both

for use and exchange on farms and in cities. During the nineteenth century the transition to industrial capitalism meant that more and more production took place outside the home, leaving the housewife as the reproducer of labour-power. In these two phases housework was a herculean, backbreaking, never-ending chore, one which Strasser chronicles in the first seven chapters. These examine in detail the changes in the production and use of food, methods of cooking, lighting, heating, water services, washing, and serving. By the early twentieth century, women's work in all these areas had been lightened as mass production of commodities along with the distribution of utilities by private and municipal companies reshaped housework. Cast iron stoves eliminated the vagaries and dangers of cooking on open hearths. Refrigeration meant a wider variety of foods were available throughout the year. Electric stoves and furnaces eliminated the never-ending cutting and hauling of fuel. Vacuum cleaners ended the horrific frenzy of spring cleaning that had upset so many a nineteenth- and early twentieth-century household.

Such changes, argues Strasser, "clearly improved the quality of life in the home, eliminating backbreaking labor, raising the standards of health and nutrition and freeing people from virtual slavery to natural cycles." (31) However, she refuses to romanticize either the past or "progress," always viewing change as a complex historical phenomenon entailing costs as well as benefits. Thus electrical and water services ended the heavy hauling of fuel and water but brought dependence on private companies operating for profit. Use of commodities run on electricity also involved dependence on repair people. Furthermore the opportunities for contact with other women diminished as a tap replaced the community well, frozen foods replaced the door-to-door hawkers, and eventually dryers inside the home replaced the washing line in public view. In all areas white con-

sumption continued, production at home diminished. At the same time waste of resources replaced conservation.

The growing isolation of women in the home that accompanied the expansion of wage-labour and the production of commodities for use in the home fueled the idea of the home being a separate and female sphere. Throughout the book Strasser criticizes the notion that the spheres were ever truly separate by showing the connections between the home and the economy. In chapters ten and eleven she examines the proponents and the paradoxes of the theory, turning away from the technology and work of the housewife to the ideologies surrounding them. Here she relies heavily on an examination of the ideas of such writers and reformers as Catharine Beecher, Melusina Fay Pierce, and Charlotte Perkins Gilman. The idea of the home as woman's sphere, as a separate haven, had always been paradoxical, she argues: men had to be accommodated there; the qualities of the ideal wife were not those of the ideal mother; its very rhythms were determined by the demands of the man's work world. As reformers pushed domestic education alongside social reform, Americanization, and school reform, the apparent separateness of the spheres decreased. Ideas developed in the workplace, including scientific management, were proposed for the home as well. In the 1890s Charlotte Perkins Gilman, perceiving the problem of housework as based in the "very nature of work privately done in separate households," (306) called for the industrialization of housework itself.

Yet housework was never industrialized, although many products industrially transformed it. Profit-making potential determined that washing machines, which women worked alone at home, became the dominant form, instead of the laundry to which they could take their washing. Products were promoted that offered the most profit to industry.

rather than the best solution or even the least work for women.

The final five chapters detail the growing intrusion of corporate strategies and products into the home and the whittling away of most of the former roles of the housewife. The optimism of the former chapters is gone. Here Strasser paints a gloomy and pessimistic picture of changes in methods of promotion and retailing that not only made consumption the major remaining role of the housewife, but that also penetrated the rhythms and content of mealtimes and altered personal relations until commodities "promise to fulfil the functions of the old private sphere — now including those of food, childcare and emotional life." (306)

Once capital's market had expanded to include most working-class homes, expansion and profit were based on aggressive advertising and production of new commodities that claimed to render older models obsolete. Old ways were debunked. From a stress on economy, advertising shifted to focus on prestige and time-saving. That families could purchase any of the new and non-essential items was made possible, as *Business Week* recognized, by wives working. Their wages not only enabled some families to subsist and others to purchase appliances that were claimed to save labour, TV dinners and fast-food meals, but more importantly were crucial in keeping "the economy going" (301) by allowing capital to continue to expand.

To attempt to summarize Susan Strasser's content and arguments is to do her work an injustice. Rich details and broad arguments go together to create a book that I found difficult to put down and was sorry to finish. It is a cleverly constructed book that is at once thematic and chronological, moving from the earliest areas of change in the home to the most recent; shifting too from the benefits of development to the total loss of control and autonomy that Strasser convincingly argues exists today. While at one level

*Never Done* is a history of American housework, it is much more than that. It is a history of the changing daily life of women, an important contribution to the history of the changing methods of commodity production and distribution. Throughout Strasser is very careful to link changes in household technology and work to the methods of production, distribution, and promotion, and to the ownership of capital. Women and the household are examined squarely as part of the mode of production, never separately. Her critique of the separate spheres concept informs the whole book, not simply the chapters on the ideology. Furthermore she consistently makes clear who is buying commodities, so that the experience of middle-class and working-class women is always contrasted. The book serves as a timely reminder of the recentness of most changes in housework, especially in rural and working-class households. Not until well into the twentieth century was the work of most of these housewives lightened by electrical services, ovens and furnaces, indoor plumbing, washing machines, and cheap ready-made clothing.

The weakest chapters are those on boarders and on children. The raising of children especially receives much less attention than its importance as a component of women's work merits. Until the twelfth chapter, women appear to be carrying out their daily tasks uninterrupted, unencumbered by the children that we know they had. Even then the topic is treated briefly, perhaps because technological changes were negligible. Yet clearly clothing, diapers, bottles, food, toys, prams, and other baby hardware have changed over time and increasingly became a source of profit for large corporations. While mothers certainly paid less attention to children in the years before the child-rearing advice of the progressive period that Strasser does document, they did constitute a constant part of their daily activity and thus warrant more attention.

*Never Done* will not appeal to conservatives or the New Right who still cling to the idea of the home as a separate sphere. It should, however, be compulsory reading for all fathers, mothers, sisters, and brothers. For, as Strasser concludes, if the corporate intrusion into our daily lives and psyche is to be halted, people will have to fight. That struggle, she suggests, must be based on a recognition of the inextricability of public and private, and on a "celebration of the human values of love and community that lost their status, connected so long to women's arduous and unstinting unpaid labour in a sphere only apparently separate and private." (312)

Bettina Bradbury  
Concordia University

Ronnie Steinberg, *Wages and Hours: Labor and Reform in Twentieth-Century America* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press 1982).

AS AN HISTORIAN, I feel partly bemused and partly mystified in trying to review a book such as this. Clearly Ms. Steinberg is far more interested in using and testing social science theories and models of public policy-making than she is in uncovering the reality of the past. She also uses forms of statistical analysis far too esoteric for this non-numerate historian to understand perfectly or even partially. Consequently, I prefer not to analyze or criticize Ms. Steinberg's more complex forms of model-building and her sophisticated statistical manipulations. Instead, I will restrict my comments only to what is of interest and value in the book to historians and historical social scientists.

Models and statistics aside, Ms. Steinberg seeks to explore two issues of central importance to historians of the modern United States: 1) the role of the state in fashioning a modern partial welfare state in which all citizens have minimal social and economic rights; and 2) the sources or origins of state welfare policies. She

focuses entirely on what she labels early and modern labour standards legislation. Early labour legislation (enacted largely between 1900 and 1920) encompasses wage payment/wage collection laws, maximum hours laws, and night work restrictions, all of which were enacted at the state level. Modern labour legislation (dating from the 1930s) includes the 1938 Fair Labor Standards Act (setting minimum wages and establishing premium payment for overtime) and several equal pay laws, which were primarily federal but had state counterparts. Ms. Steinberg is at her best in showing precisely how many and which workers were covered by the various early and modern laws. She makes evident that the state laws covered relatively few workers, provided minimal "real" benefits, and benefited male workers more than the women and children for whose protection they were intended. By contrast, modern federal legislation applied to many more workers, offered real benefits, and aided women, especially in its provisions for minimum wages and equal pay.

In explaining how and why this legislation was adopted, Ms. Steinberg is less helpful to historians. Rather than exploring in detail how any of the laws whose provisions and impacts she analyzes were actually adopted, she relies on a few published histories to make her points. Her conclusions and interpretations are made on the basis of statistical and logical inference rather than the sort of evidence historians prefer. Still, I must admit that Ms. Steinberg's interpretations fit my prejudices perfectly. I find it hard to disagree with the assertion that most employers opposed labour standards laws and only supported their enactment, if at all, after they had lost the early battles; or that social reforms were "forced on capitalism from below" and that businessmen joined in the process only "to shape and control the process of change." For these claims, Steinberg borrows directly from Fred Block's work on the role of the state in

contemporary capitalist nation. And who can disagree with the argument that "reform is an outgrowth of crisis in the legitimacy of... [the] political economy." Ms. Steinberg does prove that the Great Depression of the 1930s occasioned the greatest single breakthrough in the passage of social welfare legislation and that World War II did almost as much. Then the American domestic crisis of the 1960s set the stage for the enactment of the strongest provisions in modern labour standards laws. Finally, it is pleasant to learn that social reforms result from organized political pressure by subordinate social groups (especially trade unionists), not from the giving hands of superordinate ruling classes. Even if she lacks the full historical evidence to prove her case, Ms. Steinberg does offer a needed corrective to the "corporate liberal" interpretation of modern American history associated with the work of James Weinstein, Ronald Radosh, and Gabriel Kolko among others.

The book might have been of even more interest and benefit to historians if it had been written in language more enjoyable to read. There is a place and time for esoteric technical language and even jargon in scholarly publications but not when the author seeks to make her/his contributions available to a wider audience. Finally, the book's first chapter includes a typographical error which I simply could not let pass. On page 5 Ms. Steinberg writes about the "corporate liberal" interpretation, that "these reforms are seen by analysts as innovations that help to rationalize and sustain a social order organized in the employees' interests." She obviously means "employers' interests."

Melvyn Dubofsky  
State University of New York  
at Binghamton

Glenn Porter, *The Workers' World at Hagley* (Greenville-Wilmington, Del.: Eleutherian Mills-Hagley Foundation 1981).

THE ELEUTHERIAN MILLS-HAGLEY Foundation has a fine reputation as a research and interpretation centre for early American industry, and this recent publication is an excellent example of their work. Numerous early centres of the industrial revolution were located in the historic Delaware River Valley and readers no doubt will recall the ones immortalized in A.F.C. Wallace's *Rockdale*. The focus of this present study is another industrial village, Hagley, the Brandywine Creek black powder-making community founded by Eleuthère Irénée Du Pont in 1802. The Du Ponts and their powder works have appeared in many studies, but usually ones which focus on entrepreneurial aspects or on technological change.

*Workers' World* treats the powder-making enterprise differently in two important respects. First, the emphasis here is on the insights of the working families who lived around the type of dangerous industry we usually associate only with coal mining. Second, the study is based on the sorts of sources closest to those lives: old photographs and living memories.

The commitment to local history based on sources which have been generated by local people themselves is nowhere more thoughtfully argued than in Raphael Samuel's essay, "Local History and Oral History," which appeared in the first issue of *History Workshop*. While Samuel has overstated the case for oral evidence (and understated the value of other sources — especially of demographics and material culture), nevertheless his insights are clear and important, especially for labour historians. He argues that with the aid of "new," more authentic sources such as living memories, "the historian can draw up fresh maps, in which people are as prominent as places, and the two more closely entwined."

People and places are ultimately entwined in *Workers' World*, though I should point out that this publication was



not intended as an oral history. It emerged as an aspect of the recent Hagley museum exhibit, "The Workers' World: The Industrial Village and Company Town." Like the exhibit itself it represents the joint labours of the staff of the museum and of the Regional Economic History Research Center at Hagley. Following Glen Porter's rich extended essay on the community and its context are 40 pages of historical photographs. Many of them were the work of a French immigrant, Pierre Gentieu (1842-1930), worker-turned-manager in the powder yards. These are accompanied by what amount to fragments of a much larger record of oral interviews with former workers and their families.

The remembrances offered by the interviewees are those mostly of people who were children at the time: what interested and impressed them, filtered through subsequent adult experience and finetuned by the oral tradition of others. Perhaps it is for this reason that they offer to us little sense of the workplace and the workday at Hagley, both of which surely are critical aspects of the "workers' world." The illustrations are unsentimental and for the most part they are filled with people and action set against the backdrop of the scenic Brandywine, on the one hand, and life-threatening black powder, on the other.

While it would be impossible to capture between the covers of a book the same "sparks" that museum curators hope to pass on to the public through multimedia displays, *The Workers' World at Hagley* is an important example of the use of living memories and the photographic record in providing fresh maps to illustrate the lives and communities of most people.

Dianne Newell  
University of British Columbia

The Falmer Press 1981); and Wayne Urban, *Why Teachers Organized* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press 1981).

THE WRITING OF TEACHER union histories has been prompted by a variety of sources; one important influence was the rise of teacher militancy during the mid-1960s. Histories written in this period were first-run scholarly studies cast beyond the celebratory "pot boilers" compiled by the unions. (My favourite title in this genre is *The Long March: The History of the Ontario Primary Men Teachers' Federation*.) This spate of research waned during the 1970s, and only recently has there been a revival of interest and new vigour in the writing. This has occurred because of the inadequacies of earlier studies and the re-discovery and application of Marxian concepts of the labour process, the state and its control over teachers, and the ongoing debate on the class location of white-collar workers.

These two books represent the most recent published attempts to redirect discussion on teacher union history. Ozga and Lawn's study is the more ambitious. It draws directly from the theoretical debates in the British "new" sociology on white-collar trade unionism, aiming to generate discussion on questions of teachers' work and class, and the ambiguous nature of their trade unionism. The book's outstanding merit is that for the first time it brings together the new problematics on white-collar workers and applies them to empirical research on the growth of the National Union of Teachers of England and Wales (NUT). It starts with an excellent critical review of earlier approaches to the study of teachers' unions, outlining deficiencies in methodologies, focus and explanations in the institutional histories, sociology of professionalization and political science of interest group behaviour. The review, although confined to British studies, is applicable to other countries. Historians

Jennifer Ozga and Martin Lawn, *Teachers, Professionalism and Class: A Study of Organized Teachers* (London:

of Canadian teachers' unions will benefit from this discussion. Often working in graduate schools of educational administration and heavily reliant upon Etzioni's organizational or Dahl's political theories, they often see union growth as a dichotomous struggle between professionalism and unionism, with the ultimate triumph of professionalism.

We have to wait until nearly half-way through the book before the history of the NUT is reached. Our patience is both rewarded and aggravated. Ozga and Lawn argue that at the local level during the 1910s the NUT was moving towards a strong identification with working-class organizations. Yet it is not until 1971 that the NUT affiliated with the Trade Union Congress. The emphasis on local studies of the NUT is fascinating for its insights into teachers' changing relations with working-class organizations. In some ways, however, it was to be expected that East London or Rhondda teachers would be crucibles for a NUT transformation. But two or three swallows do not make an English or Welsh summer. I was anxious to know more of NUT activity in the "less obvious" localities, where teachers appeared fixed to, and guardians of, middle-class "virtues." Also I remain unconvinced by the authors' explanation of the NUT's "retreat after 1920. Surely it was not a case of the exodus of militants and radicals, but that they were swamped by more conservative teachers. Moreover historical questions on the motives for a white-collar union's identification with a labour movement should be treated cautiously in the light of Anthony Thomson's study in this journal (2, 1977) of the Canadian Civil Service Association.

The NUT's increasing resistance to local employers and its closer ties with the labour movement were decisive. By the end of World War I teachers came to be seen as a "social danger" by the governing class; consequently they were brought under indirect state control by the licensing of their craft. Earlier NUT histories

have insisted on a teachers' victory in this episode, but Ozga and Lawn see the state mediating initiatives to weaken mobilization and divert teachers from a natural alliance with the working class. Their argument is attractive, yet the perceived threat to the state from teachers, as distinct from political rhetoric, is not firmly established, at least in this book. The argument rings of manipulation, and also suggests that teacher militancy was equated with working-class sympathies. Nevertheless, this particular aspect of the book has already assisted other scholars in the study of Canada's teacher profession acts, which established compulsory unionism, and Australia's system of compulsory arbitration, which encouraged strong, unified teacher unionism.

Wayne Urban's book, as the title suggests, is an attempt to explain what has either been assumed or superficially considered: the emergence of U.S. teacher unions between 1896 and 1922. The book is the product of local research in Chicago, New York, and Atlanta and is a lively re-examination of the formation of the American Federation of Teachers. The study, a structured, highly informative narrative, is devoid of explicit social or labour theory. However, it builds on the "revisionist" history of education by concentrating on the organized response of classroom teachers to the systematization of their work and the centralization of control in large urban school systems. It is from these ranks, predominantly of women teachers, that Margaret Haley of the Chicago Teachers' Federation, and others, emerge as the pioneers and vanguard of America's teacher unionism. They are the sung and unsung heroes of Urban's chapters: they advanced the cause of unionism (at the expense, Urban argues, of school reform), fought for equal pay and tenure for women teachers and, in cases like Margaret Haley, influenced feminist political movements. The initiative and presence of women teachers is a significant feature of U.S. teacher

union formation (as it was in Toronto and Montreal). And this, combined with the American teacher unions' involvement with organized labour, makes an absorbing study; moreso when read in conjunction with Ozga and Lawn. Of course what was true for Chicago or New York teachers may not be true for other cities. Urban's chapter on the Atlanta teachers' unions, which eschewed militancy and labour affiliation, offers a different view of teachers' perceptions of collectivity. It is unfortunate that Urban's sights were not extended westwards to say, St. Louis and San Francisco, to give the reader a sharper composition of early teacher unionism.

Urban argues that the reasons for teacher union formation are found in the teachers' real need for material improvement and their desire to protect their service through seniority. These conclusions are not simplistic, but bland, being influenced by the evidence available from union records. The disappointment is that Urban does not analyze the teachers' work situation. In particular he skates across their increasing subordination to managerial control in the school and schools system. This process was challenged by some teachers in the felt need for collectivity: either in the incipient informal groups or women teachers' social clubs (also found in Toronto and Sydney, Australia), or the early teachers' unions. For other teachers their subordination produced a sense of futility and withdrawal, which helps explain the low level of unionization in these cities.

Also absent from Urban's explanation is the socio-legal milieu in the growth of public employee unionism. It is probably unfair to ask of Urban why teachers' unions in North American cities with elaborate, "advanced" school systems emerge at a later period than Britain, Australasia, or France. The answer lies not in Urban's strategic variables of growth — they also are readily found elsewhere — but in such factors as the overall organizational strength and social acceptability of

trade unionism. This criticism, however, should not detract from the direction of this study, nor its scholarship and presentation. Urban completes his study with a reflective "past and present" chapter to provide an elegant summary of recent developments in labour relations of schooling. He claims that collective bargaining has significantly changed the government and leadership style of American teachers' unions. The primacy of industrial negotiations has curbed the reformist political instincts of modern-day Margaret Haleys. "The evolution of Albert Shanker of New York City from a social democrat and graduate student in philosophy, to a tough minded, powerful pragmatic unionist serves as a case in point." (176)

Thus from different approaches and from the study of two distinctive forms of teacher organization, the authors of these books have raised and partially answered new questions on the history and development of modern teacher unionism. It is for others to now join them in this worthwhile, necessary venture.

Andrew Spaul  
Monash University

J.E. King, *Richard Marsden and the Preston Chartists 1837-1848* (Lancaster: Centre for North-West Regional Studies 1981).

THE HISTORY OF CHARTISM occupies a particular place in British labour history. Its earliest historians, after those writers who had been participants in the movement, were activists in the early years of the modern labour movement, seeking roots and a national identity in earlier British struggles for working-class rights and political democracy. The nature of the preoccupations of these early Fabians and Marxists inevitably dictated the kind of questions they asked about Chartism and the aspects of the movement that they recorded. In a sense, indeed, the his-

toriography of Chartism is itself a branch of labour history. It is in no way to denigrate their important pioneering work to point out that writers like the Webbs, the Hammonds, G.D.H. Cole, Julius West, and Theodore Rothstein inevitably imposed many distortions on the history of popular politics. Their work remains important, but it has to be built on by the abandonment of many of the persistent clichés which bedevil the story, and then by the close examination of the many rich and diverse sources that are now available for the construction of a more faithful picture of early popular movements.

J.E. King's short study of Richard Marsden is an excellent example of the kind of Chartist history which now needs to be written. In many ways it is a model for a new approach to Chartist studies and must rank — in spite of a few shortcomings — as one of the best pieces of Chartist historiography that has yet appeared.

Like Iorwerth Prothero's valuable study of John Gast and London artisan politics, this work combines the examination of a particular locality and its occupants with a biographical account of an important radical leader. The leader's importance arises partly from his involvement with the main industry of the district, and to an extent he embodies the experience and the politics of his constituents and followers. Two of the outstanding earlier works on Chartism, Cole's *Chartist Portraits* and the volume of *Chartist Studies* edited by Asa Briggs emphasized, in one case the influence of leading personalities on the directions taken by the Chartist movement, and in the other the importance of local characteristics and local industrial variations on forms of Chartist activity. Both emphases have their validity, but both impose distortions which have affected subsequent work on the subject. Cole chose twelve men whom he considered to represent essential aspects of Chartism. Most of these were in fact not Chartists at all, but

rather represented tendencies to be found in the movement. Many subsequent writers have used these trends to analyze the movement, and have thereby imposed divergences and schisms which did not exist. Most actual Chartists seem either to have accepted a radical cosmology which included a whole number of attitudes, some apparently inconsistent with each other, or to have passed through different tendencies at different points in their political lives. Chartism was not made up of "O'Brienite," "Lovettite," or "O'Connorite" factions struggling for the mind of the movement, but of men and women united by the demands of the Charter, loyal to their local, and to their national leaders, gaining their information mainly from the *Northern Star*, but also attending lectures, meetings, and rallies at which local and national leaders addressed them. The members of the localities were not, however, simply sociologically determined by their trade or occupation, passive recipients of attempts to impose a national pattern on a series of local grievances.

This study of Richard Marsden breaks through the limitations imposed by either biographical or regional studies by themselves. In telling the story of a local leader who was also well-known throughout the country, who lectured, wrote letters to the *Northern Star*, and spoke at the conventions, the study moves away from the squabbles of the journalists and pamphleteers into the lives of the members of the movement. The locality in which Marsden established his credentials to become a Chartist delegate is examined, and the pre-Chartist and non-Chartist activity by which he was already established as a leader in his community in 1839. By following him to the convention and to his arrest and imprisonment outside his own district, the purely parochial elements in his leadership are added to by an understanding of the way in which the experience of one trade or district could evoke responses in very different areas. Support

for Marsden and his family came in from sympathizers in many parts of the country.

Richard Marsden was in many ways a more "typical" Chartist leader than many of the better-known names that appear in the textbooks. Many of these latter flirted only briefly with possibilities of ultra-radical leadership before withdrawing into other movements or other occupations. Marsden, however, remained a leader throughout the active life of the Chartist movement. He was a founding member of the Preston Radical Association six months before the publication of the People's Charter, a supporter of the factory short time movement, and a passionate opponent of Irish coercion. He was a delegate to the first Chartist convention in 1839, sent there by the weavers and their families whose case he had already argued before the handloom weavers' commission. He was one of the very small number of delegates who were also present at the convention of 1848. He was arrested, as were very many of the local leadership, in 1840, and imprisoned, although he was released without having been brought to trial. He served a short stint as a full-time Chartist lecturer, but through most of the years of activity he was working daily at his loom.

Édouard Dolléans selected Marsden, along with Richard Pilling of Ashton, to represent the innocent, spontaneous voice of the oppressed and uneducated weavers. In fact, as the present work shows, Marsden was, like Pilling, a sophisticated, deliberate, thoughtful, and very political character. He wrestled with the questions of free trade, the land, the role of trade unions, and other theoretical questions which were at the heart of the alternative programmes of middle- and working-class radicals in those years. He by no means accepted uncritically the word or the analysis of the Chartist leaders. One of the most valuable things which this study demonstrates is the way in which Marsden, like the great majority

of the Chartists, remained a loyal admirer and follower of O'Connor, but without necessarily agreeing with his chief on everything. He had severe doubts about the Land Plan, which he did not accept or join until 1847, and he remained suspicious of the Irish repeal leaders, even when they finally, in 1848, accepted an alliance with the Chartists, rightly suspecting that most of them, including John Mitchell himself, did not believe in manhood suffrage which, to Marsden, was as necessary for the Irish as for the English. The picture that emerges here is a valuable counter to the textbook cliché of a dichotomy between the "educated artisans" of the south and the animated stomachs which made up the Chartist crowd of weavers and other outworkers in the north. Marsden advocated arming, and was a strong supporter of the "sacred month" in 1839. He was also a temperance supporter, a committed if undogmatic Christian, believed that education was one of the movement's chief aims, and was clearly a capable and articulate speaker, organizer, and writer, who retained the confidence of his fellow-radicals in Preston throughout the period. His politics had their starting point in the agony of the handloom weavers, but they were very much more than a simple howl of protest.

The pamphlet is excellently produced and reasonably priced. Inevitably one has minor quibbles. The author makes very little use of the Chartist press other than the *Northern Star*, and the Preston Chartists of the title get very little treatment — perhaps an investigation using the land company lists and the census enumerators' books would thicken up the picture. Shots were fired in 1842 in Halifax, where one man was killed and a number wounded. And Lawrence Pitkethly spelt his name without the intrusive extra "i." But these are small points in a booklet that should be part of any booklist of nineteenth-century social history.

Dorothy Thompson  
University of Birmingham

Donald C. Richter, *Riotous Victorians* (Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press 1981).

DONALD RICHTER HAS SET himself two important and interesting tasks: to explore "the alleged public orderliness of late Victorian society" (1) and to examine the forces of riot control which were at the disposal of the authorities. Relying principally upon parliamentary papers, the Home Office papers in the Public Record Office, and the private papers of individual Home Secretaries, Richter approaches these questions by means of a series of case studies: Fenianism; the anti-Catholic Murphy Riots and the struggle for Hyde Park in the 1860s; the general elections of 1865, 1874, 1880 and 1885; reactions to the growth of the Salvation Army during the early 1880s; the Pall Mall affair of 1886; and finally the 1887 confrontation in Trafalgar Square — or "Bloody Sunday" as it became known.

From these accounts Richter concludes that "the widely-held belief in the public orderliness of Victorian society, at least in eighteen-sixties, seventies, and eighties, is a gross misconception." (163) Yet the disorders, he maintains, posed neither revolutionary threat nor championed any serious social or political cause. His explanation is far more simple: "Although perhaps not currently a very fashionable suggestion, 'simple love of disorder' may have played a far larger role than has been accorded to it. There is much Victorian evidence to support Robert Ardrey's 'violence is fun' thesis. . . . The sound of shattered glass, the spectacle of police on the run, may have been intoxicating enough to explain the root cause of many Victorian civil disorders." (165-6) Richter goes on to argue that because the repressive forces at the disposal of Victorian society existed only in embryonic form, the good order which did prevail was due as much to crowd restraint as to police effectiveness. "All things considered," he concludes, "the

record of the Victorian Home Office was not a good one." (168)

Although clear and well written, this is a disappointing book. For one thing, the title is misleading; as Richter himself admits, the "major focus" is "not the rioters, but the forces of riot control." (167) The book is marred too by its superficiality. Indeed superficiality is probably unavoidable when many of the chapters are so short. Fenian terrorism is considered in just 14 pages (including footnotes and two full page illustrations); the Murphy riots in 16; and the role of crowds in the five general elections between 1865 and 1885 in less than nine pages.

More serious still is the writer's apparent ignorance of so much recent research (the latest work listed in the Bibliography was published as long ago as 1973). Thus he feels able to discuss the Murphy riots without acknowledging W.L. Arnstein's article in *Victorian Studies* (1975) and the Salvation Army riots without reference to Victor Bailey's essay in A.P. Donajrodzki's *Social Control in Nineteenth Century Britain* (1977). Most telling of all, Richter shows little compunction in continually describing the crowds he examines as "mobs." Thus it is particularly galling to be chided at the end of the book that: "The research techniques employed by Lefebvre, Soboul, Rudé, Chevalier, Pinkney and others in determining the composition of French revolutionary crowds have proved quite worthwhile and should suggest further understandings of the British crowd." (167)

Unfortunately, then, the merits of the book — the interest of the subject and the quality of the writing — cannot compensate for its several and serious weaknesses.

John Benson  
The Polytechnic, Wolverhampton

V.L. Allen, *The Militancy of British Miners* (Shipley: The Moor Press 1981).

BRITISH COAL MINERS have become

renowned for their militancy. V.L. Allen, professor of sociology at the University of Leeds, has written a political history of their struggles which focuses on ideological conflict and class consciousness. Allen's book is well worth reading to learn about the British coal industry, the National Union of Miners and how union politics operate, about relations between unions and the state, life for the working class in British coal communities, the effects of mechanization, and lessons from the experience of nationalization. The book does assume, however, considerable familiarity with local British culture and national politics.

Miners' unions had advocated nationalization of the coal industry since 1892 but when it finally occurred in 1947 the blessings were mixed. There followed a rapid intensification of "rationalization" within the coal industry as the forces of concentration and mechanization took hold. During the twenty years following nationalization the number of mines shrank from 980 to 317, displacing large numbers of miners in the process. Made politically desirable by production conditions during World War II, nationalization was preceded in 1944 by the formation of the National Union of Miners out of 36 county unions.

A key appeal of nationalization for the miners had been that it would reduce uncertainty; it became evident, however, that it was not miners' uncertainty but that of coal-using industries which was reduced. By the 1960s coal was being displaced by oil as an energy source so to remain competitive the National Coal Board (NCB) stepped up mechanization to reduce its costs. Production was concentrated in thick-seamed coal fields and power-loaded continuous cutting and conveying techniques were introduced (accounting for 10 per cent of production in 1955, mechanized pits increased to 38 per cent in 1960, 87 per cent in 1965, and 92 per cent by 1970).

Miners acquiesced to these developments, Allen argues, because of the powerful dominant ideology of justification: "the need to provide cheap power to industry, to expand exports, to compete with oil, to overcome the fuel crisis. The NCB and the Government were never lost for crises." (58) Added to this was the weight of the dominant press, particularly reinforced by the ideological sway of the Labour government's appeal to "the national interest." There was, according to Allen, "almost complete collaboration" between the union and the NCB government. Moreover, "collaboration did not stop with the demise of the Labour Government in 1951, nor when the experience of nationalization turned sour after 1956." (62-3) There was rank-and-file resistance against specific closures but mainly the response was an exodus of miners from the industry. Remaining miners experienced a real decline of earning power by more than 30 per cent during the 1960s; their wages fell from 7.4 per cent above the manufacturing average in 1960 to 3.1 per cent below in 1970. Conditions were set for a show-down with the employer and confrontation with acquiescent union leadership.

The core of Allen's book is an intensive study of factors leading to and involved in the seven-week national strike of 1972, the first official national strike by miners since 1926. Included is an examination of the leadership, strategy, tactics, issues, and events which ended the union's policy of collaboration and placed it squarely in confrontation with the government's incomes policy. In dealing with the politics of class, Allen concentrates on leaders but rank-and-file miners are not totally ignored (nor are their families).

The remainder of the book follows a series of struggles between the miners and the state. Allen observes that "despite themselves the miners were using industrial action for political ends." (230)

Encouraged by the "energy crisis" as a period of renewed demand for coal, miners were determined to win redress for past losses. While attempting to win a contract beyond the Conservative government's wage guidelines, the union banned overtime and the government responded with a State of Emergency. Miners balloted on whether to call another national strike, essentially given a choice between the government and union positions; 81 per cent favoured the union. An election was called as the strike was imminent and it became a major electoral issue. The Conservatives lost power and the miners won their demands following a month-long strike.

The minority Labour victory marked a return to collaboration by the union executive, a move resisted with significant internal opposition by militants. Tripartite talks were entered into as the government sought higher production levels to meet the energy shortage, but internal union unity was fractured. Here Allen introduces his main thesis that "the Union does not operate in a vacuum. It is a crucial political weapon in the class struggle." (283) This struggle is complicated by a variety of tendencies within the union in terms of the ideological, political, and class consciousness characteristic of both officials and membership. While the struggle is on-going, Allen concludes that miners "have learned that there is an alternative to every decision, to every course of action, to every situation even including the capitalist system itself." (323) This astuteness has become the basis of their militancy and the foundation which has politicized the union.

For a study of *The Militancy of British Miners*, however, this book is weak in explaining the great variation in the militancy of various pits and regions (such as the militant Doncaster area versus the moderate Yorkshire district). The reader is left seeking an understanding of the social, economic, and cultural basis for

such variation and diversity, both within union leadership and membership. Events are described in detail but the author fails to account for why people act as they do. Overall Allen does portray the uncertainty of life in mining communities and provides a great deal of insight into the politics of class struggle.

Wallace Clement  
Carleton University

Norman and Jeanne MacKenzie, eds., *The Diary of Beatrice Webb, Volume One, 1873-1892: "Glitter Around and Darkness Within"* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press 1982).

With labour and pain I master some poor fact, I clutch it, look at it over and over again like a miser with his coin of gold. At times I pour before me my little board of facts — a tiny little heap it is — some of it base coin too. I pass them through and through my brain, like the miser passes the gold through his hands trying to imagine that before me lies the wealth of the world wherewith I may untie the knots of human destiny.

THESE WORDS, AN ALL too telling depiction of the labours and delusions of many historians, social scientists, and students of public administration, were penned in 1884 by Beatrice Potter, who later became part of a working partnership which was to dominate the intellectual left in England for years and whose literary, political, and educational legacies have provided the stepping stones for generations who seek to understand the nature of social reality. The partnership of Beatrice Potter and Sidney Webb is justly famous and was productive enough to justify Sidney's reflection that "One and one, placed in a sufficiently integrated relationship, make not two, but eleven." Within seven years of their marriage in 1892 the Webbs had produced three works on industrial problems, among them the still useful *History of Trade Unionism*; founded the



London School of Economics, their major institutional contribution to the social sciences; became the leaders, with Bernard Shaw, of the Fabian society; acquired impressive expertise in municipal and educational reform; and committed themselves to the extraordinary series of monographs on English local government which were to take them 30 years to complete. But such solid accomplishments were, judging from the evidence of her diary, far from the imaginings of the 26-year-old upper-middle-class woman whose words are quoted above.

In 1884 Beatrice Potter was suffering from poor health, from depression which frequently manifested itself in suicidal thoughts, from the after-effects of a disastrous relationship with the politician Joseph Chamberlain (which was to remain an obsession for years after it ended), and from an underestimation of her own talents. Though she deprecated her own talents as "minute" and "beggarly," she sought to sublimate her emotional reverses through work: the study of economics and philosophy as well as practical labour as a rent-collector in the Katherine Buildings in London's East End. By 1886 she had found her vocation in the study of poverty and its causes; that vocation had been confirmed by the acceptance for publication of her first short article, "A Lady's View of the Unemployed" (1886) by the *Pall Mall Gazette*, an occurrence which she termed "a turning point in my life." Beatrice's "turning point" was also in many ways that for a generation. Her diary records the remarkable conversion to socialism of a wealthy, well-read, bourgeois young lady who had been socially active in the upper echelons of British society and strongly influenced by Herbert Spencer. She became not simply an armchair socialist but one who was prepared to dedicate her life and work to the cause.

As an individual record, her diary documents the early life and intellectual maturation of a remarkable woman. Notewor-

thy was the self-discipline which she applied to her work — a self-discipline more outstanding for being found in someone who did not have to use what she learned to support herself. Beatrice devoted assiduous effort to schooling herself in the techniques of empirical study (which found their first fruits in her work as a social researcher for Charles Booth), to painstaking research and background reading, and to teaching herself how to write. A distinguishing characteristic of the woman revealed in the diaries is a strong obligation to commit her life to public service. At nineteen, Beatrice wrote: "One hardly feels that one has the right to live if one is not fulfilling some duty towards humanity." In Beatrice this youthful idealism was reinforced when romantic disappointment pushed her to think further of the contribution to public work which could be made by intelligent single women. "Altruism is after all," she reflected, "the creed of those who are suffering personal misery and yet do not intend to sink into abject wretchedness. It used to be devotion to God, . . . now this God is dead it must be devotion to other human beings." Perseverance, intelligence, dedication, and a great deal of hard work combined to form the critical foundation for the apprenticeship of a great pioneering social scientist.

These were Beatrice Potter Webb's strengths, but she was forthright about her weaknesses and chastised herself repeatedly for her self-indulgence and vanity, as well as occasionally for her inability to appreciate the arts or make much of literature not firmly rooted in empirical reality. When she rejected marriage to Chamberlain, she did not pretend that public service was nobler: in fact, the diaries of these years are an honest, trenchant record of the tension between the attractions of comfortable, if stultifying, domesticity and lonely independence. Later, when her choice of independent work began to produce renown and yield publications, Beatrice bemoaned her ina-

bility to work for the love of the work alone without the stimulus of "vulgar ambition." Among the things for which Beatrice Webb has been most berated (at least in the period before her marriage in 1892) was her anti-feminism. Here, too, she was capable of self-criticism: she later acknowledged that the signing of an anti-feminist manifesto had been a mistake and explained that at the root of her conservatism was "the fact that I had never myself suffered the disabilities assumed to arise from my sex;" moreover, had she been a man, she thought, she would have been pushed into a money-making profession and not allowed the luxury of "a career of disinterested research." Educated, wealthy, raised in a family which valued female intelligence, childless, socially skilled, and politically astute, she certainly suffered few of the disadvantages which weighed heavily on others of her sex.

The diary is more than an introspective document: it records life in the slums as seen through the evidence gathered by a disciplined social investigator as well as through firsthand insights provided by a stint as a "plain hand" in a sweated tailoring shop; it includes astute observations of political events and personalities; and it reveals the fascination and the tedium of "the season" alongside the sometimes violent desperation of dockland unemployment. This volume of Beatrice Webb's diaries extends from its beginning when the author was fifteen to the time of her marriage at 34 to Sidney Webb. Where the evidence of the diary is thin, as during the period of the Webbs' unusual courtship, the editors have drawn on their detailed knowledge of the Webb papers to supplement the text with quotations from their correspondence or other writings. This is an historical document of note, and one which, thanks in large measure to the Mackenzies' skillful editing and introductions, reads like a well-crafted novel.

Patricia E. Malcolmson  
Ontario Ministry of Health

John Hughes, *Britain in Crisis: De-industrialization and how to fight it* (Nottingham: Spokesman 1981).

JOHN HUGHES, PRINCIPAL of Ruskin College, Oxford, wrote this clear and densely packed little book early in 1981, charting and analyzing the collapse of British manufacturing industry and outlining an alternative social-democratic strategy for recovery. The two years that have elapsed have strikingly confirmed most of his analytic judgements. They have not, however, done much to make his alternative strategy seem more plausible. The strengths and weaknesses of his book exemplify those of an important part of the "old" Labour left in Britain.

The strengths are extremely important. Hughes cuts through the mystification of most business journalism to show that the post-1960 decline in British manufacturing is nothing less than catastrophic. This is true by every indicator. During the 1970s productivity fell to less than half the North American rate, and less than a third that of France, Germany, and Japan; net manufacturing investment declined from 2.5 per cent of Net Domestic Product to 1.2 per cent during the same period. Employment fell by 30 per cent. Manufactured exports fell while imports increased: in the case of finished manufactured goods, exports fell from twice the value of imports in 1970, to parity in 1979. And whole industrial sectors contracted to the point of virtual collapse, wiping out capacity the lack of which increases the vulnerability of the economy to further import penetration and balance of payments problems at the next upturn.

Since Hughes wrote in early 1981 nearly all these indicators have become worse. Manufacturing output has fallen slightly further; manufacturing employment has fallen almost another million. Manufactured imports now exceed exports. Net manufacturing investment has fallen to around zero, which suggests

that the one indicator which has moved positively since early 1981 — productivity per person-hour, which rose at a rate of about 10 per cent a year between the end of 1980 and the middle of 1982 — was due primarily to the closure of less efficient plants, and more intensive labour, and hardly at all to technological innovation. And the contraction of entire industrial sectors continues, most dramatically in the case of steel, but also in textiles, and with ominous declines in some areas of engineering (the West Midlands now has higher unemployment than traditionally depressed Scotland).

According to the market doctrine of Sir Geoffrey Howe and Mr. Leon Brittan, the economy has become "leaner and fitter," shorn of the "supply side" encumbrances of obsolete units, trade union restrictive practices, and parasitic state spending. Hughes argues that, on the contrary, the Thatcher deflation has accelerated obsolescence in virtually all sectors, which certainly accords more with both everyday observation and the statistics. And the state's share of the GDP has risen, not fallen, as GDP has shrunk and the social security bill increased.

Hughes' diagnosis turns on four main factors: the central role of multi-national corporations in Britain (in 1978, 50 companies, with nearly 50 per cent of the country's industrial and commercial assets, concentrated 42 per cent of their production abroad — and both of the last two figures have been growing); the drastic shift of trade from the Commonwealth, where Britain had historic advantages, to the EEC, where she has historic disadvantages; inept state economic policies; and the struggle between capital and labour over the dwindling surplus, a struggle resolved in practice by successive devaluations of sterling, which ultimately aggravated inflation and declining international competitiveness (as exporters responded by raising sterling prices, rather than by using foreign price advan-

tage to enlarge their share of export markets).

If anyone still doubts that the British economic problem bids to be as serious, if not more serious, than Germany's in the 1920s, they should read Hughes' book. What he describes is, in the simplest terms, a small island which must sustain 55 million people by international trade, which can no longer solve problems by mass emigration or protectionism, and which is none the less rapidly losing the ability to engage in trade in competition with other manufacturing economies. As a result capital (of which multinational companies are only a highly rationalized form) is less and less likely to remain there, let alone flow in (in 1981 the net outflow of private capital was over £7 billion, when net manufacturing investment in Britain was around zero). Today's unemployment in Britain (conservatively indicated by the 16.5 per cent registered male unemployment rate in September 1982) is probably only a foretaste of one form of the impoverishment that must sooner or later be shared by all sectors of the population (except, of course, capital and its functionaries) unless something very radical happens.

But Hughes' solution is less persuasive than his analysis. He advocates a "new style mixed economy of a more democratic and creative kind." The essential thing, he rightly insists, is the rapid construction of an efficient national manufacturing industry (the idea that Britain can "live with" de-industrialization, as journalists glibly imply, is a cruel illusion). This means, Hughes argues, resolute state involvement in both public and private sector investment and in R and D; radical education and training initiatives; state purchasing policies; etc. Investible resources exist in the shape of North Sea oil revenues (for a generation, more or less), and in the workers' pension funds (together with insurance funds these now own over 40 per cent of all UK equity shares, but they are presently being

invested in *Japan*, in spite of their privileged tax status). It also means industrial democracy. Trade unions will have to sacrifice pay increases and accept work-sharing, half-time work, and earlier retirement, in favour of technological advance, a higher social wage, and new jobs for the unemployed; and they can only be expected to agree if they have a major share in enterprise planning and management as well as in national policy-making.

The trouble is that Hughes' analysis is purely economic and ignores the only political conditions under which such an approach is really thinkable in Britain, that is, a mobilization of popular opinion and feeling, and of party and union cadres, strong enough to impose themselves over a prolonged period in face of the hostility of both capital, the state apparatus, and the media. The vision he puts forward — supported by some important practical proposals for its implementation — is one that can be envisaged either as an end in itself, or as a transitional step towards socialism. But in either case it is hard to imagine that the sort of class and popular mobilization needed to make it possible could be accomplished and still find international capital ready to play its part, as something like an equal partner with organized labour, in the modernization of British industry. Would capital not be more likely to settle for South Africa or Brazil? And on the other hand, the sort of popular mobilization required will have to go far beyond organized labour (the "voluntary" component of which is probably now a minority of the labour force: Hughes' view of the unions' strength and "maturity" is to say the least debatable). It will have at least to rely on the full support of an expanded women's movement, on the anti-nuclear movement, the green movement, and more — on all of which there is a symptomatic silence in Hughes' book.

And then there is the most sobering fact of all — Michael Foot's foreword to the book, audibly trembling with anxiety

not to be closely identified with its contents. He hopes that "every Socialist in the country will study it with care and sympathy." In relation to the main Labour leadership, in other words, Hughes is an extreme radical; even now, few of them have really grasped that the foundations of the old world of British social democracy have collapsed. And the crux of the political situation is that the Thatcherite Conservatives do understand this, whatever illusions they may cherish about the economic alternatives.

Colin Leys  
Queen's University

William P.L. Thomson. *The Little General and the Rousay Crofters: Crisis and Conflict on an Orkney Crofting Estate* (Edinburgh: John Donald 1981).

THIS REMARKABLY THOROUGH book details the background, course, and consequences of conflict on one Orkney estate in the late nineteenth century. General Frederick William Traill-Burroughs (1831-1905) was a native of northern India, born into a military family of Irish ancestry, and in 1847, while at school in Switzerland, he inherited his guardian's estate on Rousay, one of the North Isles of Orkney. He only saw the estate once as an adult before 1870, when, toward the end of his military career, and following many years abroad, he returned to Britain permanently. Yet during his absence he had taken care to enlarge his estate through purchase, and by 1853 he owned virtually the entire island, a position of monopoly enjoyed by no previous proprietor.

Burroughs took up full-time residence on Rousay in 1873 upon retiring from the army. It is clear that the island had experienced rapid and profound changes since the acquisition of the estate by Burroughs' guardian in 1840. These included two significant clearances, the consolidation of almost all the island into one estate, the dramatic expansion of arable land through reclamation, and the rise of

the crofting class to become numerically predominant. (A crofter is a farmer who pays rent directly to a landlord for an individual holding.) In the post-1840 period crofters' rents on Rousay rose steadily, and at the same time they were losing their traditional grazing rights — the other side of the increase in arable land. Yet relations between landlord and tenant remained good, at least superficially, for agricultural prices were rising, and the crofters, although pressed, were able to meet their obligations.

Rack-renting by Burroughs, an amateur at estate management, after the retirement of his highly professional long-time factor in 1873, and the onset of agricultural depression in the early 1880s, made a significant number of Rousay crofters fall into arrears for the first time. This altered local situation combined with events outside Orkney to shatter the calm of Burroughs' estate. The Irish Land Act of 1881 gave small tenants in Ireland security of tenure, the legal power to sell their interest in their holdings, and a right to judicial determination of rent. These developments were watched closely in the crofting areas of Scotland, and the widespread distress in the crofting parts of the Highlands resulted in growing agitation and actual outbreaks of disorder on Skye. The Gladstone government responded by appointing the Napier Commission to investigate the condition of crofters and cottars (agricultural labourers) in the Highlands and Islands. The bitter denunciation of Burroughs, whom the crofters evidently held responsible for their deteriorating position, before the commission in 1883 shocked the laird, and he retaliated by evicting two crofters' delegates who had testified against him. As well as provoking minor local disturbances, this revenge-taking received national publicity, and an evicted delegate, James Leonard, was hired as one of only two full-time employees of the Highland Land Law Reform Association.

The 1886 Crofters Act gave all

(remaining) crofters security of tenure, the right to compensation for improvements when vacating a holding, and the right to a "fair rent," to be determined by a land court. Infuriated, Burroughs used every possible weakness, anomaly, or ambiguity he could detect in the new system in an effort to evict his crofters; indeed, a special Act of Parliament was rushed through in 1887 to thwart one of his manoeuvres. In the end, he was notably unsuccessful. For their part, the "Crofters Party," as the opponents of Burroughs became known, fought back through such channels as were open to them. In particular, the author documents the non-educational use to which the elective School Board, formerly controlled by Burroughs and the "Respectables," was put in the latter 1880s: firing teachers associated with the laird's party. By the end of the decade Burroughs' economic and social domination of Rousay life had been severely shaken by the Crofters Act and the activity of the local "Crofters Party." The tense confrontation only ended with the unravelling of the career of one of the two leaders of the latter group, the local Free Church minister, who was exposed as an alcoholic and forced to leave Rousay in disgrace in 1889. A bachelor, he seems also to have been something of a womanizer. In fact, he had made the daughter of Leonard, the other leader of the crofters, pregnant; and for his daughter's sake, Leonard left Orkney with his family, never to return. After these staggering blows to the leadership ranks of the "Crofters Party," the movement entered a rapid decline in Rousay.

William P.L. Thomson, the author of this splendid book, makes no pretence that the story in Rousay was typical of crofting areas in the north of Scotland. Indeed, Burroughs, a war hero of the 1850s, acquired a *national* reputation for vindictiveness — the "Rousay Pharaoh" — for his treatment of his crofters in the 1880s and 1890s. Thomson delves into the general's military career to uncover

the traits which made him so unsuitable for dealing with resentful crofters in 1883: inflexibility, sensitivity to slight (probably related to his being barely five feet in height), a concern to punish offenders against his sense of the rightness of things, and an unpredictable temper. Even his attractive traits helped to create problems with his tenants. His generosity in taking over the debts of his financially irresponsible father — who seemed incapable even of cashing cheques payable to himself — added to his own debts, a burden ultimately passed on to those responsible for the major source of his income, namely his tenants. Thomson also makes it clear that Rousay was in no sense a microcosm of the Highlands. Indeed Orkney is not part of the Highlands, has a milder climate, and is more fertile. In the period under study, Orkney was more prosperous than the Highland crofting areas, and featured more economic differentiation. Rather than the mass of commoners forming a community of impoverished equals, there was a sort of farming "ladder," to use the author's phrase. Furthermore, Orkney probably had the highest literacy rate of any area of Scotland. Orcadians themselves did not speak Gaelic and did not have a history of clanship. Finally, Thomson points out that the Free Church minister played an absolutely crucial role in the crofters' movement in Rousay, whereas, according to James Hunter, *The Making of the Crofting Community* (1976), the Free Church clergy usually contributed little in the Highlands.

Hence the value of this book for the historian interested in more than Rousay comes down to its impressively judicious use of a wide variety of sources to produce a microscopically detailed local history. The author has used folklore, oral history, government records, estate accounts, and personal papers, and, one feels, has squeezed out of them all that can be honestly extracted. He has effectively used maps, tables, plates, and genealogical

charts to illustrate the evidence and create a tightly woven fabric. There is even a detailed chapter on Burroughs' part in suppressing the Indian Mutiny, with a weighing of evidence on his controversial role in the relief of Lucknow which is a model of its kind. And for the Canadian historian interested in parallels with the Prince Edward Island land question, the debates over the merits of the 1886 Crofters Act bring home just how drastically interventionist, in British terms, were the proposed solutions put forward by Island reformers and radicals in the 1850s and 1860s, and how dangerous — as possible precedents — they must have seemed to the landed classes of Great Britain.

Ian Ross Robertson  
University of Toronto

Margaret Maruani, *Les syndicats à l'épreuve du féminisme* (Paris: Éditions Syros 1979).

MARGARET MARUANI BEGAN a sociology thesis on relations between the French feminist movement and unions but changed her focus to explore the impact of feminism on unions, revising her study for a more general audience. Unable to delimit the amorphous *Mouvement de Libération des Femmes*, she compared a sample of the women's groups that sprang up in the mid-1970s to the firm-specific women's committees affiliated to unions that formed about the same time. She discovered a surprising overlap in personnel in spite of a structural separation, with the groups remaining fiercely independent and the committees choosing to operate within the larger arena of the unions. With these findings, she challenges what she considers to be historically-based assumptions about the bourgeois character of feminism (and since the publication of her book, historical research has questioned the exclusively bourgeois character of early French feminism). These findings,

presented in part three of *Les syndicats à l'épreuve du féminisme*, also help account for the adoption of feminist positions by the two major French labour federations (the CFTC and the CGT) in the 1970s. These positions include the acceptance of the social nature of private problems, beginning with abortion, which, she argues in part one, enlarges the labour movement's field of action. This complaisant analysis is given nuance by a comparison of the CFTC's early endorsement of complete equality and its refusal to isolate or prioritize women's struggles, with the CGT's slow movement toward complete equality, separatist tradition, and emphasis on the struggle against capitalism.

The second section of the book, entitled "Women's Strikes, Women on Strike," is the most substantial and suggestive. This section is at once scholarly and *engage* in the best sense of the word. Making no claims about "typicality," Maruani does monographic studies of four strike movements ranging from a women-led occupation and operation of a factory, through an equally feminine series of actions on many fronts, a mixed strike, and the resistance to Rhone-Poulenc-Textile's efforts to lay off married women. In addition to using documentary sources, she interviewed many strikers, and her respectful approach produced remarkable results. For instance, she documents how striking highlights women's familial constraints in so far as house and child-care responsibilities continue and must be accommodated to the strike, or vice versa. In the mixed strike, where women were marginalized, the union's insensitivity to women's other obligations led to a feminist group and consciousness-raising, then to a mixed commission which obtained some concessions, notably child care for strikers, and, at the women's instigation, to a "broadening" of discussions to include the whole problem of piece rates and union democracy. In the women's strikes, the fact that

no one had the time to be a full-time leader (especially after school hours) meant a non-hierarchical form of direct democracy based on general assemblies. When Maruani asked why press accounts did not mention the "feminine dimension" in women's strikes, her subject answered that the reporters only wanted to know about problems, so the women did not respond. By asking about positive as well as negative effects of striking, Maruani elicited precious information where others met silence. One wonders how often the "feminine dimension" of strikes has gone unrecorded for similar reasons. Elsewhere her openly-proclaimed feminist and union sympathies may limit her scope. When she refers to husbands opposing their wives striking, she does not indicate the husbands' class position, how they opposed, or how long their opposition lasted. When she notes that we hear nothing about husbands' support actions, the implication is that husbands were indifferent. Yet she cites support demonstrations without analyzing their composition. Did none of these strong women draw their husbands into the struggle? Finally, she lists among one communist local's explanations for not resisting the firing of married women the men's hostility to some of the women as wives of managers, and their disapproval of two-income households, but she does not explore "the men's" attitudes herself. While the explanations sound suspiciously like excuses, they touch on class consciousness, which deserves more attention here and throughout the book.

These reservations aside, Maruani's pioneering studies and provocative reflections open new vistas on women's work and strike experiences for other scholars and offer new opportunities to unions organizing women. In contradiction to received wisdom, she argues that wage work, not domestic roles or expectations, shape women's identities at work and at home. More originally, she proposes that mobilizing for strikes engenders in

women a "double consciousness" of capitalist exploitation and patriarchal oppression, especially if mixed unions ignore women's familial constraints. She posits, tentatively, that women who have to wage a "two-front war" may become more combative than men. Finally, she suggests that women, who form the majority of low-paid piece-rate workers, will, if unionized, force unions to address the problems of all overexploited workers. Her conclusions may seem optimistic, but they merit serious study and consideration.

Mary Lynn McDougall  
Simon Fraser University

William Harvey Maehl, *August Bebel. Shadow Emperor of the German Workers* (Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society 1980).

AUGUST BEBEL WAS ONE of the greatest leaders in the history of the international workers' movement. From his first activity in the workers' educational societies in Leipzig in the early 1860s to his death in August 1913, Bebel devoted his entire life to organizing his fellow workers and to guiding them in their struggle for a better world. His career spanned the era of Marx and Engels to that of Luxemburg and Lenin, from the Franco-Prussian War to the eve of World War I. He was the outstanding practitioner of socialism in the period when the German Social Democratic Party adopted a Marxist revolutionary programme. Trained in the aftermath of the 1848 revolution and in the shadow of the Paris Commune, Bebel lived to wrestle with the problems of militarism and imperialism, the growth of labour unions, and the re-evaluation of revolutionary politics after 1900.

William Harvey Maehl has written the first detailed political biography of Bebel in English, and his original research is a contribution to the available literature in German as well. This is essentially a

chronicle of Bebel's political life and activities, reconstructed in almost day-to-day detail. It should therefore be a useful reference work for historians of the German Social Democratic Party.

However, as a biography it is disappointing. Maehl so emphasizes Bebel's political activities that the reader gets little or no feeling for the person. What motivated this worker from a poverty-stricken background to devote his entire being unswervingly to the cause of his fellow workers? Bebel himself shielded his family and private life from public view, and he often sacrificed both to his public responsibilities. Nonetheless, his private life certainly impinged upon his politics, even if there was not necessarily a simple, direct link between the two. It should be the task of the biographer to present a more rounded view of such a key historical figure, to bring out the humanity that was an integral part of Bebel's appeal to workers.

More seriously, this biography does not place Bebel into the overall context of German society and politics. Maehl's extensive research rarely goes beyond a simple chronological presentation of his political life. Missing is the historical analysis that one finds in studies of other outstanding leaders of this period, such as in Goldberg's biography of Jean Jaurès and Nettl's biography of Rosa Luxemburg. Without a thorough grounding in the complexities of German history, the general reader will quickly become lost in the mass of detail, and the specialist will likely find the narrow approach tedious and unenlightening. Finally, Maehl has a tendency to superimpose his ideological viewpoint onto his material. His thesis, to the extent that he has one, boils down to the assertion that Bebel was a precursor of Willy Brandt and that Bebel's SPD laid the foundation for the German Social Democratic Party of the 1960s and 1970s. This simplistic analysis, which the historian can hardly take seriously, fails to do justice to Bebel's achievements and limita-



tions, his contribution to the German workers' movement, or the complexity of German history and the role of workers in it from the 1860s to 1914. In any case, since this biography is little more than a political chronicle, Maehl's tendentious interpretation is more an irrelevant irritation than an integral part of the text.

In sum, Maehl's biography of Bebel will interest specialists who want to know exactly what Bebel was doing politically at any specific moment, but it falls short of the mark both as a biography of the person and as an analysis of Bebel's place in and contribution to the German workers' movement.

Larry Peterson  
Institute for Research in History,  
New York

Gary P. Steenson, *"Not One Man! Not One Penny!" German Social Democracy 1863-1914* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press 1981).

GARY P. STEENSON'S HISTORY of German Social Democracy is a useful, well-written introduction to a complex, much disputed subject. Published in paperback form, it makes the SPD's history particularly accessible to non-specialists, and it is highly suited for use in European history courses, for courses on comparative workers' history, and for labour historians in other fields who would like to know something about the German workers' movement. Steenson uses a traditional, national and political approach that de-emphasizes social and local history, but he successfully highlights the main problems of the SPD's history from the founding of Lassalle's *Allgemeiner Deutscher Arbeiterverband* in 1863 to the outbreak of World War I.

After a chronological analysis of the development of Social Democracy from 1863 to 1890, Steenson concentrates on five main topics: the position of the SPD in

the German Reich (the electoral system, parliament, and foreign policy); the relations between the party and the trade unions; the development of the party's organization (including the party press and auxiliary organizations); regional differences in Social Democratic politics (especially the different paths of the Prussian and Bavarian parties); and the role of theory and intellectuals (analyses of Kautsky, Bernstein, and Luxemburg, as well as of the SPD's role in the Second International).

Particularly strong are Steenson's analyses of the SPD's place in the German Reich and its relations with the trade unions. He brings out all the complexities of the SPD's participation in electoral politics and parliament, recognizing that the pursuit of reforms was not inherently reformist but that the SPD never clarified the relationship of tactical reforms to revolutionary strategy, largely to maintain the unity of all factions in the party. His analysis of the discriminatory German electoral system is excellent, and he makes the crucial distinction between the SPD's success in winning votes and its vulnerability in winning mandates which so affected the party's perception of the success of its political strategy. Steenson also points out that the SPD tended to concentrate on domestic issues and never developed a fully coherent position on foreign policy; this greatly conditioned the SPD's response to the outbreak of war in 1914. Steenson's chapter on party-union relations is an excellent treatment of a complex subject and can serve as an introduction to one of the key problems of socialism at the time of the Second International. Steenson emphasizes the development and growth of union organizations and their impact on Social Democratic politics. Although he does not discuss strikes and industrial unrest, relations between the union leadership and rank and file, and union-state relations, he highlights the craft structure of German unions (even nominally industrial ones).

the growth of union bureaucracy and autonomy from the SPD, and the different conceptions of party and union leaders over the economic and political role of unions in the transition to socialism. Steenson also points out that at the same time the SPD capitulated to the unions over the mass strike, anti-militarist agitation, the youth movement, and the celebration of May Day (between 1905 and 1910), the absolute and relative number of Social Democratic members in the unions actually increased. Why the SPD did not take advantage of this mass following inside the unions to apply pressure on union leaders from below and what political alternatives were open to the SPD if it had done so are major political questions that historians should investigate further. Finally, in his chapter on party organization Steenson provides a useful discussion of the internal bias within the SPD toward small party locals. Both the overrepresentation of small locals in national party organs and the decentralization of the party according to electoral districts discriminated against the great mass of Social Democratic workers concentrated in urban, industrial regions. This is a subject that needs to be analyzed more closely in social terms, particularly as it relates to later divisions in the German workers' movement.

The second half of Steenson's book is more problematic. Although he poses the key political problems of the SPD's history, he does not come to grips with the dialectic of reform and revolution in the German workers' movement. He uncritically accepts Robert Michels' organizational determinism and does not take adequate account of the many examples in the SPD where the creation of mass, even bureaucratic, organization reinforced and stimulated workers' radicalism. He tends to analyze the party's organization and politics in terms of stark dichotomies — between revolutionary opposition to or negative integration in capitalist society, between socialist counter-culture or work-

ers' subculture — rather than in relation to the complex political and social structures of Wilhelmine Germany. His chapter on regional differences oversimplifies divisions in the party and overemphasizes political institutions by contrasting the "radicalism" of Social Democrats under Prussia's authoritarian and discriminatory political system and the "reformism" of the SPD in more liberal Bavaria. This uncritical acceptance of the conventional view that divides the SPD politically between North and South Germany fails to take into account the radicalism of workers in Saxony, Thuringia, the Bavarian Palatinate, and parts of Hesse, Baden, and Württemberg (all in the "reformist" south), as well as the reformism of many Social Democrats in "radical" Prussia. A social historical approach, which would have taken account of social and economic as well as political structures, would have been better suited to explain the complexities of the SPD's social base and political divisions. Finally, Steenson's chapter on theory and intellectuals personalizes their role in the SPD too much by concentrating on three exemplary figures. Although Steenson provides useful summaries of the work of Kautsky, Bernstein, and Luxemburg, he fails to address the broader questions of where theory fits into the party's political practice, what role intellectuals played in the party, and how the creation of an ideology provided the SPD as a whole and factions in the party with a language and concepts to define their politics. His conclusion that the SPD devoted a lot of time to the development of theory but never used it practically fails to come to grips with the party's creation of an ideological framework as an integral part of its appeal to workers. In the end, Steenson concludes that the SPD's Marxism was little more than window-dressing, that German workers would have eagerly let themselves be integrated into capitalist society if only the state and its Junker and capitalist supporters had been willing to

make a few political concessions and social reforms. Like most historians of the SPD, Steenson falls into the trap of trying to fit the party's development from 1863 to 1914 in a single mold, in this case by trying to reduce it to the prehistory of Willy Brandt's and Helmut Schmidt's SPD. In so doing, he glosses over or rationalizes many contradictory aspects of the party's history. The SPD followed no linear path of development, before or after 1914. Its history cannot be fully understood without recognizing the multifaceted sources of the workers' movement within the complex structures and relations of German society.

Despite these criticisms, Steenson's history of the SPD is nevertheless a solid introduction to both the SPD and its place in German politics before 1914. His chapter on the place of the SPD in the German political system and on party-union relations are among the best general treatments of these subjects in English and are reason alone to welcome his study. Many will disagree with his conclusions about the development of party organization, regional differences, and the role of theory and intellectuals, but Steenson succeeds in posing many of the key political problems that the SPD faced. His book fills a major gap in English-language literature on the German workers' movement and should be particularly useful as a pedagogical tool.

Larry Peterson  
Institute for Research in History,  
New York

Denis MacShane, *Solidarity: Poland's Independent Trade Union* (Nottingham: Spokesman 1981).

SOLIDARITY'S SUDDEN APPEARANCE on the Polish and world scenes gave rise to a virtual mini-industry in western publishing. During that brief period from the summer of 1980 to the summer of 1982, when world attention was riveted on

Poland, there was an outpouring of volumes ranging from stiff sociological treatises all the way to photo collections glorifying Lech Walesa. The market was indeed broad. For Solidarity appealed to almost the entire political spectrum, from those on the left who saw in it, and justifiably so, the promise of a genuine democratic socialism, to the right, which perceived in Solidarity an anti-socialist movement that would restore capitalism and deal a blow to the political and military might of the Soviet Union. (This latter view was also shared by certain left elements, notably those close to the communist parties.)

To the casual observer Solidarity was, and remains, an enigma. Here, it seemed, was the working class of an important industrial society at last assuming the historic role Marx had attributed to it as the hegemonic force, the leader of the nation in a highly egalitarian (and clearly anti-capitalist) movement for democracy and social justice. But here too was a working class that chose not to celebrate May Day, the international workers' holiday, preferring 3 May, a national holiday commemorating the liberal constitution of 1791; a working class that made use of its newly-won autonomy to turn the official miners' holiday of 4 December into a religious festival of St. Barbara, patron saint of the miners, whose statue, duly blessed, was placed in every pit.

It is this complex reality of Solidarity as a workers' movement, but one with its own historical and cultural roots, that Denis MacShane sets out to explain in this slim but surprisingly comprehensive and well-informed volume written in summer 1981 with rank-and-file trade unionists in mind. MacShane is a former president of the British and Irish National Union of Journalists and is presently an official of the International Metalworkers' Federation. He visited Poland in 1981 and was able to speak at length with both leaders and rank-and-file members of Solidarity. He thus brings a great deal of empathy,

western trade-union experience and ordinary common sense to the topic, and it is these traits that recommend this book amidst the dozens of volumes that have appeared on the topic.

At the same time, the book is marked by an ambivalence (one cannot help but feel that it too is related to MacShane's background as a British trade-union official) which the author never really faces up to and which makes this a much less illuminating work than it might otherwise have been. MacShane, following Walesa and the moderate majority of Solidarity's top leadership (the author does not hide his preference for "cautious centrists in whom trust can be placed" over "radical demagogues"), emphasizes that Solidarity is a trade union, that it does not seek political power. This is the vision of the "self-limiting revolution" in which the bureaucratic state is left in place as society gradually wrests from its control increasingly large chunks of social and economic life, which it proceeds to organize autonomously. To pose the question of power, to directly challenge the state, would be suicidal — this would provoke an armed Soviet intervention and reduce to naught all that had been won. The logic of this strategy, as Jacek Kuron, one of its main proponents, readily admitted, was that Solidarity must, in fact, prop up the failing state as the only bulwark standing between itself and the "ultimate disaster."

The premise upon which this strategy rested — the long-term possibility of co-existence between the bureaucratic state and an independent workers' movement — proved illusory. It is a tribute to MacShane's journalistic skills that this is already quite evident from the story he tells, even though he himself seems only confusedly aware of this and refuses to draw any conclusions. (The closest he comes is the following statement: "The existence of Solidarity raised political questions that at the time seemed almost better left unanswered." [132])

The premise was illusory on two inter-related counts. On the one hand, the state showed from the start that it was unwilling to tolerate Solidarity, no matter how the latter defined itself. The history of Solidarity's existence is a chain of government provocations and probing actions. As MacShane observes, Solidarity put forth no new demands after August 1980: all conflicts were over forcing the government to carry out the accords it had signed. The turning point came in March 1981 with the police attack, ordered from on high, on local Solidarity leaders at Bydgoszcz. Solidarity's National Coordinating Commission called for a general strike unless those responsible were punished, but Walesa, in a widely criticized move, called the strike off without having received any real concessions. Where MacShane sees a victory for "responsible leadership" and "realism," the government saw a sign of weakness: the union refused confrontation over the most fundamental of issues, the physical security of its members and leaders. Solidarity to this day has been unable to regain the lost initiative.

On the other hand, regardless of what it said about itself, Solidarity never ceased to be an eminently political movement and could not help being that in a society where the state controls the entire economy. The very structure of Solidarity — built on a regional rather than industrial basis — not only expressed its profoundly egalitarian ethos but was designed "to mirror the actual power structure that exists in Poland." (68) Among the 21 points of the Gdansk accord are the demands for a major reform of economic planning and management, freedom of expression, and an end to political appointments — all political demands, to be sure, but all economic demands too, in the Polish context. Among the many workers MacShane spoke with, no one mentioned a wage increase as one of Solidarity's main achievements. "It is difficult to sum up exactly what difference

Solidarity has made for me," replied a woman electrician, "but now I feel free." (85)

The entire situation posed the question of power. To be sure, this was a very unpleasant question, given the threat of Soviet intervention over a challenge to the "party's leading role," i.e., the bureaucracy's monopoly of power. Hence the tendency to simply avoid the issue and the attractiveness of the idea of a self-limiting revolution. But the defeat of December 1982 showed that the question could not be ignored and that this seemingly realistic strategy was neither realistic nor a strategy. Perhaps then, as Plekhanov commented on the Revolution of 1905, "one should never have begun?" It would be well to recall Kuron's own statement that it was fortunate that he had been in jail in August 1980: "If I had gone there [to Gdansk] I would have told them that expecting to get free trade unions was too much. I really believed it was impossible. In fact, I knew it was impossible." (134)

Those in Poland who opposed the prevailing orientation of Solidarity's leadership (MacShane's "radical demagogues") do not, of course, call for an immediate insurrection. They call rather to pose the issue of power openly before the workers and to work out a long-term strategy with this final goal always in view, so that all the partial struggles and tactical retreats that are necessary will contribute to strengthening the workers' organization and self-confidence rather than demobilizing them and frittering away their energy.

It is clear that the Soviet bureaucracy will not tolerate the independent organization of the working class in its "camp." But it is equally clear that the more formidable the enemy it wants to crush, the more it will hesitate before such a risky action and the more attractive the movement will appear as a model for emulation by the workers of the other countries.

David Mandel  
Université de Québec à Montréal

Alain Besançon, *The Rise of the Gulag: Intellectual Origins of Leninism*, trans., Sarah Matthews (New York 1981).

STARTING WITH THE TITLE ITSELF, this is meant to be a provocative book. The tone is polemical and didactic throughout, perhaps consciously mirroring the subject matter. At times the result is a *tour de force* of the historians' craft — notably as an intellectual analysis of what makes Leninism (if not its architect himself) tick — but it is also too often one-sided and unduly pessimistic. This work is not, therefore, the place for an introduction to Marxism-Leninism, or for a balanced picture of its positive and negative aspects.

Besançon's thesis is not really very new: since the Russian Revolution of 1917, its opponents have stressed its illegitimacy and perverseness; the author sharpens the focus of these categories, arguing that the thought of Lenin is a base confusion of quasi-religion and quasi-science. This horrible mutation — or beast, to use the precise term he chooses — sweeps everything before it in the name of ideology. Following the lead of Solzhenitsyn, Besançon produces a very compelling vision which can only be described as apocalyptic and (again to borrow his own word) Manichean. That is, the modern period of history is seen as increasingly divided between the evil forces of (Leninist) ideology and all that is good in Western liberal civilization; and the former are gaining. This is the continuity thesis with a vengeance, drawing an inexorable progression (decline?) from Hegel to Marx to Engels to Plekhanov to Kautsky to Lenin to Stalin. The linkage is there, undeniably, but (as Medvedev and Cohen among others have noted) that does not prove that there is no significant difference between Lenin and Stalin, or that Stalinism was inevitable as well as irremediable.

Besançon's argument is at its most instructive when tracing the intellectual antecedents of Leninism. His view of it as

a kind of Manichean gnosis is quite convincing, down to such striking details as the notion of two camps, two regions, and three times. It is, of course, the substantive Manicheism of Leninism's monopoly on *true knowledge* and *total explanation* which constitute the more important parallels. The author describes the process of gnosis becoming ideology via modern science in several historical stages, and cannot resist the comparison with stages in the lives of parasites. We are shown the chief political precursors of Lenin in what he calls the French and German cycles: these are Robespierre, Frederick II, Napoleon, and Bismarck (as well as their common ancestor Machiavelli). But as the author grudgingly concedes, Lenin was more than the sum of his parts. "How could one be both Marat and Bismarck? This is the mystery of Lenin." (191)

The key to understanding Lenin, in any case, is not to be found in the many foreign influences (however more original they may have been intrinsically), but rather in the intellectually minor notes of native Russian radicalism, and especially in the persons of Chernyshevsky and Tkachev. Thus, important as were Jacobin politics (closely blending consciousness with opportunism) and Hegelian dialectics (with the scary capacity to explain away all inconvenient contradictions), Chernyshevsky's anti-liberalism and Tkachev's sense of timing were still more fundamental. Leninism, we must infer, might not have happened anywhere but in Russia — and here Besançon parts company with Solzhenitsyn, arguing that the entire intellectual tradition in Russia was really a self-serving facade for xenophobia which violently opposed any westernization. This attitude towards the west in conjunction with the weakness of civil society is what made Russia so vulnerable to Lenin's demiurgic combination of hard-as-nails means and millenarian ends; and that was enough to bring him to power, where the party — his unique contribution to political theory and

practice — kept him and his successors.

Still and all, the essence of Lenin himself escapes Besançon, and not because the author does not give the devil (or more precisely the anti-christ) his due. On the contrary, Lenin emerges from the pages of this book as truly a gigantic presence, uncompromising in his terrible sincerity. His is the quality, however, not so much of the fanatic as the fundamentalist, ever motivated by the moral imperative to fit all things into the Marxist mold, supported by the correct citation from "scripture." To be sure, what offends Besançon most is Lenin's unlimited hostility towards those people he perceives to be his ideological enemies. There was something profoundly illiberal about the way Lenin treated his political opponents, but he did so precisely because for him — by contrast to the parliamentarians he so scorned — politics was everything and all-important. Thus, as in war, no holds were barred and it only made sense to exterminate, not merely to overcome, the ideological enemies. Lenin, it might be said, was the first full-time, professional politician (modeled on Chernyshevsky's Rakmetev) whose job it was to make revolution, and he did not try to hide his mission.

Lenin's greatness, however, went beyond his dedication and professionalism. It was, as Besançon argues, part and parcel of his invincible ideology. "The Marxist doctrine," he noted, "is omnipotent because it is true." (209) Obviously it would not have been enough for just one man, however inspired, to believe that. There had to be much more of a basis in reality for his notion that the struggle for scientific truth (*as he saw it*) was one and the same thing with the class struggle, that history was on the side of the Marxist dynamic, and that the party was history's chosen vehicle for the struggle. Lenin could only be so aggressive in promoting his ideology because it was clear even to his enemies that he was not doing it for himself. And once again,

what might have been criminal on the part of the individual could become *dialectically* the moral imperative in the name of the party (which, by definition, acts on behalf of the working people). For "there are no other rules in the matter than the interests of the revolution and of the seizure of power." (237)

The tragedy, of course, was that while the party could and did substitute itself for civil society, it was an incomplete substitution, and the Russian people were once again shortchanged. That was inevitable, according to Besançon, since "the substance of [Leninist] ideology, when it is in power, is that power itself." (287) In other words, ideology — as well as the dialectic — ends with the acquisition of power; it has no positive dimension, as Marx's old antagonist Bakunin predicted. The "liberal" Soviet rejoinder would be that it is still too soon to tell; "pure" Leninists argue that the aberrations of Stalin are remediable; latter-day Mensheviks continue to blame Bolshevik heterodoxy; and academic revisionists in the west find fault in their own camp.

Especially if all the evil Besançon, Solzhenitsyn, and others see in Marxism-Leninism really is as bad as they describe it, how is one to account (without resort to the *deus ex machina*) for the ideology's continuing, indeed growing strength? Surely that must have something to do with the paradox that in a world full of horrors, the Soviet experiment still offers a measure of hope.

N.G.O. Pereira  
Dalhousie University

Anthony F. Upton, *The Finnish Revolution, 1917-1918* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press 1981).

NO PERIOD IN MODERN Finnish history has left such bitter wounds as the years 1917 and 1918, during which the people of the Grand Duchy of Finland declared independence from Russia and then

quickly plunged into a vicious fratricidal conflict. Before the agonies of the Civil War were over and the White Army had emerged victorious, thousands had died in battle. In addition, an estimated 70,000 Red soldiers suffered the horrors of concentration camps: many were executed or died of hunger and disease. Fortunately, some managed to escape to Russia or North America where they had a significant impact on workers' movements.

Among Finnish scholars there was for many years a marked tendency to bury this bloody episode under white blankets of snow until all those bearing first-hand scars were dead. Until the 1960s the accepted interpretation of the events was that the Whites had fought a war of national liberation against Red insurgents who were inspired by the revolution in Russia and encouraged by its leaders. During the last two decades however, Finnish scholars have shown renewed interest in this controversial topic. Upton's new study is a masterful synthesis of the recent work by Finnish scholars, deepened by his own considerable knowledge of Finnish history. Moreover, he daringly challenges many of the traditional interpretations.

This is not the first time that Upton has surprised Finnish historians. His previous controversial studies of Finland include *Finland in Crisis, 1940-1941* (1964), and he entered deeper into "the sacred woods" of Finnish history with his *The Winter War* (1974). This won him the respect, if not always the approval, of Finnish scholars and established him as the leading authority on the subject among English-speaking historians. To these impressive contributions can also be added his editorship of *The Communist Parties in Scandinavia and Finland* (1973). Upton is, therefore, better able to deal with what he chooses to call the Finnish revolution than any other scholar in the English-speaking world.

Even the title of Upton's book is provocative. Since the 1960s, Finnish schol-

ars have preferred to describe the tragic events as a "Civil War," this being an acceptable compromise between "Class War" on the one hand and "War of National Liberation" or "War of Independence" on the other hand. According to Upton, the revolution, rather than being masterminded by Russia, was essentially caused and fought by Finns who were moved by domestic issues. The Whites won because of their superior organization, straightforward objectives, and capable leadership.

Prior to 1918 the only workers' party in Finland was the Social Democratic Party (SDP), founded in 1899. By 1903 the SDP had become explicitly Marxist and had won considerable public support in both rural and urban areas. In the nation's first general elections held in 1907, the SDP captured one-third of the votes and by 1916 was the largest party with a clear majority of 103 in a Parliament of 200. The failure of the left to consolidate this groundswell of popular support was, according to Upton, caused largely by a waffling and disorganized leadership. Oskari Tokoi, the first prime minister of Finland and a Social Democrat (who later sought refuge with 46 other Red Guard leaders in an Ontario lumber-camp) is described by Upton as "a windbag and a weathercock."

Although the Red Finns occupy most pages of this book, no party escapes Upton's scrutiny. He demonstrates a deep psychological understanding of the motives and the hesitancy as well as the militancy of the various leaders whom he describes with sharp criticism but not without sympathy. In the end, the author refuses to take any side.

The story of the revolution is told only in the words of the leaders, although enough glimpses of the people and their conditions are given to lead me to suspect that in his promised second volume Upton will allow the people to have their say. Upton's objective: "to give a non-Finnish readership access to this significant and

little known episode in modern European history" has been clearly fulfilled in this massive volume of 608 pages. This interesting analysis of the tragic but important period in the history of Finland is highly recommended to any student of European history.

Varpu Lindstrom-Best  
York University

Bjorn Gustavsen and Gerry Hunnius, *New Patterns of Work Reform: The Case of Norway* (Universitetsforlaget 1981).

IN THE WRITING OF THIS volume both authors bring with them almost a decade of "engagement" in social research on industrial democracy. Gerry Hunnius is best known for work on the Yugoslav system of workers' self-management and his collaborative efforts with G. David Garson and John Case in their edited volume, *Workers' Control* (1973). Bjorn Gustavsen, a lawyer by training, is director of the Institute for Work Psychology at the Work Research Institutes, Oslo, Norway.

Unfortunately, we are treated to an excursus on work organization and boardroom participation in Norway rather than an analytical treatment of these social phenomena. The materials and the personal contribution of Gustavsen in framing the Work Environment Act (1977), for example, are catalogued in a chronological manner. The absence of a conceptual rationale other than asserting the importance of examining the specific evolution of industrial democracy in Norway leaves the reader with the conviction that the work reforms surveyed are inapplicable to any other than Norwegian society. And, that may well be the case. But, an important tenet of social research is its replicability to other comparable social circumstances. This task is accomplished by employing a specific method. The absence of an explicit methodology pre-



cludes any such efforts by others interested in the topic. This lacuna is indeed the major drawback of this volume. One is tempted to add that such are the foibles which must be endured when reading essentially descriptive accounts in the human sciences. The result is a volume containing an interesting, exotic case study with little heuristic merit. It is salvaged from being a completely bad book when the authors describe the Norwegian experience with occupational health and safety legislation.

In addition, there are two annoying editorial flaws. The numerous typographical errors should have been corrected. Secondly, the book is written in a curious mixture of Norwegian and English. This style becomes an additional burden for the reader to bear. Although these are editorial difficulties, they only contribute to the more important problems of the book.

The book contains nine chapters which can be contextually dichotomized into a descriptive analysis of the Industrial Democracy Programme (abbreviated as the ID Programme in the text) and a second section outlining the rationale and the reforms carried out under the Work Environment Act.

The first chapter is somewhat of an anomaly. We are offered an overview of Norwegian labour relations history and a description of recent incomes policy and tripartite bargaining in Norway. This chapter would have benefitted immeasurably from an exposure to Geoffrey Ingham's important book on how infrastructure variation between industrial societies affects systems of industrial relations. It might have become the theoretical and methodological basis upon which the data catalogued in this volume could have been selected and organized.

The remaining seven chapters, the bulk of the book, are informed by an alternate concern — the description of the history and a selective appraisal of legislation in the area of work organization in Norway.

The second chapter examines the historical development of the uniquely Norwegian industrial democracy programme. Chapters 3 and 4 continue the saga by discussing the implementation of the ID Programme and the participation of employees on decision-making boards of Norwegian companies. For the non-Norwegian expert, one could fairly say these constitute reasonable introductions to these issues. But, there are instances when the authors could have broadened their horizons. A case in point is suggested from the centrality placed on industrial democracy as a theme in legislative strategy in the area of work reform. The authors make but one reference (49) to how the ID Programme benefitted from the ideas which emerged from the Tavistock experiments in Great Britain and the initiatives taken in recent Australian agricultural reforms. This gap is all the more surprising since the authors make repeated exhortations on the positive role of ideas in bringing about social change... "the unique contributions of the ID Programme are to be sought in ideas about *social change*. We believe it is possible to argue that even though ideas about change and the use of research in action were not new, the Industrial Democracy Programme represented an important new effort for the purpose of achieving changes in society." (45. Emphasis in the original) If such was their intent, why is there little in the way of theoretical and methodological guidelines that could be applied to a society such as Canada? These are the consequences of the quandary the authors have placed themselves in — they encourage us to take action but provide only a descriptive account of one society's experience.

The second section is by far the more important of the two. These chapters should be read by trade unionists, managers, government officials, and academics whose interests lie in occupational health and safety issues. First, the authors pro-

vide the history behind the passing of the 1977 Work Environment Act. The 1973 Norwegian election whose fortuitous results led to a socialist majority in Parliament is awarded the most significant event which led to the drafting of the unique combination of industrial democracy as practised in Norway with the medical concerns associated with occupational health and safety issues. The authors point out that it has become increasingly accepted by academics and decision-makers that certain psychological and physiological disorders are correlated with occupational status. For example, they present statistical evidence on the mortality rate among Norwegian men aged 40-49 years in different occupational categories. The men are divided into four separate groups — academics and functionaries, skilled workers and unskilled workers. The occupational categories can be lumped together into a mental/manual labour distinction. Academics and functionaries (that is, mental labour) exhibit the least deaths per 1,000 workers with 16.0 and 15.0 respectively, while the skilled and unskilled (that is manual labour) showed a dramatic increase to 24.2 and 55.1 respectively. The authors agree that "the organization of work becomes of the most extreme importance to the total health policy in society." (182) This is not an unusual conclusion to draw given the evidence they bring to bear on the subject.

They point out that the traditional means of intervention has been a rule-based approach to work environment issues. They proceed to suggest that these rules become narrowly defined bureaucratic criteria and go on to argue that the procedural context by which these rules are administered very often exacerbate the preventative measure ensconced in them. In lieu of abolishing them, the innovativeness of the Norwegian solution lay in their "integration" into a "participative structure" where workers would be encouraged to become involved in not only defining the health and safety issues but

are awarded the means to mobilize the necessary resources to solve them. One would be hard pressed indeed not to see the exciting prospects such legislation contains for expanding the horizons of the traditional medical model approach to health and safety issues to include the social sciences. By reading their description of the significance of a socialist majority in Parliament in pioneering this approach, we are led to conclude that the feasibility of any similar development occurring in Canada, for example, is as likely as the NDP acquiring political power at the federal level.

In summary, if the authors are correct in their assertion about the positive role ideas linked to research can achieve in bringing about changes in society, then this second section of the book should receive a general readership. Even if they are incorrect, as wide an audience as possible should at least be made aware of this innovative Norwegian approach to occupational health and safety issues.

Daniel Glenday  
Brock University

Jerome R. Mintz, *The Anarchists of Casas Viejas* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press 1982).

NO OTHER ASPECT of modern Spanish history has attracted English-speaking hispanists as has anarchism, and this extraordinary interest shows no sign of abating. New books appear regularly and fortunately they are getting better and better. In the last three years we have had Temma Kaplan's *Anarchists of Andalusia*, an analysis of the spread of anarchism among the workers of Jerez de la Frontera, and Lily Litvak's *Musa Libertaria*, a fascinating study of anarchist culture which has not, unfortunately, been published in English.

Jerome Mintz's excellent new book is

the latest addition to this series. He bills it a study in "ethnohistory," but this label serves little purpose other than to call attention to the fact that the author is an anthropologist and not an historian. In both approach and technique it is little different from Ronald Fraser's three oral histories of modern Spain. Professor Mintz uses the interviews he collected during three years' residence in the village of Casas Viejas as well as written sources, including the handwritten historical record compiled by one of the residents, to show how anarchism arrived there. Casas Viejas was not chosen at random but because on 11 January 1933 it was the scene of an anarchist rising against the Second Republic which ended in a massacre carried out by the police.

Yet Casas Viejas was by no stretch of the imagination a hotbed of anarchism, or of labour militancy of any sort. It formed part of the township of Medina Sidonia which had had an anarchist presence since 1872, but Casas Viejas itself did not get its first workers' centre until 1914 and even then it was organized by someone from outside the village. Despite a promising beginning, with 170 paid members after six months, the *centro* was closed down in 1915 when the authorities took advantage of the suicide of its president to claim that a wave of terrorism was being planned. There was no new anarchist organization in Casas Viejas until February 1932 and this new *sindicato* was also the product of the efforts of outside organizers.

Some villagers understood anarchist doctrines and even practised anarchism as a way of life — vegetarianism, abstinence, and free union — but they were a definite minority. Not everyone who joined the union was a militant or even had much of an idea of what anarchism was about. There were many more men who joined "as a social necessity" than there were those who "had ideas" or devoted their free time to reading and study. Not even all the members of the

executive were committed anarchists. The secretary was a 20-year-old peasant who had no previous union experience and who, in his own words, "didn't know anything." (159)

The insurrection that made Casas Viejas a household word in Spain was part of a nationwide rising planned by the anarchist extremists of the FAI to coincide with an expected railroad strike. But the railroad strike did not materialize and the rising was quickly suppressed in Barcelona on 9 January. The next day violence broke out in Cadiz province and on the 11th Casas Viejas rose even though the prearranged signal from Medina Sidonia had not been received. Many of the villagers had no idea of what the insurrection was about and both the president and secretary of the *sindicato* were against participating in it. The secretary even went to tell the Guardia Civil that trouble was brewing. (198)

The rising in Casas Viejas was bloodily repressed by the Assault Guards, the newly created Republican police force, on the 12th, but not before villagers had killed two of the four Guardia Civil posted there. Eight people were burned alive when the hut in which they were hiding was set on fire by the police and the next morning twelve prisoners taken at random were shot in cold blood. The truth of these events was slow in coming out, in both parliament and the press, and although there was no deliberate coverup by the authorities Prime Minister Manuel Azaña's defence of the severity with which his government had reacted to the revolutionary outbreak proved politically costly, contributing to the breakup of the centre-left coalition that had governed Spain since 1931 and tarnishing Azaña's own reputation.

Although this book tells the story of anarchism in one village, and particularly one incident, Mintz does devote some attention to more general consideration. His chosen target is the "religious interpretation" of Andalusian anarchism, best

known to English-speaking readers from Eric Hobsbawm's *Primitive Rebels*. His six strongly written pages (271-6) should put that hypothesis away forever. The rising at Casas Viejas was not a millenarian revolt but a response to a call for a nationwide revolutionary strike. The village itself was not at all militant and few local anarchists were committed revolutionaries; there was no charismatic leader and kinship was not important among the leadership.

The author is more concerned with burying Hobsbawm's explanation of anarchism than with proposing a new one of his own. The harshness and misery of peasant life which Mintz so movingly portrays were the basis of class tensions, but even in a rural economy dominated by latifundia, society was not divided into just two groups, landowners and labourers. In between there were other groups whose relations with them and with anarchism were ambiguous. Small landowners and renters who both hired workers and hired themselves out were the first to be hurt by increases in agricultural wages. The *fijos*, the workers who had year-round jobs on the big estates, had even lower daily wages than the day workers but they were guaranteed work every day compared to the 170-180 days the *eventuales* could hope for. Their life was every bit as hard as that of the day workers but they were totally dependent on the landowners for the minimal security they had and were the staunchest opponents of any organization of the agricultural workers.

Within the narrow limits of labour organization in Casas Viejas, anarchism was more successful than socialism, with some 300 members compared to 30. Mintz appears to credit this to the congruence between anarchist practices and "village mores." (94) Communal landholdings had been traditional until they were wiped out by the disentanglements of the mid-nineteenth century and cooperation between families was common.

Even "free love" had been anticipated in the villagers' casual approach to legalisms such as marriage. One-third of the marriages which did take place featured a bride who was pregnant or who had already had a child, sometimes years before. "Already anarchist in spirit," it was natural that the villagers should embrace anarchism as an ideology. (83)

On its own this innate predilection for anarchism is not an adequate explanation.

As the book clearly shows, the appeal of anarchism for individual villagers was thoroughly filtered through class relations, and particularly the nature of their relationship to the large landowners. However, this cannot be a major criticism of Mintz's book, where such overall explanations clearly take a back seat to the narrative. His purpose is to tell a tragic story and he tells it well, providing a vivid picture of life in rural Andalusia in the first third of this century. By dividing each chapter into a number of short sections, many of which are devoted to a particular person or aspect of life, he creates a colourful patchwork effect. The hatred of the labourers for the estate owners is evoked by the account of the exceptional rapacity of José Vela and the daily arrogance of his father, Don Antonio, in one of the village bars. On the other hand, the legendary anticlericalism of the Andalusian *bracero* was moderated by the congenial parish priest Don Diego.

The whole book is characterized by an overwhelming sense of humanity, a concern for individuals and their fate, and this is its greatest virtue. For, after all, all history — and even such grand themes as anarchism and the Spanish Civil War — is made up of the lives, and all too often the tragedies, of men and women like the villagers of Casas Viejas.

Adrian Shubert  
University of Calgary

Jim Hagan, *The History of the ACTU* (Melbourne: Longmans 1981).

ON THE WHOLE, Canadians are unfamiliar with the specifics of Australian labour and industrial relations history. Although Australian precedents played a powerful role in establishing provincial arbitration acts at the turn of the century and in Mackenzie King's Industrial Disputes Investigation Act of 1907, Australian workers and employers have been left to pursue their respective struggles in antipodean isolation. Only the cyclical crises befalling world capitalism have affected Australia — though with the aggravated impact associated with resource-based economies.

As in Canada, Australia's federal system has distributed responsibility for labour relations between state and commonwealth governments. The early dominance of a "labourist ideology," based on social equality, high wages, protectionism, and the "White Australia" policy, led to the establishment of a Commonwealth Court of Conciliation and Arbitration in 1903.

The easy self-confidence of "labourism" dissolved in World War I's conscription crises and the post-war employer counter-attack as Australia's economy lost its early glamour. The Australian Council of Trade Unions (ACTU) was an outgrowth in 1927 of One Big Union radicalism and the struggle of industrial and craft unions. However, as Hagan's history painfully underlines, development of the ACTU has been shaped by half a century of relations with the Commonwealth Court and its successor.

Industrial relations systems are not easily exported but Canadians interested in the might-have-beens of history may ponder what could have happened if our labour movement had developed on its own without American influences or if the Mackenzie King version of tripartism had been carried to its logical conclusion. Australian unions did develop on their own and the ACTU, for all its radical impulses, soon acquired the centralized

bargaining responsibilities that Ron Lang and others hoped to win for the Canadian Labour Congress in the ill-fated Manifesto of 1976.

Although he is painstaking in reporting the ebb and flow of left, right, and Communist forces in the ACTU, Hagan's conclusion is inevitable. Whatever its initial radical and even revolutionary impulses, fifty years of history have led to "the almost complete triumph of the Labourist tradition."

Whatever myths of Australian militancy persist, they conceal a familiar pragmatic reality. The "left" coalition that swept to power in the ACTU in 1969 rapidly watered the strong wine of opposition to uranium mining and export. In 1979, when a new "left" coalition won support for a total ban on uranium production, Hagan notes, some of the most vociferous unions still had members in the industry a year later. When the right-wing governments that toppled labour in 1975 proceeded to abolish Medibank, the Australian version of Medicare, the ACTU tried its first-ever national work stoppage. The dismal result persuaded the Council's leaders that any future policies would depend on consensus.

One surprising outcome of that consensus was a coalition between the ACTU and the Australian Confederation of Industries against the far-right policies of the Fraser government. By attacking both unions and Australia's protected industries, Fraser forged the uncomfortable alliance that produced Labour's victory in 1983. At the head of the new government is ACTU former president, Bob Hawke.

Jim Hagan's book is no easy primer for an outsider to the complexities of Australian labour. The title itself is fair warning of the alphabet soup inside. This is perfectly reasonable. A comparable book for Canadian specialists would presume some familiarity with CUPE, the PSSRA, or the Freedman Report. Those who are willing to plod through a dusty and unfamiliar landscape will be rewarded by

occasional flashing insights into our own predicaments.

Desmond Morton  
University of Toronto

Stanley B. Greenberg, *Race and Class in Capitalist Development*, (New Haven: Yale University Press 1980).

THE RACIAL DIMENSION, like the gender dimension of class division under monopoly capitalism, continues to excite both discussion and investigation by social scientists of every theoretical persuasion. Structuralists, who emphasize the role of the state, "primordialists" who point to the family as establishing an ineluctable sense of identification in each individual, and Marxists have all contributed to the debate.

Professor Greenberg's analysis attempts, in the liberal tradition, to fashion within these parameters a distinctive, analytical method intended to re-affirm the validity of positivist social science as the method which can contribute most to "an understanding of individual action and social relationships." With this goal in view he has "disaccentuated" capitalism as a conceptualization of whole societies embodying rules of conflict and historical development in order to focus on dominant class actors, that is particular segments of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat — commercial farmers, businessmen, and organized labour.

These groups, he argues, in the period of capital intensification, impose on the state racial differentiation to suit their different interests. Once the racial divisions are drawn, the continued survival of the racist state depends on the strength of the "subordinate challenge" and the perceived interest of the businessmen in the commercial and industrial sectors.

This thesis is explored most thoroughly in relation to South Africa with ancillary studies of Alabama, Northern

Ireland, and Israel. The result is a series of vignettes of the author's chosen class actors. The South African study highlights the role of the agricultural sector and the mine owners in the creation of apartheid and the use that was made of it by both the artisan and the industrial unions. It was left to the manufacturing and commercial sectors, under pressure from "subordinate groups" to question "the quality of African lives and the role of discrimination." The pattern is repeated with variations in the other studies; the author contends that, in each case, once the subordinate population has raised the cost of continuing repression businessmen had "come to understand Gramsci's notion of hegemony: force must be tempered by consent."

Viewing the evidence on the terms in which it is presented, this conclusion is inescapable and the investigations provide interesting new insights, for example, into the role of the agrarian interests in South Africa. At the same time, however, the terms on which the investigations take place are themselves questionable. The concept of class actors arguably obscures more than it reveals, particularly since the choice of class actors seems arbitrary; the assumptions which inform the relationship of the chosen class actors with the state are questionable and create significant distortions. The current conflict in Northern Ireland for example is thereby detached from its historical context. The origins of Ulster (like the origins of Israel) are a crucial dimension of the present political scene and cannot be encompassed by the sentence: "In the end the Union Jack flew proudly over the Harland and Wolff shipyards." One distortion leads to another: the current conflict presented as a civil rights issue while the national question and the Westminster-Belfast-Dublin dimension are left aside.

The cast of class actors, moreover, includes no representatives of the "subordinate classes" whom the author recognizes as the most important force for

change. They are relegated firmly off-stage, and their omission renders much of the discussion esoteric. The book as a result is not dominated by the conflicts embodied in the societies under discussion, but by the positivists' conflict with Marxism; this battle leaves its mark on most pages to the point where the book could be subtitled *Marxism dismembered*. Its concepts are utilized, repudiated, misstated, turned into rules, simplified (Gramsci's concept of hegemony, for example, becomes the politics of consent) until the study of the societies themselves seem to serve primarily as an opportunity to exorcize Marxist ideology — a process facilitated by the off-stage treatment of the subordinate classes.

Marxism, nevertheless, proves its resilience. In the last analysis Professor Greenberg concludes that the forces of capitalism may prove endlessly capable of evolving "racist and coercive mechanisms," a conclusion which echoes Oliver C. Cox: "The interest behind racial antagonism is an exploitative interest, the peculiar type of economic exploitation characteristic of capitalist society."

Mary Turner  
Dalhousie University

Maureen Hynes, *Letters from China* (Toronto: Women's Educational Press 1981).

MAUREEN HYNES, a teacher of English as a second language at George Brown College in Toronto, was one of the two teachers sent by the Department of External Affairs to teach for five months in China, as part of the annual Canada-People's Republic of China cultural exchange. *Letters from China* is a collection of her letters home to family and friends during her stay in China, as well as selected diary entries. It is an informal and delightful way of chronicling the impressions, sights, and sounds which hit a first-time visitor to China. This reviewer

was first secretary for cultural and scientific affairs at the Canadian Embassy in Peking during Miss Hynes' stay in China, so is familiar with many of the events and incidents mentioned in the book.

The "foreign expert," of which Hynes was one, enjoys a unique position in the Chinese educational world. Foreign experts have specialized skills which are deemed important to help speed China along the path of the "Four Modernizations" currently underway. They are usually hired directly by the Chinese government and sent to teach in a variety of schools and institutions. Language training is obviously crucial to the task of absorbing foreign expertise, and language teachers far outnumber those in any other subject. As such, foreign experts are supposed to be integrated into the general Chinese educational system, being as it were an extra level of instruction to polish or upgrade whatever the Chinese are able to do themselves. Yet because they are "foreign," with no Chinese language capability, these experts find themselves isolated from the mainstream of Chinese academic life, cut-off from real contacts with fellow teachers or students, living in separate housing, eating in separate dining rooms, and everywhere escorted by an interpreter. The notion of going to China and "getting to know the Chinese" is fallacious. The resulting sense of frustration, helplessness, and sometimes downright anger, comes across in *Letters from China*, although Hynes manages often to derail such feelings with rare humour and patience.

Hynes is an avowed socialist feminist, long interested in going to China, and had applied twice previously for the External Affairs exchange teacher slot. When finally chosen in March of 1980, to go to Sichuan University in Chengdu, the capital city of Sichuan province (south-west China), she went to study developments in post-cultural revolution China, the role of women, Chinese educational practices, and of course Chinese socialism in action.

Her observations reflect both the naïveté of many western socialists in grappling with the Chinese experiment, as well as the difficulties posed by a country undergoing rapid and major changes of direction. She laments the passing of the "iron rice bowl" system, by which workers cannot be fired from their jobs (which is now universally seen as a serious deterrent to increased productivity); she does not believe that mail is officially and generally censored (Chinese officials admit to this as a necessary precaution against espionage); Chinese women to her surprise are not as liberated as generally believed in the west; she even regrets the abolition of the free admission of worker, peasant, and soldier into classrooms (now seen as a major cause of educational disruption during the cultural Revolution), and the restitution of entrance exams. The section of this book where Hynes attempts to offer background analysis of the current political and social scene in China are in fact the weakest. Her explanation of the labyrinth "danwei" (unit) system, for example, is somewhat misleading.

But read simply as a personal account of an unusual and challenging experience. *Letters from China* has much to recommend it. There are useful accounts of the vast chasm between Chinese and western concepts of language teaching; touching stories of being daily, hourly stared at, of making do without the most basic necessities, of the mounds of food offered at banquets; insights into how to deal with obstinate bureaucracy (the dancing party that never did, and the friend's visit that never took place); and the delightful life stories: Hynes caused consternation because she unwittingly bought a bicycle styled for peasant use, therefore totally unsuitable to her status as a "foreign expert;" nor did she redeem herself by learning to get on and off her bicycle "the Chinese way," but continued to do so by the alternate the "stupid" "ridiculous" way. China is tough on foreigners!

Ultimately, despite brave efforts at

making do, foreign experts still experience longings for things taken for granted at home in the west: in a moment of weakness Hynes admits to missing "sort of abstract things like privacy, self-sufficiency, free time." And Maureen Hynes, of the thirty-odd Canadian experts this reviewer personally knew during two years in China, is clearly among the few who tried the hardest, with more self-awareness and honesty, to adjust to her environment. Her *Letters from China* offers an interesting Canadian perspective on China today.

Mary Sun  
St. Mary's University

Paul Connerton, *The Tragedy of Enlightenment* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1980), and George Friedman, *The Political Philosophy of the Frankfurt School* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press 1981).

THE UPHEAVALS OF THE 1960s catapulted Herbert Marcuse into prominence and initiated the translation and assimilation of the works of the Frankfurt School. This process must be virtually complete, since everyone nowadays knows "what is wrong with Critical Theory" and we are deluged with books by lesser lights dispensing A's, B's, and F's to original thinkers. In any case, it is much easier to comment on the previous products of critical thinking than to do it oneself. In the two books under review, we have probably the best and worst of this genre.

The Frankfurt Institute was formed in the 1920s in order to continue Marxist research and criticism from an independent (non-state and non-party) position. Given the impotence of the Second International in the face of World War I, the degeneration of Bolshevism and the rise of Fascism, an early theme was the perpetuation of psychological domination within the proletariat. This did not replace



the criticism of capitalist society, but rather amplified it by tracing the stalling of revolutionary consciousness to the reproduction of social domination within individuals. Consequently, Critical Theory defined itself not as the "proletarian standpoint" (Lukács) but as the "critical consciousness of the proletariat" (Horkheimer). In America during World War II, Horkheimer and Adorno began their most characteristic work — an attempt to decipher the reasons why modern society, despite extensive development of the means of production, was consolidating the psychological and technical domination of the population, rather than entering a new era of freedom. Previously they "still trusted too much in the modern consciousness" (*Dialectic of Enlightenment*). They synthesized psychological domination with the domination of nature by science and technology into the concept of "instrumental reason." Thus, they brought into question the modern enlightenment belief that the domination of nature, the increase in scientific-technical control, would lead to a free and equal society. In other words, instrumental reason necessarily has the consequence in the social realm of reinforcing domination. With this step Critical Theory had, it seems, parted company with Marx — who expected growth of the forces of production to shatter capitalist relations of production.

Friedman purports to give an account of the origin, problem, and solution of the analysis of modernity. The section of "philosophical roots" reads like a cook's tour of nineteenth-century thought. Anyone who can devote whole chapters to the influence of Spengler and Heidegger on Critical Theory simply doesn't know what he is talking about! However, it should be noted that Marcuse is an exception in this respect. The early influence of Heidegger and phenomenology accounts, at least in part, for the difference between his work and that of Horkheimer and Adorno. Friedman's strategy is to consider the

whole "school" as a collective project; consequently, he is blind to even the most obvious differences. As anyone who has engaged in collective work knows, cooperation does not necessarily mean the imposition of a single "position" under which individual perspectives are crushed. After the glut of wholesale "critiques," what is needed now is an evaluation of Critical Theory that gives centre stage precisely to these differences.

Sections two and three, on the problem and solution of modernity are merely limpid paraphrases. Friedman's central thesis is that the Frankfurt School accepts the modern attempt to fulfill human needs through the domination of nature but rejects the obvious conclusion that this leads to the self-satisfaction of Nietzsche's "last man" rather than a community of creative socialized individuals. This appears to be because they, like all moderns, repress the tragedy of death and consequently obscure the fundamental non-satisfaction in human existence. (I say "appears to be" because these random sallies never achieve coherent argumentation.) At this point Friedman's basic antipathy toward the project of Critical Theory becomes manifest — any attempt to relieve human toil and suffering and to found a social order of satisfaction, happiness, and well-being is, for Friedman, simply a mask for the fear of one's death. Socialists may well be uneasy about the consequences of the unbridled pursuit of happiness, and can indeed learn from Nietzsche here, but they are rightly suspicious of apologetics and justifications for suffering and exploitation.

Friedman goes on endlessly about death, as if it guarantees his profundity, without succeeding in saying anything of consequence. Nevertheless, without supporting his thesis, there is something to be noticed here. Marx, in the *1844 Manuscripts*, noted that "the particular individual is only a *determinate species being* and as such he is mortal" in order to turn his attention to "species being." In this

respect, Critical Theory is in accord with Marx and almost all socialist theory that individual death is not an issue — for surely it would bring an element of tragedy into one's thinking. However, I am not sure that this adequately represents the experience of active socialists, who have always had to confront individual ostracism, pain, and death as a consequence of their actions. Indeed, this has often led to an integrity of character which does not follow from the slogan "satisfaction of human needs."

Connerton's book is an extended essay that is short, to the point, and intelligently written. After a satisfactory account of the early work, he notes the significant change of direction with the publication of *Dialectic of Enlightenment*. There, Horkheimer and Adorno traced the implications of a central insight: that the domination of nature cannot be insulated from society. Connerton points out that "no distinction is clearly made in principle between control over nature and control over social relationships," and remarks that "failure" has "serious consequences." (63) Now, whatever one thinks of it, this is not a "failure" — it is a *rejection* of the modern Nature/society distinction that is most characteristically expressed by Kant. The dialectic of enlightenment conceptually clarifies the historical process whereby institutionalization of scientific-technical and psychological control has come to destroy all social goals beyond "control;" thus, instead of extending human happiness and autonomy as expected, enlightenment has become a new myth in which the proletariat is as likely to be trapped as anyone else.

With this shift in Critical Theory, the project of enlightenment becomes problematic, though it does not follow, as Connerton suggests, that it becomes impossible. (71) His main point is that, in Marx, the human/nature relationship is organized within various modes of intersubjectivity which characterize different

historical epochs. Consequently, the specific character of these historical modes of intersubjectivity must be related to the prevailing labour process. This is overlooked by Horkheimer and Adorno, who focus on the dialectic of myth (domination) and enlightenment (freedom) as the basis of the historical process. In short, Connerton points out, correctly, that the analysis has revised the fundamental Marxist conceptions. It is not as concerned with the critique of capitalism as with the possibility of enlightenment itself.

Connerton's second criticism pulls in the other direction entirely. He cites the fact that Critical Theory, from the beginning, attempted to understand society through the single category of "work" as the basis of the "failure" of the *Dialectic of Enlightenment*. (63, 75, 79) Consequently, he treats sympathetically Habermas' distinction of communication and intersubjectivity from the labour process and the argument that they are equally primordial in historical development. As a result, the blocking of social change by scientific-technological development is defined as a problem of ideology. In other words, the domination of nature does not *necessarily* lead to social domination (as Horkheimer and Adorno argued), rather this only *appears* to be the case due to the suppression of communicative interaction by technocratic ideology. In this return to a dualistic basis of historical development, Habermas returns to the Kantian distinction between nature and society. Connerton does not entirely accept this argument. He questions its reliance on a psychoanalytic model of social change and regards the distinction between work and communication as leading to a depoliticization of Critical Theory. (106-8) However, its clear advantage is the possibility of constructing a theory of the public sphere which is crucial in the contemporary situation and which Marx's notion of ideology-critique assumed as unproblematic. (59)

Both of these criticisms centre on the relationship between labour and intersubjectivity: human/nature versus human/human relations. Horkheimer and Adorno came to question the modern project as a whole — that a free and equal society can be constructed on the foundation of the domination of nature. Habermas retreats from this position and resurrects a communicative ethics alongside labour that is expected to redeem the promise of modernity. Connerton's two criticisms are entirely at odds. In the first place, he argues that intersubjective relations derive from the labour process, as did Marx. In the second, he champions the nature/society distinction. The interpretation of Marx is fundamental for this issue: Does Marx's account of the labour process assume the nature/society distinction or does it surmount it? (And, if the latter, does it differ from Hegel's account of the passage from nature to society, in the *Phenomenology of Mind*?)

With these questions, we are in deep waters indeed. However, aside from the interpretive problems, the basic issue has been encountered by most contemporary socialists in their practice: Is socialism primarily in continuity with the tendencies of modern society, or, does it require a radical break? Is it possible to reconcile the communalistic ethic of socialism with the instrumentalizing tendencies of modern industry? Can the productivity of modern capitalism be simply appropriated by the whole of society, or, does the mode of industrial organization require a degree of unfree social deployment? Is it possible to increase the realm of freedom outside work (which requires efficient production) and also democratize the labour process itself? There will be no easy answers to these questions, either now or in the foreseeable future. However, a certain clarity can be derived from recognizing that, with these practical questions, we are facing the basic assumptions that define the modern world. It is to the merit of Critical

Theory that they have brought these questions into focus.

Ian H. Angus  
Simon Fraser University

T.W. Hutchison, *The Politics and Philosophy of Economics: Marxians, Keynesians, and Austrians* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell 1981).

T.W. HUTCHISON is Emeritus Professor of Economics at the University of Birmingham. Since 1938 he has written extensively about the history of economic thought, the methodology of economics, and the foolishnesses that economists often commit when addressing matters of policy. The present volume, a collection of inter-related essays, draws upon all three aspects of his life work. Three of the essays are new; six are revisions of materials that have appeared elsewhere.

The first essay deals with Engels and Marxian political economy, and the second treats the connections between the extension of the franchise in nineteenth-century Britain, the changing agenda of politics, and the obsolescence and redundancy of Marx's political economy. It is these two papers which readers of this journal will most readily be able to understand, and they should certainly read them, if only to discover with what scorn and contempt a serious and thoughtful scholar regards "the Engelsian-Marxian dynamic theory of capitalist economic development and political revolution." (18) For Hutchison argues that if this theory made sense anywhere or at all, it did so only in an advanced industrial society where, at the same time, workers had neither votes nor any other sort of economic or political power. That is to say, it made some sense in Manchester during the 1840s, but with respect to predictive or explanatory power it has long had nothing to offer. It cannot even claim standing as a general theory of the movement of the economy in that its forecasts have been systematically and regularly

falsified by events. Further, Hutchison notes, as a direct result of their "philosophical, or epistemological preconceptions," Marxians "have claimed an infallible correctness which has justified their intolerant, one party totalitarianism." (18-9)

Although the other seven papers return to Marxism from time to time, they concern themselves chiefly with matters that have long been discussed among academic economists in English-speaking and German-speaking lands. That is, they are about ontology and epistemology, the importance of trying to keep one's desires out of one's analysis, and the tracking down of professional errors, absurdities, contradictions, and dishonesties. To readers who are not professional economists these seven papers, concerning themselves so largely with names, controversies, and concepts that are unfamiliar outside "the trade," will be somewhat perplexing, although there are points of contact for the general reader, who will soon discover that with respect to policy making in the 1970s Hutchison has reservations regarding the power of the unions and the unhealthy interaction between vote-seeking government and favour-seeking electorate. Admittedly, too, there are some familiar names — something on Friedman, plenty on Keynes, but almost nothing on Galbraith. Doubtless Hutchison would regard the eminent oversimplifier and vulgarizer as a foe unworthy of his steel. There are few tendencies in twentieth-century economics which escape Hutchison's rapier. He is not an easy man to please, and it is not only Marxians who distress him.

Hutchison thinks that much of British economics since Keynes has been flawed by dogmatism, oversimplification, ignoring of changing circumstances, lack of respect for evidence, excessive politicisation, crude worship first of Stalinism and then of Maoism, and a lack of concern about difficulties of theorizing when economic actors do not have perfect knowl-

edge about both present and future. He devotes two essays to the preparation of this bill of attainder, which I am inclined to think entirely justified. Hutchison also skewers the productive and influential Cambridge Marxist, Maurice Dobb, whom he quite rightly finds as an observer, naive and gullible — or perhaps political and dishonest — and as a predictor, absurdly inaccurate. To some readers this demolition will seem unfair in that Dobb wrote more, and on more topics, than Hutchison mentions. But Dobb is in the essay partly so that his Stalinist enthusiasms in the 1920s and 1930s can provide counterpoint for the Maoist enthusiasms of Joan Robinson, a much influential and significant Cambridge economist, in the 1960s and 1970s.

One short paper is devoted to the "social market economics" of Walter Eucken and the Freiburg School. Hutchison observes that this approach to economic policy making, so very different both from traditional *laissez faire* and from the Keynesianism that followed Keynes, was misunderstood by Anglo-Saxon economists but largely adopted in the Federal Republic, whose economic success in relation to the lands of Keynesianism and monetarism has long been so very remarkable. Here as elsewhere Hutchison is careful to exculpate Keynes from the errors of the Keynesians, while offering yet more examples of the unwisdom of Lord Balogh, energetic Anglo-Hungarian economist and advisor to Sir Harold Wilson. Here as always it is silliness rather than politics to which Hutchison objects.

Two long and important papers treat Carl Menger and the "Austrian" approaches to economic theorizing. Here the non-specialist will encounter many unfamiliar names and two very familiar ones — Ludwig von Mises and Friedrich von Hayek. Hutchison is very critical of the early Hayek and of Mises, because both men adopted an approach to eco-

conomic theorizing which was unscientific in that it began with unverifiable and untestable "self-evident truth." Hutchison observes that Mises stayed with this approach to the end, that Hayek, influenced by Popper, abandoned it in 1937, and that latter-day Marxists often adopt a methodological position that is indistinguishable from it, becoming methodologically Misesians in thin disguise.

In the last two papers of the volume Hutchison discusses the character, possibilities, and limitations of what economists call "theory." He argues that because microeconomics has traditionally had to assume not only competition but also perfect knowledge and accurate foresight its utility has been somewhat limited, while the assumptions of macroeconomics are necessarily chosen in such a way as to make its theorems impermanent or less than general. He therefore asks for much more attention to the particular, and to economic history, while deploring the politicization of economists' discussions about macroeconomic matters and the game-playing that has come to predominate in much economic theorizing. Economists, he thinks, would do better to devote themselves to "the growth of knowledge in accordance with the criteria and disciplines of a 'scientific' subject." (271) This approach would involve a clear distinction between positive and normative and between definitional and empirical, an attempt to improve the predictive power of the discipline (something in which neither mainstream nor Marxian economists can take much pride), a forthright adoption of Popperian norms regarding "testability," and a self-denying ordinance with respect to "a-priorism and infallibilism," whether Austrian or Marxian. The results, he believes, would be wholly healthy. Economists would become more willing to say they do not know, and less willing to sound off to the Great Public, thus "raising standards of rational discussion and debate in a pluralist democracy... or

'open society' where there are no privileged or protected positions." (298)

Although Hutchison is critical of mainstream economics, the nonprofessional reader should recognize that he is not anxious to throw out the baby with the bathwater; he would certainly maintain that orthodox economics, though sometimes flawed, is redeemable and useful, while on methodological grounds Marxian economics is utterly irredeemable. Mainstream economists can learn a great deal from Hutchison; Marxists, especially the more absentminded or unreflective ones, have, even more cause to ponder his message.

Ian M. Drummond  
University of Toronto

Robert Lekachman, *Greed is not Enough: Reaganomics* (New York: Pantheon 1982).

BY SEPTEMBER 1982, unemployment in Canada had risen to more than one and a half million, over 12 per cent of the labour force. If one adds to this the number of discouraged workers, those that did not bother looking for work because of the desperate unemployed situation, and those that were working part time because full time work was not available, the number of unemployed exceeds two million. In Britain the September figures were even more depressing, over three million unemployed or more than 14 per cent, higher than was recorded in the great depression of the 1930s. Following three decades when residents of the western capitalist economies were assured that a major depression was no longer possible because of the adoption of a set of policies that have come to be known, somewhat erroneously, as "Keynesian" — after all even Nixon declared himself a "Keynesian" — such real economic distress comes as a major cultural shock. But the rise of unemployment, far from being seen as a manifestation of systemic failure by the governments of the United States, Britain, even of Canada, is seen a happy

waystation on the path to economic health. Such figures are viewed by the conservative right not only with equanimity, but with satisfaction.

In the United States, unions and national parks are destroyed with equal disregard while social security for the lowest echelons is undermined with scarcely a backward glance. Over the devastation beams Ronald Reagan whom Robert Lekachman describes as the "nicest president who ever destroyed a union, tried to cut school lunch milk rations from six to four ounces, [shades of "Thatcher the milk snatcher"] and compelled families in need of public help to first dispose of household goods in excess of \$1,000." (3)

Lekachman's book is not a sober, academic appraisal of Reaganomics as it is operating in the United States today. It is full of moral outrage which must strike a sympathetic chord with anyone who views the current economic crisis as something imbedded in the economic system, and the conservative reaction to the crisis as an attempt to make the victims pay for the failure. What makes Lekachman's argument credible, quite apart from the wealth of anecdotal evidence that he provides, is his own, considerable, reputation as a scholar, as a significant contributor to the field of aggregate economic theory and to the history of economic thought. Central to his argument is a rejection of monetarism, the monetary doctrine associated with Milton Friedman, the high priest of economic conservatism.

Criticism of monetarism, the economic taproot of Reaganomics, as well as the policies of Gerald Bouey, Governor of the Bank of Canada, has been somewhat rare among academics worried about acceptability, publishability, and tenure. Fortunately the disease has not afflicted all and some like Lekachman in the United States and recognized scholars in Canada such as Clarence Barber, have fought back with various mixtures of fact,

theory, and where appropriate, a healthy dose of sarcasm. *Greed is not Enough* is no academic treatise. It is much closer to a diatribe, a denunciation of the whole basis of Reaganomics, not on the basis of ideology or abstract theory but on simple argument that anyone, whether trained in economics or not, can appreciate. It is both devastating and colourful. By way of example, his comments on the banking industry:

Commercial bankers are the monetarists' only substantial constituency. For them high interest rates swell their earnings. For practically all other businesses, they are a calamity. . . . Doctors who sicken at the sight of blood make poor surgeons. Central Bankers who weep over the fate of home buyers, builders, and crumbling cities will never convince the world that they can stop inflation. (131)

John Kenneth Galbraith many years ago gave up writing for fellow academics. His reason was quite simple. Academic economists were so wedded to the received wisdom of conventional economics that ideas that went against the grain of orthodoxy, however plausible or well argued, would receive scant attention. His answer to this problem was to write for the general audience, a strategy that has given him a formidable influence beyond the halls of academe. Consciously or not, Lekachman has gone the same route. The book is easily understandable by the non-economist for whom it is obviously intended. Unfortunately, it is unlikely to receive the currency it deserves given its price. Such well conceived and executed polemics call out for broad distribution in cheap paperback format.

Despite its strengths, *Greed is not Enough* is not without its faults. It is a cogent criticism of Reaganomics and its effects on American society, particularly those at the lowest end of the social stratum. It does not go beyond this criticism, however, to provide an alternative critique of the contemporary western political economy. Perhaps this is asking too much for a book of this nature but it

does leave us with the question, if not Reaganomics, then what? More of the same welfarism mixed with fine tuning of the economy that has seldom played anywhere near in tune? Lekachman does not provide an alternative. Nevertheless his

critique of the conservative alternative is both stimulating and devastating and, therefore, well worth reading.

Paul Phillips  
University of Manitoba