

Reviews / Comptes Rendus

Volume 19, 1987

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/llt19rv01>

[See table of contents](#)

Publisher(s)

Canadian Committee on Labour History

ISSN

0700-3862 (print)

1911-4842 (digital)

[Explore this journal](#)

Cite this review

(1987). Review of [Reviews / Comptes Rendus]. *Labour/Le Travailleur*, 19, 169–252.

REVIEWS / COMPTES RENDUS

- Leo Panitch and Donald Swartz, *From Consent to Coercion: The Assault on Trade Union Freedoms*
by Glen Makahonuk / 169
- Ian McKay, *The Craft Transformed: An Essay on the Carpenters of Halifax, 1885-1985*
by Michael Kazin / 171
- Mike Solski and John Smaller, *Mine Mill: The History of the International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers in Canada Since 1895*
by Douglas O. Baldwin / 173
- Gordon Inglis, *More Than Just a Union: The Story of the NFFAWU*
by Bryant Fairley / 174
- Victor Howard, *"We Were the Salt of the Earth!" A Narrative of The On-To Onawa Trek and the Regina Riot*
by Michiel Horn / 177
- Mervin Y.T. Chen and Thomas G. Regan, *Work in the Changing Canadian Society*
by Joseph Smucker / 179
- J.B. Cunningham and T.H. White, eds., *Quality of Working Life: Contemporary Cases*
by James Rinchart / 180
- Henri Gagnon, *Les P.M.E. (les petites et moyennes entreprises) à l'agonie*
by Geoffrey Ewen / 182
- Jonathan Lomax, *First and Foremost in Community Health Centres: The Centre in Sault Ste Marie and the PHC Alternatives*
by Theodore H. Tulchansky / 183
- Eric H. Monkkenon, ed., *Walking to Work. Tramps in America, 1790-1935*
by Michael B. Katz / 185
- Philip S. Foner, *The Workingmen's Party of the United States: A History of the First Marxist Party in the Americas*
by W.M. Dick / 187
- David J. Hogan, *Class and Reform: School and Society in Chicago, 1880-1930*
by Dan Hawthorne / 189
- Naomi R. Lamoreaux, *The Great Merger Movement in American Business, 1895-1904*
by Stephen Scheinberg / 190
- Pete Daniel, *Breaking the Land. The Transformation of Cotton, Tobacco, and Rice Cultures Since 1880*
by Steven Hahn / 191
- Peter Carlson, *Roughneck: The Life and Times of Big Bill Haywood*
by Mark Leier / 193
- Donald E. Winters, Jr., *The Soul of the Wobblies: The I.W.W., Religion, and American Culture in the Progressive Era, 1905-1917*
by Clark Halker / 195
- Allan Kent Powell, *The Next Time We Strike. Labor in the Utah Coal Fields, 1900-1933*
by Dave Roediger / 196
- Joe William Trotter, Jr., *Black Milwaukee: The Making of an Industrial Proletariat, 1915-1945*
by James R. Barrett / 198
- Royden Harrison and Jonathan Zeitlin, eds., *Divisions of Labour: Skilled Workers and Technological Change in Nineteenth Century Britain*
by Alvin Finkel / 201
- H. Gustav Klaus, *The Literature of Labour: Two Hundred Years of Working-Class Writing*
by Graham Carr / 203
- K.D. Brown, ed., *The First Labour Party: 1906-1914*
by Melvin Sheffitz / 206

- Alex Callinicos and Mike Simons, *The Great Strike — The Miners' Strike of 1984-5 and Its Lessons*
by Frank Roberts / 207
- David I. Kertzer, *Family Life in Central Italy, 1880-1910: Sharecropping, Wage Labor and Coresidence*
by Franca Iacovetta / 209
- Albert Szymanski, *Class Struggle in Socialist Poland*
by Thomas Rutman / 212
- John Riddell, ed., *Lenin's Struggle for a Revolutionary International. Documents 1907-1916: The Preparatory Years*
by Christopher Schenk / 214
- Mark Halström, *Industry and Inequality: The Social Anthropology of Indian Labour*
by Hugh Johnston / 217
- Verity Burgmann, 'In Our Time': *Socialism and the Rise of Labor, 1885-1905*
by Jeremy Mouat / 219
- Edward D. Beechert, *Working in Hawaii: A Labor History*
by Catherine LeGrand / 220
- Joan Kelly, *Women, History, and Theory*
by Linda Kealey / 222
- Helen Remick, ed., *Comparable Worth and Wage Discrimination*
by Roberta Edgecombe Roth / 224
- Kathryn M. Borman, Daisy Quarm, and Sarah Gideonse, eds., *Women in the Workplace: Effects on Families*
by Arlene Tigar McLaren / 226
- Laurie Larwood, Ann H. Stromberg, Barbara A. Gutek, eds., *Women and Work, An Annual Review*
by Anita Clair Fellman / 228
- Paul Willman and Graham Winch, *Innovation and Management Control: Labour Relations at BL Cars*
by Wayne Lewchuk / 230
- Tom Juravich, *Chaos on the Shop Floor: A Worker's View of Quality, Productivity and Management*
by Robert Wrenn / 232
- Christopher Eaton Gunn, *Workers' Self-Management in the United States*
by Gerry Hunniss / 234
- William DeFazio, *Longshoremen: Community and Resistance on the Brooklyn Waterfront*
by Eli Zaretsky / 236
- Ellen Meiksins Wood, *The Retreat From Class: A New "True" Socialism*
by Bryan D. Palmer / 237
- R.E. Pahl, *Divisions of Labour*
by Paul Phillips / 240
- William B. Gould IV, *Strikes, Dispute Procedures, and Arbitration: Essays on Labor Law*
by Paul Craven / 242
- Eric Schragge, *Pensions Policy in Britain: A Socialist Analysis*
by David P. Williams / 243
- Charles Handy, *The Future of Work: A Guide to a Changing Society*
by W. Warren Wagar / 247
- C. Stewart Doty, *The First Franco-Americans. New England Life Histories From the Federal Writers' Project, 1938-39*
par Pierre Ancil / 247
- Marie Lavigne Yolande Pinard, *Travailleuses et féministes: Les Femmes dans la société québécoise*
par Denyse Baillargeon / 250

REVIEWS / COMPTES RENDUS

Leo Panitch and Donald Swartz, *From Consent to Coercion: The Assault on Trade Union Freedoms* (Toronto: Garamond Press 1985).

THIS IS AN IMPORTANT and timely polemical study of the recent assault on trade union rights in Canada. Most of this short monograph, part of Garamond's Network Basic Series, appeared in *Labour/Le Travail* 13 (Spring 1984), as an article entitled "Towards Permanent Exceptionalism: Coercion and Consent in Canadian Industrial Relations." The article was based on an earlier paper prepared for an October 1982 conference on public sector industrial relations sponsored by the Carleton School of Public Administration and the Institute for Research on Public Policy. Written in response to the federal government's passage of the Public Sector Compensation Restraint Act (Bill C-124) in June 1982, the only new information in the monograph is the discussion of the recent passage of provincial anti-labour legislation, particularly by the Bennett government in British Columbia.

Panitch and Swartz argue that the era of free collective bargaining came to an end with the introduction of Bill C-124 in 1982. They suggest this legislation constituted an assault on trade union rights which was comprised of three factors: "first, the generalisation of the federal government's '6 and 5' restraint legislation which temporarily removed the right to strike from most public sector workers in Canada; second, the partial extension of the restraints to the private sector; and

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

third, the increasing frequency of permanent legislation restricting trade union rights." (39) A new era of permanent exceptionalism was created in its place. This new era marks a return to the situation in which the state and capital rely on coercion, fear, and force to subordinate labour. This is not to imply a return to the state's use of the police as the only means to coerce labour, but rather to the formal use of coercion in the rule of law.

But what is meant by free collective bargaining and when did it exist? The industrial relations orthodoxy, as Panitch and Swartz refer to it, is premised upon the acceptance of the word "free" to mean, on the one hand, a balance of power between capital and labour in the bargaining process; and, on the other, a state which acts as an impartial umpire in the application and interpretation of impartial rules. The authors argue that the era of free collective bargaining began with the labour legislation of the 1940s, particularly Order-in-Council PC 1003 which was followed by the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act of 1948. The provinces followed with similar legislation that granted workers the right to organize, to bargain collectively, to engage in conciliation and arbitration procedures, and to strike. Such legislation did not evolve through a process of gradual reformism, but was a direct response to the militant labour struggles of the 1930s and 1940s and the rise of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation. Indeed, Saskatchewan's CCF government produced, according to the Canadian Congress of Labour's Political Education Committee, the most progres-

sive labour legislation in Canada when it passed the Trade Union Act of 1944.

Although the so-called era of free collective bargaining continued well into the 1970s, labour still found itself limited to bargaining on bread-and-butter issues such as wages, hours of work, fringe benefits, pensions, vacations, sick leave, shift premiums, overtime, job promotions, and layoff procedures. Rarely has labour, especially in the public sector, been able to make any significant inroads into those areas covered by management rights or prerogatives. Furthermore, when labour decided to strike in order to back its demands, the employers were able to call upon the assistance of the state to limit the effectiveness of the strike. In other words, the master-servant relationship remained as the major aspect of the Canadian industrial relations system during the era of so-called free collective bargaining. "Employers and the courts," as H.C. Pentland has articulated, "have sought laws and practices that will accomplish in the industrial age what the Master and Servant Act did in an earlier one: namely to *confine sharply attempts by workers to challenge the authority or interrupt the operations of their employers.*" A case in point was the federal government's 1975-8 Anti-Inflationary Wage Controls Program, which suspended free collective bargaining for all workers.

This legislation provided the groundwork for the period of permanent exceptionalism. In their discussion of this period, Panitch and Swartz point out that the right-wing ideological changes and the new coercive role of the state has resulted in the passage of bills at both the federal and provincial levels which attack trade union and free collective bargaining rights. The provinces followed the lead of the federal government's Bill C-124. Ontario, for example, passed the Inflation Restraint Act (Bill 179) in September 1982, placing a 5 per cent limit on compensation package increases. A good synopsis of the other temporary and per-

manent restrictive measures passed in the provinces is also provided. These restrictive measures were based on the neo-conservative, anti-union logic of premiers like Bill Bennett and Peter Lougheed, who argued that it was in labour's interest to entrust its future to capital.

The final and most interesting section of the monograph is "Towards the Future," where Panitch and Swartz evaluate the labour movement's response to the new era. Even though they argue that the CLC was able to mount a national one-day strike on 14 October 1976 against the Anti-Inflation Wage Controls Program and the B.C. workers were able to create the Solidarity Coalition with its various demonstrations and strikes, the Canadian labour movement has been "incapable of undertaking a sustained coordinated defense, industrially, politically, ideologically, of the right to strike." (61) The authors' explanation for this draws on a statement by Jean Claude Parrot. In short, Parrot reasons that because workers have a feeling of powerlessness and because the structure of the CLC has removed the leadership from the membership, the labour movement has forgotten the "ABCs of struggle." (62)

This may be so, but it seems that Panitch and Swartz fail to take into consideration the CLC's proposed political strategy for solving labour's economic problems. As Dennis McDermott has stated, "the problems are social and economic but the solution is political." This solution involves the adoption of the electoral process for supporting the NDP at the expense of militant industrial action, particularly the mass general strike. The CLC, through its federations and labour councils, firmly believes that only an elected NDP government can revitalize the capitalist system and resolve labour's problems by passing favourable labour legislation and minor economic and social reforms. This thinking has been reaffirmed at CLC, CUPE, and other union conventions. The consequences of such a

strategy do not look all that promising when one considers the fact that NDP governments have on occasion acted against labour's interests and have used back-to-work legislation to break strikes. An obvious example was the Blakeney government's decision to legislate the CUPE hospital workers back to work during their strike in 1982.

Despite the brevity of the analysis of the Canadian industrial relations system between 1944 and 1985, *From Consent to Coercion* will be of particular importance to students of Canadian industrial relations and labour history. It should also be required reading for all trade unionists who are experiencing the assault on their rights. They should seriously consider Panitch and Swartz's conclusion that labour will have to revitalize itself by mobilizing for socialist goals.

Glen Makohonuk
University of Saskatchewan

Ian McKay, *The Craft Transformed: An Essay on the Carpenters of Halifax, 1885-1985* (Halifax: Holdfast Press 1985).

THIS SMALL BOOK is hedged about with modest intentions. Ian McKay's task was to produce a semi-official, centennial history of Local 83 of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America (UBCJA), and he largely confined his research to the minute books of an organization that seldom numbered as many as 1,000 dues-payers and usually included far fewer.

Following his main source, McKay focuses almost exclusively on the institutional history of Local 83 — trade rules and union bylaws, changes in the personnel and political opinions of the leadership, ebbs and flows of membership, strikes and collective bargaining, and the effect on the union of laws like the Industrial Standards Acts. Such topics as workplace and community culture and

working-class ideology which North American "new labour historians" have fruitfully pursued are not part of this local study.

However, within its self-imposed limits, there is strength. McKay has produced a convincing portrait of one group of union workers over a century of often wrenching change that was faced, in different ways, by all skilled trades in Canada and the United States. In an engaging, popular style that never condescends to readers, he explains how the carpenters of Halifax coped with a chronically unstable building market, the hostility of large contractors, and the subdivision of their trade. It is a sharply drawn miniature that captures much that is significant about the largest craft in an industry which has been largely neglected by twentieth-century labour historians absorbed with manufacturing workers and the large corporations which employ them.

As his title suggests, McKay dwells on the discontinuities in the history of Halifax carpenters. He identifies three periods of change. First, from the 1860s to the turn of the century, carpenters worked for small, locally-based contractors and spent most of their organizational energies attempting to exclude "botches" and other woodworkers who had not served an apprenticeship in the trade. Down into the 1890s, Local 83 was open to both journeymen and master carpenters, both of whom were threatened by an influx of outside contracting firms.

The second period lasted from roughly 1900 into the late 1920s and was marked by the new power of "consolidated capitalism." Large construction and material supply companies, most of them with headquarters in Montreal, transformed the urban landscape of Nova Scotia and introduced machinery and hard-driving foremen which degraded the skills and self-respect of carpenters. Local 83 responded by shelving its former emphasis on mutual benefits and engaging instead in a series of militant strikes and demands for a gen-

eral agreement with all building employers. During the World War I period, class-conscious members elected local leaders attached to the resurgent left and became active supporters of the Halifax Labor Party. Spurred by the reconstruction boom following the huge city explosion of December 1917, the local achieved the largest membership in its history.

McKay argues that the third period, from 1926 to the present, has been one in which Local 83 (and, by extension, the entire Canadian labour movement) has been restrained within the bounds of "industrial legality." His argument is similar to that advanced by Marxist scholars such as David Montgomery, Stanley Aronowitz, and Bryan Palmer. Legislation passed in the 1930s and 1940s which forced contractors to recognize unions, bargain seriously, and abide by the letter of signed agreements seemed to unionists to be a great advance. But by the 1960s the effect of these laws was to place union power in the hands of bureaucratic officials who were often corrupt and to surrender to employers all control over how work was done. Unlike most authorized histories, McKay's book is no celebratory tract. It ends with the stern judgement that, "Business unionism, which turned against labour politics and a vision of labor as part of a broad struggle for social justice, now finds itself unable to motivate unionists to undertake the hard task of rebuilding the labour movement." (143-4)

The problem with such an approach is that McKay provides scant evidence that the members of Local 83 ever really wanted to enlist in a social movement instead of a trade union with limited ends. Except for the half-decade following World War I, Halifax carpenters seemed, from McKay's own account, to be primarily concerned with protecting their skills and jobs and holding the line on wages. At the end of a bitter 1919 strike, craft workers (joined by other building trades workers) even chose a friendly employer to represent their interests on the arbitration board.

Before delivering his jeremiad on the contemporary scene, McKay depicts the union as buffeted over the past century by the constant storms of economic and social change. Outside contractors, new building materials, technological innovations, and federal and provincial labour laws seemed to rock Local 83 this way and that, and unionists reacted defensively or simply acquiesced. They showed little recognition of themselves as self-conscious agents, makers of their own history. Thus, when McKay inserts his own political agenda into the story, it is not convincing.

In fact, his treatment of labour politics is the weakest part of the book. For example, McKay argues that the turn towards radicalism in the 1920s was due to post-war unemployment and a final attempt by carpenters to preserve their craft status. But there is no discussion of ideological traditions which may have encouraged the members of Local 83 to vote for communist and labourist officials. After all, economic hardship did not, in other times, provoke a move to the left. His discussion of the local's decline over the past generation similarly lacks an examination of what rank-and-file carpenters were thinking and why or whether they changed their minds. Here, his reliance on minutes of local meetings hinders a broader understanding. Oral history would have enriched the formal record.

Yet, when he sticks to the chronicle of workplace and bargaining table, McKay succeeds splendidly. His microcosmic perspective allows him to gauge the impact of specific building projects on the labour market, and he includes a number of anecdotes which allow one to visualize the carpenters of Halifax as more than "economic men." The book begins with a vivid account of the 1884 speech by UBCJA founder P.J. McGuire which inspired the Halifax labour movement to launch boycotts and local unions and, throughout, McKay enlivens his narrative with biographical sketches and telling quotations. The shelf of good histories of

the North American building trades is a short one, but *The Craft Transformed* certainly deserves a place on it.

Michael Kazin
American University

Mike Solski and John Smaller, *Mine Mill: The History of the International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers in Canada Since 1895* (Ottawa: Steel Rail Publishing 1984).

MINE MILL IS THE STORY of the IUMMSW's struggle to achieve workers' rights, and its 1960s absorption by the United Steelworkers of America. Both authors thoroughly influenced Mine-Mill politics, Mike Solski as chairman of the Sudbury union's organizing committee, and secretary-treasurer and later president of Local 598, and John Smaller as a Sudbury staff member in charge of public relations and the union's weekly newspaper. Despite their promise to relate Mine-Mill's history "objectively and yet passionately," the latter tone usually predominates. As well although the book is apparently based upon "sources too numerous for a detailed accounting of credits," the reader is often treated to page after page of material reproduced from published reminiscences or a few selected newspapers.

The first section recounts Mine-Mill's origins, growth, and demise in separate chapters devoted to the United States, as well as western Canada and northeastern Canada. Unfortunately, this topical arrangement, emphasizing organizational drives, strikes, and prominent individuals produces many redundancies without adequately comparing the three regions. Brief individual biographies and anecdotes enliven the text but fail to characterize working conditions in the mines adequately. Continuous harassment by government and mine owners provides the connecting theme as the authors move from one outrage perpetrated on the miners to another. Despite this determined resistance, Solski

and Smaller credit the Western Federation of Miners and Mine-Mill with achieving nearly every major advancement in hours, wages, and working conditions made in the United States and Canada.

The fourth chapter examines the 1941 Kirkland Lake strike in northern Ontario. Reprinted newspaper editorials and participants' reminiscences detail the events of the strike from the union's perspective. Despite the opposition of the "arrogant, nose-thumbing mine owners," who were "luxuriating in vast estates or castles," the Kirkland Lake strike ultimately forced the federal government to enact PC 1003, a law which enabled workers to select their own union. This chapter has no surprises. Readers would be better advised to consult Laurel Sefton MacDowell's equally sympathetic, but more profound analysis of the strike and its subsequent impact.

The strength of this study lies in the final chapter on Sudbury Local 598, Canada's largest trade union local. Occupying more than one-third of the text, this section draws heavily on the authors' personal experiences and taped interviews to explain the success of the United Steelworkers of America in forcing Mine-Mill into the 1967 merger. To bolster their outrage at this event, the authors delve into the social, economic, and cultural benefits the workers and their spouses had gained before the Steelworkers' raids began in the 1950s. According to Solski and Smaller, the order to destroy Mine-Mill came from American politicians, business owners, and unions caught in the anti-communist hysteria of the McCarthy era. Mackenzie King's "subservience" to Washington, and the hostility of such Canadian government agencies as the Ontario Labour Relations Board facilitated the Steelworkers' raids. Once Mine-Mill was labelled communist, almost every influential Canadian organization joined the "conspiracy" to destroy the union. With the active support of the Roman Catholic church, the CCF, the Thompson newspaper chain, *Maclean's* magazine, and such high profile jour-

nalists as Pierre Berton, USWA Canadian Director Charles H. Millard initiated a "boring from within" campaign which eventually succeeded, thanks to "traitors" within the ranks of Mine-Mill.

The writing style in *Mine Mill* is lively, and the narrative is supported by numerous excellent photographs. Unfortunately, the authors lack objectivity. Their union battles emerge as "good guys" combating "bad guys." Mine-Mill can do nothing wrong, in their view, whereas the Steelworkers, supported by a subservient Canadian government and communist-baiting press, can do no good. Surprisingly, Solski and Smaller never address the question of whether Mine-Mill was communist, nor whether its opponents truly believed it was a cog in an international communist conspiracy.

Douglas O. Baldwin
University of
Prince Edward Island

Gordon Inglis, *More Than Just a Union: The Story of the NFFAWU* (St. John's: Jesperson Press 1985).

THE RISE OF the "fishermen's union" is one of the most significant developments in Newfoundland society and in the fishing industry in the Atlantic provinces. From 1970 to 1980, the Newfoundland Fishermen, Food and Allied Workers Union (NFFAWU), now formally Local 1252 of the United Food and Commercial Workers International Union, grew from fewer than 1,000 to some 23,000 members. It encompassed virtually all those working full-time in the Newfoundland fishery, and had become a power to be accounted for by employers and in state policy. Since 1980 the union has moved beyond Newfoundland to represent potato-processing workers in Prince Edward Island and to organize fishery workers in Nova Scotia.

The fishery union is really remarkable because it is "more than just a union." It

is a social movement with members and purposes not traditionally associated with trade unions. The NFFAWU has always included not only workers in processing plants and on large fishing vessels (trawlers) owned by some plant owners, but also the owner-operators of small and large "inshore" fishing boats, the latter "longliners" valued at \$50,000 to \$500,000, and the employees of the longliner owners (so-called "sharemen") as well. The union has always been in the immediate business of negotiating not only wages for trawler and plant workers, but also fish prices to be paid to fish-catching enterprises by processing plants. Most importantly, the union has also always had a stated political and social goal of restructuring the whole fishery society in Newfoundland to remove from centre-stage the fish-processing companies (and the paternalistic relations associated with their dominance), and these aims have been equated with the historic struggles of fishers against the oppression of the Newfoundland merchantocracy. To these ends the union has produced sophisticated analyses of the development of the fishery. Usually the bottom line of such interpretations stress policy proposals for a change in the entire system so that the profitability of fish-catching enterprises and fair wages are assured. These goals were most vigorously (but unsuccessfully) pursued in 1980 when the union's 10,000 inshore members engaged in a six-week boycott of the major processing companies.

Although studies of episodes in the union's history have been published before (notably David Macdonald's analysis of the trawler workers' strike in 1974-5, *Power Begins at the Cod-End*), Gordon Inglis' book is the first general history. It is beautifully written and tells powerfully of the building of the NFFAWU between 1969 and 1980. Inglis focuses on the major episodes in the union's history: its founding in 1969-71, the Burgeo and the trawler workers' strikes of 1971-2 and

1974-5, and the 1980 action by inshore fishers. The book will interest more than those readers with expert knowledge of Newfoundland and the fishing industry. Each of the events dealt with is prefaced by character sketches of the leading actors, details on the structure of the industry, and background in Newfoundland social and cultural history.

More than anything, Inglis' selection of events, detailed background, and narrative style, draw attention to the basis of the "counter-hegemonic" capacity of the fishery union: to why in the 1970s its agenda for reform was often the agenda for a diverse range of classes and class fractions in the Atlantic fishing industry and in Newfoundland society. His treatment of the nine-month strike in 1971-2 at a fish-processing plant in Burgeo on the southwest coast of Newfoundland is a case in point. This industrial action established the popular perception of the union as a leading social critic, and it cemented the class alliances the NFFAWU represents. Inglis' account shows that this owed far more to the nature of the opposition, to the obstinacy, stupidity, and cupidity of the employer, Spencer Lake, than to the substance of the union's demands for a moderate wage increase and a compulsory dues checkoff. (122-3) Instead of co-opting the local leadership by immediately recognizing the union and keeping discussions to wages and benefits, Lake took unionization as "a genuine vote of non-confidence against" himself:

Lake talked to his workers, telling them that the NFFAWU was backed by "gangsters from Chicago" who only wanted their dues. In a letter, he informed workers that he and his wife had talked the matter over and concluded that they could not tolerate a union in the fish plant: "We both feel that Burgeo would not be worth living in under these conditions — therefore we would most likely have to sell the plant and move away. . . . I would like you all to think this matter over very seriously before you sign up to have a union in Burgeo, because I am afraid I could not operate under such circumstances." (116, 121)

Since Burgeo was a one-company town and Lake owned the supermarket, the barbershop, and the dairy, this was a substantial threat. More absurd was Lake's alienation of all possible public allies in Newfoundland, to the union's gain:

Lake could usually be depended upon to enliven interviews with denunciations of the NFFAWU as "a conspiracy by the United Church, the Roman Catholic Church, political opportunists like [union president] Richard Cashin, and union gangsters from Chicago." Sometimes he added lines like, "and I don't give a damn if you print that," which were duly printed. Lake neither liked nor trusted the press, and the reporters often turned his attacks back upon him. *Evening Telegram* reporter Ron Crucker opened one story by quoting Spencer's first words on meeting him: "I don't even know you yet. But as far as I'm concerned you're a p---k like the rest of them." (145)

With enemies like this, who needs deliberately to make friends?

Inglis' treatment of the lengthy trawler workers' strikes in 1974 and 1975 shows the impact circumstances and the right issue also had in establishing the union's hegemony. As it applied to the workers employed on company-owned trawlers at issue in the actions were not wages, but the "co-adventurer" or "co-venturer" system under which non-owners of a fishing vessel are considered to be entrepreneurs on an equal footing with the owner and paid by a share of the catch — with an obvious implication:

A union publication at the time of the strike described one . . . trip in 1974 on which a Fishery Products trawler landed a volume of fish that would, in normal circumstances, have given each crewman a share of about \$300.00. In the plant it was discovered that the fish were worthless because something the fish had been eating made the flesh unusable. According to the Union's account, the workers who unloaded the fish, the cutters who discovered its condition, the labourers who eventually dumped it were all paid at their regular hourly rates: the fishermen, after ten days of hard work at sea, received nothing at all. (209-10)

Pay for work! On such an issue one could

hope to move most of thinking society — and that was ultimately the case.

Most interesting, however, given the acclamation the union enjoyed following the overthrow of the co-adventurer system, was how little the union's agenda actually had to do with the outcome. The first strike began as a spontaneous action of trawler workers, when those working for *Fishery Products* were called out to a mass meeting in support of inshore fishers.

"We just wanted to put a bit of pressure on Fishery Products," Cashin says, "to get them to settle the inshore strike at Port au Choix. . . . And it was working. . . . Then the Atlantic Fish Processors boats [also] began to tie up at Marystown. . . . Then I get a call from Bill Morrow [of National Sea Products] and he was mad as hell. He was furious — one of his boats had tied up. So I'm . . . still on the phone: 'Get the Atlantic Fish boats back! Get the National Sea boats back! . . .' But, anyway, we couldn't get them to sail. . . . So we thought, 'Oh, my God, we're into it now!' There was nothing we could do but go ahead with it. (203-4)

In the second strike, the co-adventurer system was put on the agenda not by the union, which "had made no specific demands." (213) but by a conciliation board appointed to end the first wildcat strike. Also significant was the support of St. John's interests, expressed in a front-page editorial in the *Daily News*, "the newspaper that during the Burgeo strike had published. . . attacks on 'wrecker Cashin, the butcher of Burgeo!'"

"Co-adventure is a foolish anachronism. . . . Who but the merchants, steeped in historic arrogance, would dare cling to the idea of equal risk, more or less, between a trawlerman and his co-adventurer fish baron?" (226)

The union's achievement was that when handed the ball, it did not fumble, and in the process it managed to extract some concessions for inshore fishers (price subsidies) as well.

Inglis' account also stresses the importance of what the NFFAWU did not bring into question — the less tangible con-

tinuities between it and the historical experience of Newfoundlanders — in contributing to its hegemony. Among these were, in a province with a history of personalism in politics, the many facets of Richard Cashin, the union's first and only president, and Desmond McGrath, the liberal, liberationist Catholic priest who played a central role in organizing fishers and founding the NFFAWU. Most interesting are the similarities Inglis points to between the experience of evangelical Christianity in rural Newfoundland and union-organizing:

It was not an easy audience — the Bonavista Bay men listened impassively and the visitors [Cashin and McGrath] could not tell what sort of impression they were making. When the speeches were finished, one after another, fishermen stood and spoke in response. Older men first, then younger, they told of their own experiences of injustice and hardship. . . . To Cashin and McGrath it was a baffling performance, and it was not until much later they realized that. . . like a Methodist or Salvationist congregation, the fishermen were confirming the "sermons" with personal testimony. (31)

The strength of *More Than Just a Union*, however, is also its greatest weakness. In focusing on the successful growth of the fishery union as a comprehensive organization of fishers and plant workers, and in becoming absorbed by his narrative, Inglis fails to treat the unions' agenda for reform as an object of analysis. If the union is a "social movement," then where is it "moving" society? What are the implications of its policy proposals and pursuits for the development of the fishery? What does it foreclose, as well as make possible? Given the diversity of its membership, who has gained or lost the most in the process? Most important, what are the limits of the alliance represented by the NFFAWU: at what points does the alliance break down because the *bona fide* interests of some categories of membership are contradicted by further demands and struggles?

Beyond what the union itself has had to say, that in relation to the fish processors all its members are in the same boat, (292) Inglis says little about these questions. Similarly, conflicts within the union are rarely examined, and when they are (as in the treatment of the 1972 Locking affair, when the international union representative was essentially purged from the NFFAWU for opposing the inclusion of the fishers) they are presented as tactical disputes in which the only issues were the efficacy of a comprehensive union and its continued unity — and not the policies a comprehensive organization should pursue.

But none of this detracts from the fact that, in capturing the fishery union as it appeared in popular politics, Inglis' work will be the touchstone for further analyses of the union and Newfoundland society.

Bryant Fairley
Queen's University

Victor Howard, *"We Were the Salt of the Earth!" A Narrative of The On-To-Ottawa Trek and the Regina Riot* (University of Regina: Canadian Plains Research Center 1985).

THE 1930S IN CANADA witnessed many failures. Perhaps none was greater than government's failure to deal humanely and effectively with the tens of thousands of transients who roamed across the country in search of work. Usually though not invariably single men, they were often ineligible for unemployment relief in their own right even in their home communities (if they had one; not a few of them were fairly recent immigrants). When they hit the road or, more commonly, the rails, they soon found that residency requirements barred them from all but the most temporary relief wherever they went. Free market theory favours a labour force that can move to where the jobs are. But throughout the 1930s there were not enough jobs. Until the establishment of

relief camps most transients did whatever came to hand, including begging and petty theft, simply to keep alive.

Victor Howard's interest in these men, or rather the politically active among them, goes back almost two decades. In 1967 he interviewed approximately 30 men as part of his research for a book on the Canadians who fought in the International Brigades during the Spanish Civil War of 1936-9. That book, published as *The Mackenzie-Papineau Battalion* in 1969 (the author's last name at the time was Hoar), was followed in 1973 by an edited volume, Ronald Liversedge's *Recollections of the On-To-Ottawa Trek*, to which Howard had added a number of related documents. Now we have Howard's own narrative account of the trek and the Regina riot of Dominion Day, 1935. It is a valuable addition to the literature on the depression years.

Howard has written a meticulously detailed account of the Relief Camp Workers Union (RCWU) strike which began on 4 April 1935 in the federal relief camps located in British Columbia. By mid-April 1,500 strikers were in Vancouver, hoping to win their demands. Initially there were seven of them of which "work with wages" was the most important. Although the strikers managed to obtain some minor concessions from the city of Vancouver, the provincial and federal governments stonewalled. In late May the strike was on the verge of collapsing. It gained new life when a majority of those still striking voted to take their protest to Ottawa. On 3 and 4 June rather more than a thousand left Vancouver on top of CPR boxcars.

By the time the On-To-Ottawa Trek moved out of Calgary on 10 June, it consisted of 1,400 men. The Bennett government had no intention of allowing an augmented number to reach Ottawa, and took the steps necessary to halt the trek in Regina. The choice was deliberate, Howard writes: Saskatchewan had a Liberal government, and Regina was held to be a

safer place than Winnipeg or some more easterly city. In spite of Premier James Gardiner's vigorous complaints, the RCMP, brought under federal control through the invocation of the Railway Act, stopped the trekkers from moving further east. Eight delegates were allowed to travel to Ottawa and met Bennett and his cabinet. This produced no agreement. The federal authorities, who had agreed to provide relief to the trekkers while negotiations were taking place, withdrew the offer on 26 June: the provincial government again declined to provide relief. With 340 RCMP officers now at Regina, the Bennett government decided to arrest the strike leaders. Without them, the trek would presumably collapse. A special camp had already been prepared at Lumsden, Saskatchewan, to receive the trekkers.

The decision to arrest the strike leaders while they were addressing a meeting of trekkers and sympathizers in the market square on the evening of Dominion Day was surely provocative. A riot broke out which took several hours to subdue. Howard's account of the riot makes skillful use of interviews and is genuinely gripping. Two short chapters deal with the immediate and longer term aftermath of the strike. In the second of these chapters, Howard mentions the closing of the camps by the Mackenzie King government in 1936, and notes that as many as 400 of the relief camp strikers ended up fighting in the Spanish Civil War, which broke out in the summer of that year.

In ending the book in 1936, Howard limits somewhat his book's usefulness. The problem of transiency did not end with the closing of the federal relief camps. King was even less happy to provide for the unemployed than Bennett had been. The niggardliness of King's government contributed directly to another well-known incident of the decade, the sit-down strikes in the Vancouver Art Gallery and post office in 1938, the forcible clearing of the post office building, and the

subsequent On-To-Victoria Trek. Like the trek of 1935, the later incident failed in its attempt to induce governments to provide adequately for the single unemployed and for transients.

Indeed, Howard might profitably have added a few pages to discuss the unwillingness of the federal government to take responsibility for the relief of unemployment in general, and for unemployed single people in particular. The argument, of course, was that under the BNA Act this responsibility did not rest with Ottawa. Local governments should provide relief, with the provinces supplying money when necessary. As in the early 1920s, the federal government came reluctantly to provide funds to provinces and municipalities. The Bennett government's decision in 1935 to introduce a scheme of unemployment insurance was something of an aberration. That it was judged in 1937 to be *ultra vires* is not as important as that it excluded seasonal workers and did nothing for the very people Howard writes about, the long-term unemployed.

Ottawa's relief camps for single men were evidence less of an interventionist attitude than of the belief that such camps might be a cost-effective method of preventing social disorder. General A.G.L. McNaughton, chief of the general staff, boasted in 1934 of the low cost of relief provided in the camps, which were under the authority of the Department of National Defence. At \$1.17 per person-day they were indeed a bargain! The work done in them was often scarcely worth doing, and they were in fact nothing but holding pens for those who could find no real work. But no one in Bennett's cabinet believed that much more could or should be done.

It is possible to point to the huge sums spent in meeting the debt charges of the Canadian National Railway system and contrast them with the considerably smaller amounts transferred to the provinces for relief, and the very much smaller sums spent on the relief camps. But con-

servative governments in capitalist countries are bound to rate the welfare of investors higher than that of unemployed workers. The deflation of the early 1930s made the government's solicitousness for investors notably burdensome. Paying the full interest on the CNR's bonds and on a national debt bloated by wartime borrowing nevertheless continued to be seen as a sacred trust.

Given the claims on Ottawa's revenues at a time when the wish for a balanced budget was strong though unfulfilled, the relief camp strikers were bound to fail. Howard shows quite clearly that their hand was weak. Nevertheless some Canadians thought that the riot might be the start of social revolution. The Communist Party leadership was under no such illusion. In spite of being formulated by the Communist-dominated RCWU, the trek's aims were far from revolutionary. They were also doomed.

Howard's book is well-written and well-illustrated. It deals with a fascinating event, and provided it gets some promotion should sell well. Labour historians will certainly want to add it to their libraries.

Michiel Horn
York University

Mervin Y.T. Chen and Thomas G. Regan, *Work in the Changing Canadian Society* (Toronto: Butterworths 1985).

THE PROBLEM WITH writing a textbook is that while you may think you are writing for students, it is their instructors who make the decision whether they will use it or not. Perhaps this is as it should be, but instructors vary widely in their approaches to their subject material. Some instructors focus upon exegetical analyses of certain classic texts, while others stress a survey of literature in the field. Some may insist upon a particular analytic perspective, while others are committed to a more eclectic approach. Under such circum-

stances an author who attempts to please everyone may satisfy no one.

The authors of this text follow an eclectic survey approach which incorporates, they claim, analyses of the work role from both social psychological and structural points of view. "Structure" as they use it simply means "organization" or the structure of work roles. These two perspectives are brought together by their non-controversial assertion that they view persons as workers, working within organizations, and affected by the inroads of technology.

The first chapter begins with a brief overview of the historical meaning of work. Instructors who place some importance on historical transformations in the place of work in meaning systems or with cross-cultural comparisons à la Polanyi will be dissatisfied with the very brief statement. But those who want to get on with contemporary issues in meanings attached to paid employment will not be bothered. The first chapter concludes with an introduction to issues in the study of work and a description of the chapters to follow.

The authors then describe the characteristics of the Canadian work force, citing problems of definition, detailing historical comparisons of the age and gender characteristics of the labour force, shifts in the occupational structure, and pointing to the enlargement of the service sector. A section on dependency ratios and a short discussion of future trends based on the work of Denton and Spencer rounds out this part of the text. Unfortunately only cursory reference is made to unemployment, citing a "host of causes" without any explanation or assessment of them.

Chapters three and four deal with occupational choice and socialization to work respectively. Here the social psychological approach is made explicit. The authors present an overview of approaches to the study of career choice, citing the fortuitous, the rational decision-making approach, and explanatory models, the

latter incorporating what the authors call "socio-cultural" influences which are socio-economic status, parental education, gender, and ethnicity. Finally the authors present a description of occupational choice as a function of societal allocation of work roles.

The chapter on socialization to work presents material which follows Everett C. Hughes' orientation. Most notable here is a presentation of Haas and Shaffir's study of socialization into the medical profession and Kelner's work on chiropractors. A discussion here of the nature of socialization to routine work and the interaction between class of origin and the demands of the job would have added interest. Paul Willis' research in England provides a good point of departure for analysis at this level. These two chapters are strong on typologies and descriptions of other people's works, but short on analysis and explanation.

Chapter five deals with careers and chapter six with occupational mobility. The chapters cover the standard issues and in chapter six touch upon some special issues in stratification, most notably the effect of wives' employment on the status of the family. This chapter also presents statements of functional versus conflict theories of stratification.

Chen and Regan present a straightforward description of organizations in which several typologies are presented. But power and strategies for its deployment, both by managers and the managed is not discussed, thus leaving the material relatively lifeless. Labour unions, the authors assert, have become organizations that are "much too familiar." Again, the authors treat the material primarily in the form of descriptive typologies without much attention to analysis and explanation.

After reviewing the research on automation and the effects of technology, primarily with respect to alienation, job satisfaction, deskilling, and unemployment, the authors come down hard on the

side of ambivalence: "Whether we will be able to benefit from the possibilities offered by the new technology will depend on how we manage it. Technology is a choice, not a determinant." (236)

This text would serve those instructors well who wish to familiarize their students with contemporary research on work in Canadian society. An excellent bibliography follows the substantive chapters and in the chapters themselves research findings march smartly across the pages. The march is too swift for my taste. The student can watch the parade but she or he may be left wondering why it got organized in the first place. But perhaps the authors intend this to be the role of the instructor.

Joseph Smucker
Concordia University

J.B. Cunningham and T.H. White, eds.,
Quality of Working Life: Contemporary Cases (Ottawa: Labour Canada 1984).

THIS BOOK CONTAINS fourteen case studies of recent Canadian QWL initiatives at the workplace and one case in which employers and unions collaborated to achieve regional labour market stability. The targets of reform ranged from warehouse and factory workers to clerks and professionals. With the exception of a productivity gainsharing scheme, the programmes utilized were of two types (sometimes used in tandem) - participative management and job redesign. The former tendency constructs mechanisms (joint worker/union-management committees, works councils, consultative supervision) which give subordinate employees a voice in decision-making - usually on matters pertaining to their jobs and immediate work areas. The objective is to alter workers' consciousness, to supplant oppositional with cooperative workers. The second approach to reform, job redesign (job enrichment, autonomous groups), alters the content of work by

adding new tasks and responsibilities to it. Although advertised as a means of making labour more satisfying, job redesign, I submit, is employed not to contain resistance and motivate workers but to rationalize work. Redesign ordinarily is instituted in work settings (like continuous process industries) in which maximum job specialization via Taylorism and Fordism is not the most productive/profitable mode of organizing the labour process. When motivation is considered crucial to the "successful" implementation or maintenance of job redesign, supplementary programmes in the participatory/human relations genre are installed. For example, Petrosar and Shell Sarnia use autonomous groups in conjunction with joint committees and the abolition of symbols of class differentiation, like time clocks, hourly wages, and special parking lots and cafeterias for management personnel.

Several assumptions unite these programmes (and this collection of articles). The first stresses mutual benefits. We are reminded repeatedly in these articles that the goal of QWL is to improve both productivity/profits and life at the workplace. When properly implemented these reforms produce no losers — only winners. This article of faith is not challenged by the several "unsuccessful" programmes described in the book, because failures are attributed not to the principle of QWL but to inadequate methods of implementation, to the loss of top management support, to the (irrational?) actions of parties who feel threatened (employees, unions, first-level supervisors). A second assumption is that conflict between workers/unions and managers/employers is destructive and in no one's interests. Over and over again, the authors condemn adversarial relations and praise cooperation. These assumptions are used to disarm skeptics and persuade them that QWL deserves to be supported.

Although the outcomes of the programmes were not, for the most part, sub-

jected to rigorous evaluations, enough information was presented to suggest that the QWL gains realized by workers were restricted largely to the intangible area of intrinsic job satisfaction. (The degree and salience of such attitudinal changes usually were based on impressions rather than hard data.) It is undeniable that greater job variety, responsibility, and influence normally are appreciated by workers, but this advantage of QWL must be weighed alongside any tangible losses suffered by the work force. For example, at an Air Canada clerical branch, a Work Improvement Program paved the way for the subsequent introduction of computers, which led to the automatic monitoring of worker performance and labour elimination. At an unnamed plant three shopfloor workers analyzed work methods and concluded that "the shop had twice the number of people required." New work procedures were adopted, and over a four-year period the work force was cut back through attrition from 156 to 85 employees. I assume the remaining workers were not compensated for their obviously increased workloads, since the issue was not discussed. At Petrosar's Sarnia plant, an explicit objective of "participation" is to prevent unionization. Autonomous groups at a Steinberg's warehouse led to the elimination of part-time employees and induced productivity-oriented workers to police the behaviour of their work mates. (The union finally pulled out of this programme.) There are obvious advantages to the company from labour elimination, speed-up, electronic monitoring, no union, and workers' assumption of management control functions. However, to argue that these outcomes benefit workers is disingenuous.

The impact of cooperation on employees and the company is more difficult to evaluate, especially inasmuch as assessments of outcomes ordinarily are carried out within an abbreviated time frame. In the abstract, the plea for harmonious labour-management relations appears

compelling. But for all their promise of granting employees greater autonomy and influence and improving worker/union-management relations, QWL programmes do not alter the structure of workplace authority. A university-owned electronics firm staffed by professionals instituted employee representation on the board of directors, an elected employee council, and an employee stock purchase plan. These changes, which were far more ambitious than most participatory-type reforms, did nothing to transform the real locus of power. As a result, employees' orientations to work and the firm did not change. (This study by Richard Long was exceptionally forthright and rigorously conducted.) The cooperation that prevails with QWL is not a relationship among equals but operates on management's terms and under management's domination. Participatory programmes are not geared to creating a community of equals but to constructing a "community at work" or an "organizational culture" which makes management power more palatable and which mutes workers' resistance to changes in work methods, technology, and work rules. Moreover, when a company is not unionized (as in half of these cases), QWL programmes sometimes are used to keep it that way. When a union is present, participation often is used to neutralize it. If participation does manage to substitute an enterprise consciousness for a class or union consciousness and if participation does contain the union, the eventual result can only be the reduction or elimination of the conditions — solidarity and militance — known (historically) to be necessary for workers to achieve significant improvements in the quality of their working life.

James Rinehart
University of Western Ontario

Henri Gagnon, *Les P.M.E. (les petites et moyennes entreprises) à l'agonie* (Montréal: Édition Héritage 1982).

THIS BOOK IS divided into two sections linked by the author's concern for the strategies and direction of the Quebec labour movement. This is not a scholarly work and is intended for a wide audience among workers. Despite its title, small- and medium-sized business is discussed only briefly and tangentially.

The first section is a tract exhorting organized workers to fight for control over their own pension funds. While this is to insure that the contributors benefit fully from their investments, Gagnon considers these funds an instrument for social and economic change. Impressed by the *Cuisse de dépôt et placement* which has increased the Quebec government's ownership and control of the economy, he proposed that workers do the same. In control of their own pension contributions, they could decide where to create jobs or provide services to the community. The author argues unconvincingly that this would be a more important weapon than strikes, which he considers outdated. This belief seems to have grown out of a period when walk-outs became increasingly unpopular, often hurting the public or strikers more than employers. Most of the ideas in this work have been presented elsewhere by Gagnon who quotes himself several times.

While the second section is entitled "La Fraternité interprovinciale des ouvriers en électricité (la FIPOE): un grand syndicat," it hardly deals at all with this organization. It is a brief history of Montreal's Local 568 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers from which the FIPOE emerged in 1972. As president of Local 568 until 1971 and then as one of the initiators of an underground newspaper, *l'Électricien au courant*, Gagnon was well placed to explain the developments that led most Quebec electricians to leave the IBEW. The 1960s witnessed a massive organizing campaign by Local 568 that successfully recruited most of the electricians across Quebec. These workers had been assured that they

were exempted from contributing to an expensive union pension plan, but after the membership drive was over the IBEW reversed its decision and tried to impose the scheme Quebec workers did not want. The officers of the local refused to comply, in part because this would have left the union vulnerable to raids from the rival *Confédération des syndicats nationaux*. The IBEW then placed the local under trusteeship in 1970 to insure compliance, according to Gagnon. He makes the point that it was the unwillingness of IBEW leaders in the United States to understand conditions in Quebec and their undemocratic rule that led to the formation of the FIPOE. He also shows that Local 568 and the FIPOE led the fight against the Quebec government's control over the pension funds of construction workers and for the right of unions to negotiate their own contracts in opposition to legislation enacted as of 1968 imposing a powerful government presence at the bargaining table in the construction industry.

These conflicts with bureaucratic international union bosses and an interventionist Quebec government are presented as a struggle by an organization whose strength derives from the active participation of the membership and that this is a tradition that continues: "Les membres de la base syndicale ont toujours su exprimer leur volonté." (157) It is difficult to reconcile this image with Gagnon's earlier reproval of the FIPOE. He does not discuss the phony elections, strong arm tactics, loan sharking, corruption, and underworld links that crept into Local 568 starting in 1968, continuing under the FIPOE, and that he denounced before the Cliche Commission. The FIPOE was formed by the leaders of Local 568 after they were charged by IBEW headquarters for selling illicit IBEW memberships to American electricians who could use them to gain access to preferred jobs in the United States, but no mention is made of this. It is also curious and unfortunate that he does not follow developments past

1971 through to the secession and on to the period of government trusteeship. The circumstances that led Quebec electricians out of the IBEW are probably more complex than Gagnon admits. This is a useful source but it does not provide a full account of an important conflict that eventually led to the divorce between the Canadian Labour Congress and the international building trades unions, and to the formation of the Canadian Federation of Labour.

Geoffrey Ewen
York University

Jonathan Lomax. *First and Foremost in Community Health Centres: The Centre in Sault Ste Marie and the PHC Alternatives* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press 1985).

THE HISTORY OF Canada in the third quarter of the twentieth century will have much to say about social policy, and in particular the issue of national health insurance, known to all as "medicare." It is in this sphere that Canada evolved some unique, and indeed exquisite, institutions in health insurance for hospital care, then medical services, and for long-term care. These of course did not emerge of and by themselves. The strength of opposition and weight of inertia to do nothing were formidable opponents indeed.

Against this background, a small but dramatic set of struggles took place in Saskatchewan, Ontario, Quebec, and Manitoba to change some basic elements in Canada's health care system. These struggles were bitterly fought, in some cases by NDP governments, but mostly by tiny groups of reform elements against powerful medical communities and associated political groupings. Lomax describes well, and in parts with dramatic crescendo, the fight to establish a prepaid group medical care system in Sault Ste Marie, sponsored by the steelworkers' union, and opposed by the local and pro-

vincial medical establishments. That the struggle took place far from metropolitan centres, and was small in the scale of national or international events does not diminish its importance in Canada's social history.

Lomax has done an excellent job of describing the process of development of an idea, in this case imported from the United States but with local modifications, and the ensuing external and internal battles surrounding its implementation. Regrettably, there is less success in setting the context of the issue and its importance to the whole development of health care organization in Canadian social evolution. But the book does achieve its immediate purpose of a descriptive history of "the Sault" health centre.

The story, briefly, is as follows: in the late 1950s in Sault Ste Marie, the steelworkers' union (USWA) led by the redoubtable John Barker, was concerned with available local medical services, particularly in regard to insufficient numbers of doctors, lack of specialists, inadequate insurance coverage, over-billing, and long waiting times. Barker and colleagues looked to the American union scene and saw successful health care organizations, then called prepaid group practice (PPGP), now known as health maintenance organizations (HMO). They liked the approach, and galvanized the union membership and its professional support to go ahead and develop such a plan in the Sault. The local medical society, and behind them the provincial medical association, generated and sustained an intense campaign of opposition, public and private, that nearly inundated and certainly prejudiced the fledgling health care project. Nevertheless the programme got going with the support of 3,500 steelworkers putting up \$135 each by checkoff to provide the facility, and then by their massive support in opting to get their health care in the new centre as opposed to continuing with the local private medical service.

Following the establishment of the centre, Ontario's Conservative government reluctantly accepted the federal "50 cent dollar" incentive and introduced its medicare plan of universal medical care insurance in 1969. The government saw its responsibility to be the provision of an insurance mechanism only, and it steered clear of initiatives to reform the delivery of health services. As a result "the Sault" and the new St. Catharines health centre project were subject to numbing and sterile negotiations which led to partial solutions hobbling the programmes and ultimately knocking off the St. Catharines health centre. The government could never bring itself to deal with the basic issue of funding by capitation payment of a prepaid group practice based on periodic choice of selection of health care system rather than day-to-day choice of individual health care provider (the "freedom of choice" issue).

During the 1970s governments across Canada had to face the issue of cost containment to prevent collapse of the universal medical care insurance system. At the same time it was essential to extend the range of benefits so as to lower cost alternatives to expensive and unnecessary hospital care. Some provinces also initiated programmes in reformed health care delivery, province-wide such as in Quebec, or in demonstration project developments such as in Manitoba. In Ontario, the government stood pat, and put the non-government initiatives in jeopardy from continued medical establishment opposition, but more seriously from compromised and unworkable funding systems.

For the involved veteran of such battles, Lomax evokes the lovely and bitter conflict. The small scale doesn't diminish its importance. Unfortunately, the outcome was more of a tie than a victory for one side or the other. The Sault survived, St. Catharines subsequently collapsed. Others were largely peripheral; the initiative for reform of health care delivery in

Ontario, and the rest of Canada, except Quebec, largely stopped by the mid 1970s.

Meanwhile in the United States, HMOs have gone from success to success and are now the new favoured "mode" even if still small vis-à-vis the total United States population. In Canada, reform of health care delivery has been put either on simmer, or off the governmental stove altogether. What will happen to this issue in the remainder of the 1980s and the 1990s remains to be seen.

Lomax's book deserves reading by those close to these issues, as well as a wider audience of those interested in the social history of Canada.

Theodore H. Tulchinsky
 Director of Personal and Community
 Preventative Health Services
 Jerusalem, Israel

Eric H. Monkkenon, ed., *Walking to Work: Tramps in America, 1790-1935* (University of Nebraska Press: Lincoln and London 1984).

THROUGHOUT AMERICA in the 1870s, social commentators began to use "tramp" as a noun to describe the increased numbers of itinerant persons on the road in search of work, shelter, and food. Despite respectable America's obsessive fear of tramps, almost no historians paid much attention to them until the last few years, when new emphases in social and labour history independently led a number of scholars to rediscover their important role in Gilded Age and Progressive era experience. In *Walking to Work*, Eric Monkkenon has brought together a sampling of this recent work on tramps. His book usefully demonstrates the variety of questions about tramps currently addressed by historians and the wide range of methods and data they employ.

The essays cover a broad array of topics which are united by their focus on

transient labour rather than by any shared theoretical, thematic, or methodological concern. Two of them treat the itinerant poor before industrialization: Douglas Lamar-Jones sketches the dimensions of transience in eighteenth-century Massachusetts, and Priscilla Ferguson Clement delineates the history of the relations between the wandering poor and social welfare in early nineteenth-century Philadelphia. Through case studies of carpenters, cigar-makers, and the labour press, Jules Tygiel, Patricia A. Cooper, and Michael Davis explore connections between tramps and organized labour. Lynn Weiner examines the relations between gender and tramping in her overview of women tramps; Eric Monkkenon explicates the most important regional differences in tramping; and John C. Schneider argues that tramps formed a distinct subculture.

In his introduction, Monkkenon stresses the relation of tramping to the history of the labour market. In nineteenth-century America, he argues, "the growth of the numbers of tramps directly paralleled the growth of industrial capitalism. The decline of the industrial tramping system by the 1920s coincided with the emergence of corporate capitalism and the modern welfare state. . . . Tramps were . . . the ordinary working people of the United States on the move between jobs and residences. . . . Tramps were not a reserve army at all, but rather a highly mobile infantry." This interpretation of tramping as a product of economic cycles, seasonal demands for labour, and the structural transformation of production, claims Monkkenon, is the thread that unites the diverse essays in his book. Although he is right about tramping's labour market role, the essays, which are a good deal less consistent than he implies, raise other important themes as well.

The first is definitional. Who was a tramp? Throughout the book the term is used differently. In fact, most often it

shades into transience, which is the book's real focus. Indeed, by implication the essays show how impossible it is to draw a distinct line between unemployed workers on the road in search of jobs and a subculture of professional, permanent vagabonds. Tramp, it turns out, is another one of those ideological constructs (like *the unworthy poor*) that divided the working class against itself, dampened charitable impulses, and legitimated harsh, punitive methods of social discipline and labour market regulation.

Second, the essays highlight the contrast between image and actuality. Tramps were not, as contemporary commentators asserted, lazy, violent, dishonest outcasts. By and large, they did not spend their winters luxuriating in southern sunshine. Instead, they were mostly young, unmarried white men willing, indeed eager, to work. (On this point, my own research on tramps in New York State in the 1870s, reported in *Poverty and Policy in American History*, reveals exactly the same features.)

Third, tramps played an important role in the creation of working-class institutions and culture. This is the book's most counter-intuitive point. They did not retard the development of labour unions or working-class cohesion. To the contrary, they helped nationalize some trades. In fact, some important crafts (for instance, cigar-makers and carpenters) incorporated tramping into their trading and organization.

Fourth, the reasons why individuals tramped were complex. Some men tramped to find work; for others, tramping was a part of the working-class life cycle, and they tramped for a few years in their youth; for much smaller numbers, tramping became a preferred way of life. Of these reasons, the intersection of tramping and the life cycle is the freshest and most heuristic observation.

Fifth, tramping was not random. Rather, it followed definite patterns deter-

mined, for the most part, by railroad lines, which provided tramps with their major form of transportation.

Despite its utility, *Walking to Work* has some serious limitations. Aside from Clement, the authors do not situate tramps within the history of the so-called able-bodied poor. Yet, the story of poor relief is as important as industrial structure to the history of tramps. Indeed, poor relief, industrial organization, and tramping were as interconnected as the three sides of a triangle. Perhaps therein lies a clue to an important issue that none of the contributors explore: the reasons for the puzzling hatred and fear of tramps in late nineteenth-century America. From their start in the 1870s, discussions of tramps reeked of hostile emotion. Given the usefulness of a flexible labour force, the structural reasons why most men tramped, and the long history of working-class transience in America, it is not completely clear why respectable citizens transformed itinerant workmen into subhuman objects of disgust. In the same years, hostility to other dependent people also escalated, and, throughout the country, citizens reduced or abolished municipal outdoor relief, deployed the techniques of scientific charity to toughen private relief practice, and used the latest research on heredity (soon to be incorporated into the eugenics movement) to define tramps and paupers as biologically degraded. As much as the industrial revolution, this war on poor relief and its unfortunate recipients is central to the history of tramps in late nineteenth-century America.

Unfortunately, *Walking to Work* is not adequately edited. The essays could be tied together and cross-referenced much more thoroughly, and the uneven quality of individual contributions could have been reduced. Except for Monkkonen's essay, most of the quantification is weak, indeed, below currently acceptable standards in social history. Nonetheless, it remains an intelligent, provocative collec-

tion that opens an important neglected topic in American history.

Michael B. Katz
University of Pennsylvania

Philip S. Foner, *The Workingmen's Party of the United States: A History of the First Marxist Party in the Americas* (Minneapolis: MEP Publications 1984).

FERDINAND LASSALLE considered that trade unions were futile and that the working class should seek emancipation through independent politics. Karl Marx argued that trade unions were the only sound working-class organizations. Once firmly established, they would provide a basis for revolutionary politics, but this development was relegated to the future. Though these two positions were theoretically incompatible, German working-class leaders ignored theory and united the two movements - Lassallean and Marxist - in the Gotha Programme of 1875. The German Social Democratic Party thus created became an impressive force in imperial Germany.

The American socialist movement of the 1870s, largely an affair of German immigrants, seemed to be about to follow a similar course. The Workingmen's Party of the United States, formed 19 July 1876, closely resembled the new German party. Its founding convention had delegates from the recently dissolved Marxian International, which had transferred its headquarters from London to New York in 1872, and from Lassallean groups in Chicago, New York and Cincinnati. The inspiration for the new party was of course the unity so recently achieved in Germany. At the same time, however, the American centennial gave socialists the opportunity for rhetoric about the need for a second revolution. Moreover, the fact that the Lassalleans had suffered disastrous election results in 1874 meant that they were willing for the moment to cooperate with Marxists. The platform of the new party, chiefly the work of Frederick

A. Sorge, Marx's chief lieutenant and main correspondent in America, played down immediate political action and instead emphasized the importance of building a strong trade union movement. The platform therefore represented a temporary victory for the Marxists.

The party was not to last. True, it was able to increase its following through its role in the great strikes of 1877. That role was chiefly a coordinating one, bringing together different groups of workers in a number of cities, but it was also a moderating one since the party cautioned workers against the use of violence. This is ironic since the possessing classes of America were apt to reiterate the claims of their European counterparts in claiming social unrest to be the work of conspiratorial socialists. Nevertheless, even if the influence of the party initially increased, the ultimate effect of the labour unrest was a new wave of working-class political activity which Lassalleans in the party found irresistible. Accordingly they dissolved the trade union-oriented Workingmen's Party and founded the Socialistic Labor Party which then bid for electoral support in the elections of 1878. However, as Marxists had predicted, most workers attracted by the idea of a third party preferred the alternative Greenback Labor Party, which scored quite impressive results. Again, the political socialists were left high and dry.

Ultimately the fruits of this experience were threefold. Some members of the Socialistic Labor Party, disillusioned with politics altogether, created the American anarchist movement based in Chicago. The remainder renamed the party the Socialist Labor Party and continued their quest for the perfect balance between unionism and politics. Many Marxists eventually joined it. Later dissidents helped form the Socialist Party of America and, in time, the American Communist Party, but the Socialist Labor Party still exists today as a separate entity. Finally, the Marxists of the original Work-

ingmen's Party, chastened by its failure, now concentrated on pure and simple trade unionism completely free from politics. They thus created the milieu in which the American Federation of Labor was nurtured.

This story is reasonably well known. Not least there are the previous works of Foner himself, but also, interestingly enough, the quite detailed account by Selig Perlman written as early as 1918 for the second volume of John R. Commons' *History of Labor in the U.S.* R.V. Bruce's 1877, *Year of Violence* also examines the role of the Workingmen's Party in the strikes of that year. Even the point about the contribution of Marxists to the early American Federation of Labor has been made many times, even by more conservative labour historians, like Gerald N. Grob. But no matter. Foner has traced in detail the two-year history of the Workingmen's Party. He gives a blow by blow account of the Marxist-Lassalleian debate, including even the letters to the editor in the party's English newspaper, the *Labor Standard*. He explores the party's interest in recruiting women workers and black workers. He uncovers the story of the first black socialist, Peter N. Clarke, which of course has an intrinsic interest. In fact, for those who like their labour history in the old style, with lots of institutional and personal detail, this must be the definitive history of the WPUS.

Others may question Foner's approach. One wonders, in particular, if this work is what the Marxist Educational Press of Minneapolis, the publisher of the book, was looking for. Their other volumes in the series, some of which are based on papers delivered to the midwest Marxist scholars' annual conferences, consist of a variety of sociological and anthropological studies from a Marxist perspective. So what does one expect in a Marxist analysis of "the first Marxist party in the United States?" Most Marxist scholars would expect some discussion of the structure of American society in the

period, its ethnic composition, and the nature of the work it performed, to understand the politics it produced. The usual complaint of reviewers of Foner's books (see Melvyn Dubofsky in *Labor History*, [Winter 1985]), that his work lacks such an analysis, also applies to this book. On the other hand, politically committed Marxists might be interested in the evolution of Marxist ideas in the United States. Those with such interests will find more satisfaction. But neither of these approaches is the key to Foner's history. The author is, in fact, a nostalgic Marxist with a particular fondness for lost causes. He is interested in left-wing groups and individuals engaged in a Sisyphean struggle against enormous odds. If, from the perspective of Reagan's America, their efforts seem futile, they nevertheless retain an intrinsic interest for their own sake. It is in this vein that Foner's work must be appreciated.

W.M. Dick
Scarborough College

David J. Hogan, *Class and Reform: School and Society in Chicago, 1880-1930* (Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press 1985).

THEORIES OF SOCIAL CONTROL are long out of fashion. In the history of education, where they briefly obtained popularity, they are rejected as brutally simplistic and deterministic. The correlations between economic and demographic transition, conservative economic élites, and public schooling, have been proven imprecise, if not faulty. Schools, it is argued, were, and are, complex institutions mediating various forces: economic structures, cultural perceptions, individual ability, state decree and public will. However, in some hands, the rejection of social control has meant the rejection of questions pertaining to class conflict and accommodation within a constantly transforming economy. David Hogan has challenged this

quiescence and perhaps breathed new life into educational revisionism.

Class and Reform is a conceptually rich analysis of the Chicago reform movement, with particular emphasis on schools, from 1880-1930. While much of the ground Hogan covers is well known — Hull House, child saving, Dewey and the new education, vocationalism, the Cooley Bill — much else is new. Moreover, his partiality to a Thompsonian approach to class and class formation, as well as a general attention to conflict — political, economic, and cultural — casts new light on old topics.

The first two chapters deal with the new economic order and reform, in particular child-centred reform. Though somewhat thin on evidence, Hogan argues that in the last third of the nineteenth century, Chicago's labour force was recast as un- and semiskilled: that large, impersonal, hierarchical organizations became the norm and that control shifted from "formal to real subordination." He draws on and augments slightly the literature on work and skill control. Against this backdrop he projects reform as merely tinkering with substantial economic issues. Not a repudiation of the market, child-centred reform served instead three purposes: it deflected attention away from grossly unequal economic structures; linked social service provision with children, not citizens; and legitimized unprecedented control of children's welfare, socialization, and training. He calls this the uniquely American response to capitalist abuse, the tendency "for Lockean preoccupations to promote Hobbesian solutions."

But the more important chapters, I think, revolve more closely around the school: "The Limits of Reform," a reworking of his 1978 article in *History of Education Quarterly*, which analyzes enrollment patterns by class and ethnicity; chapter four, "The Triumph of Vocationalism;" and five, "Centralization and Transformation of Public Education."

"Limits of Reform" is basically about working-class strategies and the role of education, but with unique emphasis. Through analyzing the determinants of enrollment by ethnic groups he rejects two competing theories. First, enrollment was not simply "cultural embourgeoisment." Ethnic groups both used schools differently over time and place and retained independent churches, associations, and leisure groups. Chicago schools did not ameliorate cultural heterogeneity. Second, human capital did not operate in a linear fashion. Groups enrolled differentially, weighing short- and long-term economic goals as well as cultural concerns. Even with the rise of credentialism — not unnoticed by even recent arrivees — schooling was not universal. Constraints were internal and external, cultural and economic.

However, school did facilitate class structuration, the "remaking of the Chicago working class." The market system did define the options, but not similarly for all groups at all times. Schools were also an instrument of cultural defence. Catholic schools in particular, but also neighbourhood enclaves, served to solidify cultural bonds while at the same time fragmenting the Chicago working class. Though he provides little evidence of the rich associational life he wants to claim, school, at least, appears to have been part of cultural sustenance. The exigencies of an emerging wage labour market, in concert with cultural perceptions, demanded improving, but unique patterns of enrollment.

The vocational story is more familiar. As the labour market increasingly demanded disciplined, not skilled workers, as immigrants flooded the city, as labour strife reached alarming heights, and as children continued to leave school early, business and educational leaders proposed and implemented "practical" education. And despite the defeat of the Cooley Bill — an attempt to separate physically vocational students — the

"market was victorious." Labour was defeated on the general issue of vocationalism and over junior high schools and intelligence testing. The business-backed board ran roughshod over concerns for educational equality.

His discussion of educational organization, co-authored with Marjorie Murphy, documents the suppression of the Chicago Teachers' Federation by that same business-backed board. The concomitant rise of educational professionals, a new middle class, is also examined. Together these groups squeezed the teachers and centralized school control in the hands of a small cadre of appointed officials and educational specialists. Again, Hogan trumpets the victory of "the market."

In short, the victory of the market meant the defeat of radicalism in any form and the "calibration" of public education and private industry. Hogan's interpretation is similar to earlier revisionist writings on the nineteenth century but he presents some refinements.

Classes were reproduced not through social control — though business élites expressed exactly this desire — but through the confluence of economic forces, individual choice, and misguided reform. As the economy simultaneously demanded fewer skills and placed more emphasis on credentialism, ethnic working-class groups slowly, and each distinctly, moved into classrooms. They were motivated by a complex of reasons. And reformers were willing agents of class reproduction because they neither seriously questioned the market nor, if they did, possessed a language adequate to critique it. Reform, in this case public schooling, was a forum of class conflict as ambitious attempts at socialization clashed with working-class lives.

Class and Reform will not go unchallenged. Some, for instance, will criticize the emphasis on conflict, others will protest the submersion of Thompson. It should, however, point a new path

through a consensual haze. Neither simply instruments of social control, nor truly autonomous, Hogan reminds us schools are forums of conflict — between and within classes. Efficiency squared off with opportunity; an unequal economic system clashed with an ostensibly democratic school system. The Chicago working class especially was buffeted by this conflict. They stood, throughout this period, with one adolescent foot in the schoolyard and the other in the workyard.

Dan Hawthorne
York University

Naomi R. Lamoreaux, *The Great Merger Movement in American Business, 1895-1904* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1985).

A NEW LOOK at the great merger movement by Naomi Lamoreaux, an economic historian at Brown University, promises to tell us much about the development of modern American capitalism and particularly its competitive structure. Professor Lamoreaux, a traditional economic historian, rather than a cliometrician, provides a readable and accessible text through which one can follow her centrist challenge to historians on both sides of the ideological road. She is critical of both Alfred D. Chandler's benign interpretation of the advantages of vertical integration and Gabriel Kolko's assault on the corporate use of state power, but is at her best in describing and modeling the preconditions for consolidation, the major features of the system which emerged, its impact on competition, and the response of government.

Alfred D. Chandler's influential work, *The Visible Hand: The Managerial Revolution in America* (1977), is not chiefly a study of the merger movement but in the course of his optimistic portrayal of corporate evolution, Chandler views successful vertical integration as the product of economies of speed conferred

by fuller corporate control over the various steps from raw material to marketing of the finished product. Lamoreaux contends that the managers of the new consolidations were far less optimistic about such advantages than Chandler. Their efforts to restrict competition, including syndicalist type arrangements with unions, raw material control, patents, tariffs, and the like, testify to the managers' lack of faith in the efficiencies of vertical integration.

Yet she also criticizes Kolko's *The Triumph of Conservatism* (1963) for its insistence on big business influence in determining government policy. Characteristically, Lamoreaux aims her fire at conservative critics of government intervention. Whether the middle of the road proves a safe place for scholars to walk depends on the intellectual traffic. In this area Lamoreaux is an exposed pedestrian when she neglects her skills as an economic historian and makes a brief foray into the thoroughfare of legal history. Her sketchy treatment of the evolution of American antitrust law is not convincing. Suffice it to say that she enunciates no clear theory of the law, or of the judiciary and its relation to society. Nor does she adequately document, beyond a scrutiny of published opinions, the judicial reasoning informing these decisions. Her conclusion on this aspect is that "U.S. antitrust policy was for all practical purposes formulated by judges" and Kolko for one does not give due weight to the judges' "distrust of concentrated economic power." This reviewer will await not only more thoroughly researched studies of the judiciary but also a more trenchant theoretical perspective.

Unlike many contemporary students of consolidation, Lamoreaux emphasizes market control as a major objective of the merger movement. Studying 93 of the consolidations which took place between 1895 and 1904, she finds 72 of them resulted in control of at least 40 per cent of the market and 42 in at least 70 per cent

control. The pattern she finds is that in the context of the depression of the 1890s, in an era of new growth industries which had not yet stabilized market shares, and with high fixed costs, the "rate of new investment" was the most significant variable in determining the susceptibility of an industry first to price war and then to consolidation. She goes on to maintain that the mergers of this period had an important effect on the rules of future competition. Some of the mergers persisted and the new dominant firms in each of these industries not only had a greater market share, the traditional basis for oligopoly leadership, but also learned to discipline their rivals through revived price competition when deemed necessary. Thus the next, though lesser, economic crisis in 1907 saw no great outbreak of price competition. The enduring legacy of the merger movement was then, for Lamoreaux, its effect on the competitive rules.

While by and large her argument seems clearly reasoned it is not based on the kind of close, well documented study utilizing manuscript sources, which a traditional historian would prefer. Professor Lamoreaux has raised some interesting issues but she fails to challenge seriously Kolko or Chandler, not only because her research efforts have fallen short of their standards, but also because her own intellectual position lacks the precision of their clearly defined ideological premises.

Stephen Scheinberg
Concordia University

Pete Daniel, *Breaking the Land: The Transformation of Cotton, Tobacco, and Rice Cultures Since 1880* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press 1985).

THE DEMISE OF the southern plantation system comprises one of the central chapters in the social, economic, and political history of twentieth-century America. As late as the 1930s, most southerners, white

and black, lived on the land and cultivated staple crops in a manner that appeared little changed since the Civil War or, in some respects, since the early nineteenth century. Then, within two turbulent decades of depression and war mobilization, the old order seemed to unravel. Tenants and sharecroppers left the soil, replaced by wage labourers and heavy machinery. The cotton plant migrated westward, replaced by soybeans, peanuts, poultry, hogs, and cattle. Population flowed in considerable proportions from country to city and from agriculture to industry. So rapid was the transition that some historians speak of the veritable "collapse" of the plantation economy, a collapse that ultimately helped bring down segregation and the "solid" Democratic South as well.

Yet, however compelling, the notion of "collapse" may be analytically narrow and misleading; it suggests that the Civil War was limited in consequence; it reflects almost exclusive attention to the cotton areas; and it obscures the wider processes of which the "collapse" was a part. This is why Pete Daniel's *Breaking the Land* assumes such importance. For while many aspects of the story have already been told, Daniel puts them together in the most ambitious, meaningful, and accessible way to date. He begins in the 1880s and takes us into the 1970s. He studies tobacco and rice along with the cotton sector, and he links the reorganization of southern agriculture to the larger reorganization of the American economy. In so doing, he not only adds to our knowledge and raises a great many interesting questions, he also points towards a reconceptualization of the South's transition to capitalism.

Like other scholars before him, Daniel sees the massive federal interventions of the 1930s — most notably the infusion of capital by means of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (AAA) — as a pivotal moment in the transformation of the plantation cultures. Unlike many scholars,

however, he finds the harbingers of that transformation in the impact of emancipation and Reconstruction, and in earlier federal incursions to fend off the effects of foreign competition and natural disaster. The end of slavery ushered in new relations on the land that, in varying degrees, shaped the reconstitution of staple crop production. Perhaps most startling was the rapid decline of the old rice areas along the coast of South Carolina and Georgia — where some of the greatest planter fortunes and the densest concentrations of slaves were to be found — and the emergence of prairie rice farming in Louisiana, Texas, and Arkansas owing to northern land speculation and midwestern knowhow. It was here that the South came most quickly and most closely to approximating the "classically" capitalist road of English agriculture: large landowners, some absentees, substantial tenants owning expensive machinery, and seasonal wage labour. In the cotton and tobacco areas, slavery gave way to the grinding forms of tenancy and sharecropping, though to little technical innovation. Both cultures remained heavily labour intensive. Even so, the picture hardly was a static one, as crop cultivation moved into new locales (cotton into the white-dominated hill country and westward into Arkansas, Texas, and Oklahoma; tobacco into South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida from Virginia and North Carolina) and labourers struggled with landowners over the terms of the new arrangements.

Just as the prairie rice economy anticipated farreaching changes in the organization of agricultural production, so too did it anticipate farreaching changes in the relations between southern agriculture and the nation-state. For rice growers moved to rationalize their industry and use the powers of the government — in the latter instance by means of a tariff — well before cotton and tobacco planters did. Nonetheless, the bureaucratic arms of the state made their presence felt throughout the South by the first

decades of the twentieth century, attempting to eradicate the boll weevil, break up the American Tobacco Trust, and bring relief to victims of flood and drought -- all in ways that set the stage for the New Deal policies of the 1930s.

Those policies reshaped the political economy of the South and the nation, but their impact on the South was by no means uniform. Least affected were the prairie rice areas, where the previous advances had been most significant. In the tobacco and, especially, the cotton areas, however, the consequences were striking and often wrenching, amounting in Daniel's view to a southern enclosure movement, as the AAA-inspired acreage reductions and subsidies, together with supplemental federal relief, led to wholesale evictions of tenants and croppers, to increasing reliance on wage labour, and, ultimately, to mechanization and diversification. Daniel describes skillfully the workings of federal programmes in each of the AAA's relevant crop sections, demonstrating how the balance of social and political forces determined the particular outcomes: hedging the social dislocations in the case of tobacco; hastening them in the case of cotton. Even more powerfully, he discusses the human impact of the great changes on the land and argues that the more extended road to mechanization in tobacco culture made for a less disruptive transition than was true in cotton.

Although Daniel emphasizes the diverse experiences of the southern countryside, he also points to the increasing economic integration of the region as a whole -- a matter that deserves far more attention from historians than it has received. It was cotton sharecroppers, for example, who supplied most of the seasonal wage labour for rice planters. In a larger sense, Daniel suggests that the development of capitalist agriculture in the South was a protracted, fitful, and uneven process, where the progress of one sector commonly fed off the backwardness of another, and where the

course of change within the region was intricately tied to the region's changing status in the national political economy. The New Deal interventions, as Daniel insists, were not merely a response to rural poverty and economic crisis; they must, as well, be understood in reference to the wider economic and political reorganizations ushered in during the Progressive era.

We need to know more than Daniel tells us about the role of tenants, croppers, and small producers generally in the transformation of the southern countryside, for they are portrayed chiefly as victims. We also need to know more about the shifting relations between regional and national politics, for the travails of cotton and tobacco agriculture in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were as much a product of the South's limited influence over national policy as they were of a deeply rooted state rights mentality that looked with suspicion upon the federal government. So it was that the accession of the Democratic Party in the 1930s, in which the South constituted a significant bloc, represented an event of great import. Pete Daniel's *Breaking the Land* will provide much of the direction and insight for these studies.

Steven Hahn
University of California
San Diego

Peter Carlson, *Roughneck: The Life and Times of Big Bill Haywood* (New York: Norton 1983).

NO LABOUR ORGANIZATION has prompted as much curiosity and romance as the Industrial Workers of the World; of its notables, none has attracted more interest than Bill Haywood. Billing himself as a "two-gun man from the West" while addressing workers, "Big Bill" would then reach into his coat to produce his twin weapons in the class war -- a Socialist Party card and the red card of the

IWW. His dramatic gestures and speeches are still imitated by university lecturers intent on giving jaded students an appreciation for the culture and vitality of the early labour movement, while his flight to Russia in 1921, which left comrades to make good his bail bond, is still debated by the left. Peter Carlson has thoroughly mined newspapers, private papers, and the autobiographies of Haywood, Ralph Chaplin, and Elizabeth Gurley Flynn to provide a highly readable account of the man.

The early years are perhaps the most interesting, for they document the transformation of a man as "American as Mark Twain" into a union organizer and radical. In detailing Haywood's life as a worker, Carlson underlines the violence and brutality of capitalism — bosses who would whip a boy of twelve for "shiftlessness," lynchings of blacks, agonizing work in the mines, an accident which nearly cost Haywood a hand. But brutal conditions alone do not create radicals, and Carlson is careful to outline some of the other factors that turned one man into such a fierce opponent of capitalism. The murder of the Haymarket anarchists enraged and enlightened Haywood, as it did so many other activists, while the mutual aid of the hard rock miners pointed towards a different way to run society. Finally, the naked collusion of the state, capital, and the American Federation of Labor made it clear to him that revolution was the only way to free the unskilled worker. If Carlson presents too tidy a picture of Haywood's conversion, it may be due to his forced reliance on Haywood's autobiography. Radicals are made, not born, and on reflecting upon the process, no doubt it is easier to remember the big, inspiring events that accelerated the evolution. In any event, Haywood's view of the turning points of his life is as compelling as any biographer's speculation.

While the outline of Haywood's story is known to most of the readers of *Labour/Le Travail*, there are a few sur-

prises in *Roughneck*. "Big Bill," it turns out, was in fact less than six feet tall (it's not the size of the man in the fight...), and the blindness of his right eye was caused by a childhood accident, not by struggles against the bosses. Contrary to popular belief, Haywood did not brandish his glass eye as evidence of callous bosses — he refused to wear one. The years Haywood spent in Russia suffer from a lack of material, but Carlson does provide a fascinating vignette of the syndicalist's role as a manager in the workers' republic.

The author is careful to indicate that the book is *not* a scholarly treatment, and he is quite correct. While this eliminates much of the book's usefulness for this readership, it does not take away from its interest, though the absence of footnotes is irksome. Some of the quotes are illustrative and juicy, but the notes on sources are not very helpful in tracking them down. Apart from some quick sketches to provide context, there is little analysis of the IWW and the climate in which it operated. What analysis there is has largely been cribbed from the standard sources, especially Melvyn Dubofsky's *We Shall Be All* and Philip Foner's volume on the IWW in his *History of the Labor Movement in the United States* series. Too much is made of western regionalism, and there is a tendency to imply that "IWWism is Americanism." While the Wobblies did adopt a similar line, it was merely an organizing trick, not an explanation or analysis. It was a variant of their "if Christ were around, he'd carry a red card" — useful as rhetoric, but nothing else. Both characterizations muddy any examination of a union that was headed by atheists opposed to private property.

Carlson's notes on the authenticity of Haywood's autobiography similarly lack rigour. In his autobiography, Ralph Chaplin suggested Haywood's book was largely ghost-written by Communist editors, while Dubofsky is in substantial agreement. Carlson disagrees strongly,

but offers no new evidence. Forced to rely on the work for a goodly amount of the detail and richness of his own, Carlson's stand needs more support than an assertion that the book has Haywood's "tone of voice." The issue is complicated by the fact that neither Soviet officials nor the book's publishers have ever commented on its origin or that it was published during the debate on "Americanization" within the CPUSA. The mystery continues.

Despite these flaws, Carlson has crafted an interesting biography. While many social and socialist historians attack the genre, biographies are popular, and it is probably better that the world outside the history profession read biographies of revolutionaries and unionists than laudatory ones of prime ministers, kings, and presidents. *Roughneck* is entertaining and well-written; it is a good night-table book for labour historians.

Mark Leter
Simon Fraser University

Donald E. Winters, Jr., *The Soul of the Wobblies: The I.W.W., Religion, and American Culture in the Progressive Era, 1905-1917* (Westport, CT: Greenwood 1985).

SINCE THE 1960S historians have been increasingly interested in the role of religion in working-class culture and consciousness. Little wonder, then, that someone steps forward with a study of religion and the Industrial Workers of the World. Specifically, in a brief 135-page text, complemented by an appropriately coloured red cover, Donald Winters proposes to "examine the relationship between the IWW and American religion; or more specifically between the IWW and American Protestantism" from 1905 to 1917. He maintains that contemporaries and historians have misunderstood and underestimated religious motives in the IWW, and have dismissed the organization

as either anti-religious or essentially non-religious. In contrast, Winters argues that while the IWW detested middle-class religion in this era, the union seemed generally "at home with religion — or at least its own radical, prophetic version of religion." With the "literature and lore" of the Wobblies as evidence, Winters sets out to build his case.

In the five chapters comprising the main text, Winters examines IWW religion in varied contexts. First, he offers information on the importance of religion for Eugene Debs and Father Hagerty. Second, he considers "Wobbly hymnody," or the religious impulse informing many IWW songs. Next he recounts the debate over the "religious question" in the IWW press. Winters follows with an assessment of the religious motifs in the poetry of the IWW and finally, he provides a revisionist interpretation of the IWW's impact among Finnish iron ore miners from Minnesota's Mesabi Range, arguing that the IWW's sectarian spirit appealed to Finns and helped to bridge the division between Red Finns, church Finns, and temperance Finns.

Historians may find their curiosity piqued by this argument, but they will not find it convincing. Since Winters has neither the primary evidence nor the theoretical foundation to support his assertions. The entire book rests upon an embarrassingly thin research and theoretical base and historians will discover it unpersuasive and unilluminating — not to mention poorly written and badly organized. Winters broaches a topic worthy of study and helps to give IWW poets Ralph Chaplin, Arturo Giovannitti, Charles Ashleigh, and Cowington Hall their proper place in history, but his work contains notable flaws.

From the start the book suffers from deficiency of purpose and direction. In the first six pages Winters variously describes his work as an examination of the relationship between the IWW and "religion," the IWW and "American Protestantism," the

IWW and "radical" American religious thought, and the IWW and "not so radical" American religious thought. In addition, Winters claims to assess "the IWW's impact on American society and culture" and "the reciprocal impact of American culture — particularly American religion at the beginning of the twentieth century — upon the IWW." Few readers will escape without being confused about the particular topic Winters really plans to address. Moreover, in the remainder of the introduction Winters does nothing to alleviate the confusion. He posits what he believes is a workable definition of religion in regard to the IWW:

a system of beliefs and symbols which seeks to develop in the working class a sense of solidarity and class consciousness, and a motivation to engage in a class struggle against the evil force of capitalism toward the end of creating a new order, a "commonwealth of toil."

A more unworkable definition of religion would be difficult to imagine. Does Winters consider German free thinkers, Italian anarchists, Yiddish socialists, and Serbian communists in the same "religious" category merely because they advocated class solidarity? More importantly, does he believe that more than a handful of white male IWW members felt motivated by the Wobbly religion he defines? Winters would do well to redefine his topic and reconceive the notion of IWW religion should he hope to gain a wide audience.

Winters' problematic definition and conception may well stem from an alarmingly poor grounding in primary and secondary sources. Readers who proceed beyond his introduction will immediately discover Winters has not done careful homework. His shallow treatment of Eugene Debs reveals apparently lackadaisical research habits, since Winters makes no mention of the essential and voluminous literature on the history of socialism. Discussing Debs without mentioning Salvatore's masterful study must be judged foolhardy. In a similar vein, readers cannot be convinced of the reli-

gious impulse in Wobbly hymnody when Winters neglects systematic collection and analysis of songs, avoids the historical literature on Protestant hymnody, shuns research on religion and labour songs, and makes no reference to Paul Scheip's pamphlet on the history of "Hold the Fort." Likewise, even the most sympathetic reader must admit that Winters' account of the "religious question" falls short. Winters has not adequately researched letters to the editors in the IWW press and has an imperceptible knowledge of recent scholarship on antebellum religion by labour, feminist, political, and intellectual historians, including Herbert Gutman. Even in his examination of "poetics" Winters did not scour the Wobbly press for evidence and he somehow managed to overlook entirely Ralph Chaplin's *When the Leaves Come Out* (1917). Finally, as if either he or the editor wanted to frustrate readers completely, Winters chastises Robert Wiebe for calling the IWW the "international" workers of the world, only to refer to them by the same name in a citation of Philip Foner's study of the organization. In sum, in his attempt to find the "soul" of the IWW, Winters fails to elevate our understanding of that body!

Clark Halker
Albion College

Allan Kent Powell, *The Next Time We Strike: Labor in the Utah Coal Fields, 1900-1933* (Logan, Utah: Utah State University Press 1985).

THIS IS A straightforward and well-written account of the arduous process through which the United Mine Workers of America (UMWA) came to represent workers in Utah's coalfields. It is styled very much like the older labour history of the Commons school, and is almost purely narrative. The focus stays trained on Utah and on Utah's relations with district and international union officials. That limited

focus becomes both a strength and a weakness of the book.

Powell begins his study with a brief review of trade unionism and the coal industry in Utah history. The context of Mormon anti-unionism is effectively developed but the section on coal signals a continuing weakness in the book. It stresses the growth of various mines and fields but has little to say about the labour process in mining coal. Later disputes over coal companies cheating on weighing or over charges that immigrant workers used dangerous techniques to get out more coal would have been clearer had readers known more about how miners worked and were paid. However, the chapters on the mine disasters at Winter Quarters in 1900 and Castle Gate in 1924 are evocative of life underground and of mining community life and are among the best sections of the book.

The material on strikes and organizing drives in Utah finds the UMWA playing a surprisingly episodic role. After losing a large 1903-4 strike in the Utah fields, the UMWA suffered through a twelve-year "intermission" in Utah. During that period, the Western Federation of Miners and the Industrial Workers of the World played major organizing roles along with Greek ethnic societies. The UMWA achieved a measure of success in Utah during World War I, thanks in part to favourable decisions from the Federal Labor Mediation and Conciliation Board. But after defeats in 1919 the "loyal patriotic and conservative" UMWA saw its organizing gains rolled back. The Utah open-shop drive of the 1920s, which featured passage of a state "right-to-work" (that is, anti-closed shop) law further encouraged the decertification of local unions. When organizing efforts sponsored by the UMWA did succeed in and after 1933 they were in large part responses to organizing campaigns by the Communist-led National Miners' Union (NMU).

Powell seldom explicitly evaluates the

role played by the UMWA international leadership in shaping, and at times ignoring, Utah's coalfield organizing. His introductory assessment suggests that the UMWA played an extremely positive role in adopting a "conservative rather than revolutionary course" and in securing "better conditions," promoting "class consciousness," resisting wage cuts, and reducing "the animosity and antagonisms among the ethnic groups in the coal camps." He also emphasizes, much as David Saposs did long ago and as James Barrett has recently, that unions served workers as a "school for learning democratic practices." But in a trenchant concluding statement, Powell stresses workers' self-activity far more than the union structure: "In retrospect, Utah miners more often took the initiative in dealing with their employers to establish the United Mine Workers of America than did UMWA spokesmen."

In tracing the relationship of the international to organizing efforts in Utah, Powell notes that Utah was a state with a history of failing to repay the efforts of organizers paid by the UMWA and that, at least by 1919, the John L. Lewis leadership of the international was reluctant to expend more funds and energy there. He further observes that the interests of the union in Utah did not always fit in well with the "overall strategy" of the UMWA. This failure of coordination did not always result from lack of militancy or attention on the part of the international's leadership. In 1919, for example, Powell argues that the rather weak Utah locals would have benefited from continued supervision of labour relations by the Mediation and Conciliation Board, but the UMWA was as a whole committed to challenging the continuation of board jurisdiction and of other wartime-imposed measures limiting the right to strike. Powell does find the UMWA generally lacking in its support for ethnic organizers victimized by nativism and local opposition to trade unionism.

The Next Time We Strike reminds us that even (or perhaps, especially) in the isolated mining towns of the West, immigrant labour was of vital importance. Powell shows the momentum for one organizing drive after another growing from solidarity among Finns, Japanese, Italians, and Slavic miners. The hesitancy of U.S.-born miners to join unions before 1933 was the Achilles heel of the Utah labour movement in coal.

Powell's work is little influenced by the trends in labour and social history over the last two decades. Its sources are mainly area newspapers, though some inventive use is made of police informants' reports and oral interviews, including some with mine guards. There is little description of ethnic working-class community structure, family patterns, and leisure activities, although some appended songs and excellent photographs are suggestive on these scores. There are few foreign language sources, possibly because few have survived.

Little acquaintance with the growing literature on labour and communism is shown in the sections on the NMU, although Powell's account of that union is quite even-handed. Nor do larger questions frame the description of the Industrial Workers of the World, the discussion of which relies heavily on the local press and therefore credits the image of the violent Wobblies overly much. The book lacks a bibliography but it does not appear from the notes that the IWW archives or the IWW press were consulted as sources.

If *The Next Time We Strike* fits into any trend in labour history writing, it is surely one leaning towards an appreciation of the achievements of moderate labour leaders and trade unions and of workers persistently nurturing unions while making modest demands. Powell, who comes from a mining family, clearly admires the UMWA for being there over the years and for its eventual quiet triumph. In this he resembles recent writers who have praised the achievements of

relatively conservative unions in surviving the 1920s and contributing to the labour upsurges of the 1930s and who treat Samuel Gompers with great respect, lauding him as a realist in touch with working-class opinion.

Coming at a time when survival of existing unions seems a major achievement — when commentators on contemporary labour laud strikes which settle for large concessions as partial "victories" insofar as the union was not completely broken — such interpretations have an appeal. But we should not miss the extent to which the achievements of "realistic" and moderate unions were enhanced by the presence of radical alternatives. The 1933 acceptance of the UMWA in Utah, partly as an alternative to the more radical NMU, is an excellent case in point. If we applaud, with Powell, the record of the UMWA in winning concrete gains for Utah miners over the last half-century, we must also note that the union has as yet found no successful moderate strategy to stop the erosion of union strength in the western coalfields and the proliferation of non-union mines there.

Dave Roediger
University of Missouri

Joe William Trotter, Jr., *Black Milwaukee: The Making of an Industrial Proletariat, 1915-1945* (Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press 1985).

ON THE SURFACE, Milwaukee is an unlikely subject for a study of the emerging black urban working class during the early twentieth century. The tiny black community there, which grew from .02 per cent to only 1.2 per cent of the total population between 1910 and 1930, never really achieved ghetto status. And that is, after all, what most historians of twentieth-century Afro-America have studied — the development of the ghetto. Milwaukee's blacks were also much less concentrated than those in almost any

other large industrial city. Besides, Milwaukee's socialist city administration might reasonably be expected to have a far better record on civil rights and race relations than the political machines of cities like Chicago or New York. So, at the outset, one is tempted to speculate that Joe William Trotter has wasted a lot of time and energy on a community which was really not very important in the broader scheme of things (though obviously important to black people living in Milwaukee).

In fact, this book teaches us a lot, and its accomplishments testify to Trotter's fresh approach and careful research. What is new about *Black Milwaukee* is that its author seriously considers the phenomenon of class and the problem of class relations as important influences on the development of urban blacks. Most other authors dealing with urban Afro-America have not. They have certainly described occupational structures and observed that most black residents were poor. On the other end of the social spectrum, they have often described the emergence of a Negro élite as a key to understanding the growth of the institutional ghetto. What they have often failed to do is consider these urban dwellers as industrial workers, influenced as much by that status as by their status as black people living in a white society. Trotter places his emphasis squarely on the juncture between race and class, and asks how the experience of these workers was different as a result of their race.

Trotter demonstrates the tenuous quality of black proletarianization right up to World War II. He also analyzes the implications of black workers' weak economic position for interclass relations within their own community and for their relations with white workers in the city at large. Persistent discrimination in labour and housing markets (by craft unions and white workers as well as by industrial employers and real estate firms) and extremely high unemployment levels dur-

ing the 1930s both accentuated black workers' identification with the Afro-American bourgeoisie and restricted their solidarity with white workers.

By the 1940s several factors converged to consolidate the position of Milwaukee's black proletariat. Conversion to defence work, together with some federal action against employment discrimination, brought an increasingly larger proportion of the population into more stable and relatively better paid employment. The simultaneous emergence of mass-based interracial CIO unions offered crucial vehicles for self-expression and interracial working-class struggle. Union activists recruited blacks, publicly denounced racism, and cooperated with civil rights groups and middle-class social service agencies in campaigns against discrimination in housing and employment. The CIO also spawned its own civil rights organization, the Milwaukee Interracial Labor Relations Committee, which was chaired by a black tannery worker but also included many white labour activists.

What difference did it make that this process of black proletarianization occurred in a city governed by socialists? Trotter's conclusion seems to be, not much. Yet his evidence suggests a mixed picture. Mayor Daniel Hoan effectively quashed most efforts to import black strikebreakers, the single most important source of conflict among black and white workers in so many other cities. This step certainly reduced the potential for physical violence between the races, but Hoan's actions owed more to his close relationship with the segregated Federated Trades Council than to his concern for black workers. Likewise, Hoan served on the NAACP board and acted to stem the growth of the Ku Klux Klan in the city. But again his motivation was practical: he was protecting his hold on a solid black constituency. Chicago's reactionary and corrupt Republican boss, "Big Bill" Thompson, paid at least as much attention to blacks as the socialist Hoan and apparently for the same

reason — votes. Still, in Chicago blacks were voting for a representative of the "party of Lincoln." In Milwaukee, they abandoned the Republicans for a self-described working-class party, turning in large pluralities for the socialists. This adherence to the socialist standard, especially in the face of the party's dismal record on the race issue during the early twentieth century, makes the political behaviour of Milwaukee's blacks all the more striking. Their ability to look past the national party's neglect of civil rights and even Mayor Hoan's own insensitivity (telling a "darky" story before a large, interracial socialist audience, for example) suggests a strong class awareness and a high level of political sophistication. Such behaviour seems to have clear implications for Trotter's theme, but the book contains no substantive discussion of the socialist vote in the black community.

Milwaukee may not have been a much better place to be an Afro-American during the early twentieth century than most other northern industrial cities. But the administration's policies sometimes helped blacks along with the rest of the labouring population. The city's overwhelming working-class black community took note and voted accordingly.

Getting some minimal representation through the Socialist Party was one thing. Getting one's own black representative into the city council or state house was quite another. Although this was a high priority throughout the period, black political activists repeatedly failed to achieve it. In part this was due to the small number of voters involved, but intraracial conflict among competing factions also played a role. One of Trotter's significant findings is a high degree of social and political friction *within* black Milwaukee — between old-line, long-settled integrationists and newer, more nationalistic community-builders; between socialists and Republicans; between Garveyites and NAACP activists. Racial solidarity was not always strong enough to obliterate the

influence of competing religious and political philosophies or, for that matter, the self-interest of competing élites.

The value of any case study hinges at least in part on what it can tell us about the general problem it seeks to explain. Trotter's use of the proletarianization concept sets his study within a broader Marxist theoretical context common to much of the more recent work in the field of North American labour history. This context allows Trotter to conclude with a comparative chapter which enhances the book's value to historians of the working class. Most of this chapter is devoted to comparisons of the Milwaukee evidence with that from studies of other black communities in the northern and southern United States. Trotter is correct that the experience of proletarianization provides a fertile ground for the sort of comparative working-class social history that is still so rare. His own effort, however, is rather superficial, especially with regard to the "new immigrants" of the early twentieth century. A rigorous comparison of the black migrants with the new immigrants would be particularly significant, not only because of the large number of people involved but also because of what appear to be so many similarities in the demographic characteristics and even the migration and work experiences of the two groups. Trotter's conclusion that proletarianization was a step down for most white workers certainly does not apply to many of the Slavic peasants and agricultural labourers who abandoned the farm for factory, mine, or mill in these same years. Whatever the social and economic difficulties faced by these immigrants (some of them comparable to those faced by blacks), industrial work represented a significant improvement in their living standards.

The maturation of a self-conscious, organized, black working class was crucial to the development of the labour movement in the United States. But this class also shaped the history of the black

community itself. As Trotter concludes, "... the emergence of Milwaukee's black industrial proletariat thrust class, along with race and ghetto formation, to the center of the Afro-American urban experience." (238)

James R. Barrett
University of Illinois
Urbana-Champaign

Royden Harrison and Jonathan Zeitlin, eds., *Divisions of Labour: Skilled Workers and Technological Change in Nineteenth Century Britain* (Brighton: Harvester Press 1985).

LABOUR HISTORIANS are increasingly skeptical about the simple equation of the introduction of machinery with the "deskilling" of craft workers. As Craig Littler and other sociologists of work have indicated, the notion of "skill" is socially created, and no obvious objective criteria link certain occupations with the prestige-cum-remuneration which are ascribed to these occupations. Indeed, even conventional labour economics has long supplied empirical evidence, its mythological universe of perfect competition notwithstanding, that certain groups of workers at certain times in certain countries will be more or less advantaged or disadvantaged not because of their inherent skills but because of complex market forces.

Divisions of Labour traces the forces that affected selected groups of workers in Britain throughout the nineteenth century and determined to what extent society — particularly in the form of employers — would treat their work as "skilled" at various periods. But while economic forces are considered, the authors generally share the view expressed in the book's introduction by Royden Harrison that workers' strategies for coping with such forces — including technical change, and domestic and international market pressures — were equally important: "The

ability to ride technical innovation might be crucially affected by the imagination, courage, understanding and organizational ability displayed by the craftsmen themselves. In particular, how they related to neighbouring or adjacent workmen within the division of labour emerges as an under-examined problem, although it was crucially important." (12) In the six excellent essays that compose this book, the old but still relevant debate about the character (and indeed the existence) of the "aristocracy of labour" informs much of the analyses of workers' relations with other groups of workers as well as with employers and the state.

David Blankenhorn's essay on cabinetmakers makes the point that is made about most groups identified as labour aristocrats throughout the book: while their wages at certain periods were over the mark which Hobsbawm sets as the minimum qualification for aristocrat status, their position was always precarious. Their organization was never able to protect the entire trade and economic changes — in this case, both technological change and the depression of 1873 — eventually undermined their wages and their organization. And cabinetmakers, like other groups of skilled workers, were divided over tactics for dealing with change. One group, clinging to the view that cabinetmaking was the prerogative of a small talented group, denounced the firms that used new machinery and snubbed their workers. Another group recognized that the preservation of wage rates and working conditions for cabinetmakers in the face of the new economic realities required the support of the workers hired to do the drudge jobs in furniture manufactories. These disagreements led to the second group forming a separate union in the 1870s which largely accepted the principles of the new industrial unionism. Unsurprisingly, the better off cabinetmakers operating in fancy areas of cities, proved the major hold-outs to the new unionism and watched with disdain

as the Alliance Cabinet-Makers' Association grew to become the major organization of furniture workers.

Blankenhorn claims the élitist group in the old Friendly Society of Operative Cabinet-Makers (FSOCM) "entered the 1890s as an overshadowed enclave of craft tradition increasingly out of harmony with a changing industry." (43) But his conclusion is a bit misleading since it follows mainly from an analysis of the relative growth in the late 1880s of the two contending unions. His own evidence indicates that the FSOCM members everywhere earned more than their alliance counterparts and that "the Alliance, unlike the FSOCM was too weak to enforce branch-wide standards." (40) Indeed, it appears that the snobbishness of the FSOCM did not endanger the livelihood of its members; it merely prevented the organization of workers in the more capital-intensive plants. Those who crafted fine furniture for the rich in exclusive firms appear to have continued to do so. That they became a smaller proportion of the furniture-making work force as new firms produced products for a wider market is undeniable but hardly justifies the view that their strategy for survival, while reactionary, was unworkable.

Indeed, a second essay by Mark Hirsch dealing with sailmakers suggests that one should not overstate the extent to which workers who clung to a policy of exclusion in the face of technological change did so because of a blind allegiance to their craft traditions. "Victims of obsolescence," he notes, "they made a choice to bar non-legal men for economic reasons: an all-grades policy in the 1890s would have been self-defeating." (100) In any case, these labour aristocrats in decline were not without sympathy for the labouring classes as a whole. They favoured independent labour representation and saw no contradiction between a defence of craft privilege and labour political unity.

One group which followed the exclu-

sivist strategy and demonstrated that new machinery need not always undermine a craft union's strength was the compositors, who are compared by Jonathan Zeitlin to the less fortunate engineers. Zeitlin, unlike Blankenhorn, is more concerned with unions' successes in enforcing their wage scales and negotiating favourable working conditions than with mere success in gaining members. Noting that new technologies in the 1890s reduced the "real skills" component of the compositors' job close to that of a typist, Zeitlin observes that union militancy in an industry whose employers feared bankruptcy in the event of a strike led to happy results for the workers in question. The compositors, like the élitist group among the cabinetmakers, sought to exclude rather than to organize those whom employers used to "dilute" the craft — particularly women. Militancy thus bore several faces: a progressive face in the battle for worker control of the production process but a reactionary face in the insistence on such traditional craft practices as exclusion of women where this proved practicable. The engineers proved less militant than the compositors, while their employers, concerned about international markets, demonstrated the cohesion and aggressiveness that the newspaper owners lacked. A combination of market forces and their own divisions weakened the engineers' ability to fight capital at a time when new machinery threatened their autonomy and their wages.

Standing midway between the compositors and the engineers were the shipbuilders, studied by Keith McClelland and Alastair Reid. These workers, threatened by new technologies, reacted neither with an exclusivist strategy nor one of simply throwing in their lot with the increased number of workers labeled semiskilled who were suddenly in their midst. Instead they organized these workers into their own unions but negotiated contracts that maintained clear distinc-

tions in salaries and working conditions between the supposedly skilled and the supposedly semiskilled. Such a strategy raises a number of questions, unanswered — and perhaps in terms of available documents unanswerable — in the article regarding the attitudes of the semiskilled group to a union strategy apparently dictated by the craft workers. Once again it would appear that deft strategy allowed a threatened craft to retain, at least in part, its relatively privileged position in the workplace — though as these authors stress, the economics of shipbuilding did not allow even skilled shipbuilders to secure a position within the labour aristocracy, though Hobsbawm places them in this rank.

The divisions among shipbuilding workers in terms of remuneration and working conditions pale against those among pottery workers. Richard Whipp's essay on the Staffordshire potters, perhaps best among the essays in this book, demonstrates the extent to which insecurity marks the position of many workers who superficially appear at a given moment to be labour aristocrats. Equally it demonstrates on a micro-level the complex issues that create oceans of difference among the groups that compose the "working class." In particular, it tackles the reasons for the inferior position of women workers in the labour force both before and after the introduction of machinery. Beginning as the unpaid assistants of fathers and husbands in the seventeenth century, women potters later became the sweated subcontractors of male potters, the slaves of slaves, as Sylvia Pankhurst observed. An extreme division of tasks within the industry, as well as the sexual division of labour, insured that pottery workers were never united and only rarely unionized.

Unity alone proved insufficient for workers where market forces were wholly on the side of capital. Ian McKay demonstrates that in the case of Scottish bakers, a militant union could not withstand pressures created by an outbreak of competi-

tion in the industry in the 1870s. The union's militancy in Scotland had improved the position of Scottish bakery workers relative to their London fellows for many years, but eventually the union succumbed to an employer onslaught. Clearly the baking of bread, unlike the publication of a newspaper, did not require extensive capital and the craft workers' proud defence of the integrity of their trade counted little in battles with employers.

On the whole, then, these essays provide a suggestive sampling of the complex relations between "objective" market forces and subjective workers' strategies in determining the position of various groups of workers during periods of economic change. Richard Whipp's piece deserves a special mention because, unlike several otherwise excellent articles, it attempts to dig out the attitudes of those workers who were deemed unskilled rather than to deal with these workers only insofar as they fit in with the strategies of the recognized craft groups.

Alvin Finkel
Athabasca University

H. Gustav Klaus, *The Literature of Labour: Two Hundred Years of Working-Class Writing* (New York: St. Martin's 1985).

DESPITE THE GROWING interest in working-class culture, surprisingly little has been written in English about the literature of labour. Apart from some American and British studies of the proletarian aesthetic of the 1930s, neither historians nor literary critics have made any concerted effort to explore this alternative genre. Now, in this ambitious, if slim, book, the German literary historian, Gustav Klaus, has tried to lift the subject out of the shadows and give it the attention it deserves. Evocative and free-ranging, his efforts clearly illustrate the diversity and potential richness of the field, as well as

underscoring the difficulties, both conceptual and methodological, that need to be overcome if it is to be worked successfully.

Structurally, *The Literature of Labour* consists of a brief preface and seven autonomous essays, four of which have been published previously, and some of which have been translated here into English for the first time. Though all the essays focus on Britain, and deal in some way with the general issue of literature and the working classes, that is roughly the extent of their interconnectedness. Chronologically, the breadth of Klaus' vision extends from the eighteenth through the mid-twentieth century, and his methodological range is practically as sweeping. Each essay utilizes an independent approach, whether biographic, bibliographic, thematic, formal, and so on.

As is usual with collections of this sort, such eclecticism can be construed as both a disappointment and an inspiration. The quality of the essays is uneven in style and content, and while this may be partly attributable to some dull writing, or indifferent translations, it also reflects the fragmentary nature of much of Klaus' evidence, a problem that is not uncommon for practitioners of working-class cultural history. Overall, however, the results are encouraging and three essays particularly deserve recognition.

In "The Historical Bent of the Chartist Novel," Klaus makes a valuable contribution to the intellectual historiography of Chartism by demonstrating that the movement's literature evinced a unique sense of history. But the essay is also useful for its discussion of radical literature in formalist perspective: specifically, the effort by Chartist writers to politicize the novel as a genre. By contrast, Klaus raises a different set of issues altogether in "Forms of Miners' Literature in the Nineteenth Century." Here the focus is not so much on philosophy and ideas as on sociology, and the literary evidence is by the workers themselves, rather than by

others about them. Not only does Klaus delineate the multitude of literary forms used by the miners, he draws on that diversity to make a convincing argument that the literature contributed to their collective sense of occupational identity. Still another approach to the literature of labour can be found in the longest piece in this collection, "Let the People Speak for Themselves: On the Documentarism of the 1930s and 1940s," written in collaboration with Jürgen Enkemann. Beginning with an analysis of the timely changes in the "composition," "social position," and "consciousness" of the artistic intelligentsia, Klaus investigates the formal and thematic properties of a genre which is both a product of the "new media" and targeted at its "principal consumers . . . : the broad mass of the working (not to mention the unemployed) population." (129)

In large measure the credibility of these articles derives from Klaus' ability to interpret literary artifacts in interdisciplinary perspective, combining historiographical insight with a critical awareness of literary form. Yet notwithstanding these significant accomplishments, his work is marred by conceptual and methodological flaws that are no doubt inherent in any attempt to construct a new interpretive field.

Fundamentally, the problem with Klaus' work is that his vision is too diffuse and lacks a theoretical framework. Nowhere is the need for a concrete, theoretical design more evident than with regard to defining exactly what the term "literature of labour" constitutes. According to Klaus, the term "covers plebeian, working-class, proto-socialist and socialist literature." (x) But, since this leaves open "a vast middle ground of possibilities," (170) questions naturally arise. For instance, does the term refer to the textual contents of a given work? Does it demand the existence of a particular ideological perspective, or imply a specific theme or subject matter? Or is the

literature of labour best defined by a category of authorship? On this latter point, Klaus echoes Lukács' critique of "vulgar sociology" ("Narrate or Describe," 1936), suggesting that there is a tendency to exaggerate the relevance of writers' social backgrounds as determinants in their work. Significantly, Klaus' own essays deal with writers from various social and occupational spheres, including members of the working classes, but also bourgeois intellectuals.

Equally central to the question of defining the literature of labour is the problem of deciding which forms of expression can properly be classified as literature. Obviously, novels, poems, and autobiographies should qualify, and Klaus makes use of each. But some of his material is taken from personal letters, films, and even testimonial evidence given before governmental committees; in these cases, it seems the designation "literature" has perhaps been stretched too far.

Parallel to these problems of definition is another significant conceptual issue involving the relationship of the literature of labour to the so-called great tradition. In Klaus' view it is implicit in any definition of labour writing that it is not part of the great tradition. And while this does not preclude the possibility of making connections between the two, Klaus seems eager to take the distinction further by arguing that the literature of labour is so much a product of isolation and circumstance that it cannot be part of any tradition at all. This is an interesting thesis, but it is one to which he has a hard time adhering, perhaps because it runs so contrary to the prevailing doctrines of critical and historiographic conceptualization. At one point Klaus actually refers, himself, to the "long if sporadic and uneven tradition" (60) of the literature of labour, and — whether inadvertently or not — he further sanctifies this notion of continuum by arranging the collection chronologically, according to the periods the individual essays discuss.

Although these criticisms do not seriously detract from what Klaus has endeavoured to do, they nonetheless give rise to a point worth considering: if the literature of labour represents an alternative to the great tradition, should not the literature about the literature of labour do the same? Curiously, this point does not seem to have occurred to Klaus. He appears neither to have been influenced very greatly by the alternative visions of the great tradition put forward by critics such as Williams, nor to be concerned with establishing his own innovative approach to this separate subject he has chosen. Instead, he openly concedes of his own work that: "Methodologically, none of this is new." (xi)

Both as historiography and as literary criticism Klaus' essays are struck from highly conventional moulds. In virtually every case, the emphasis is placed on outstanding individual achievements and uniqueness, on identifying who did what first and, by the measure of some arbitrary scale of value, how well. Consistent with academic tradition the focus in every instance is single-mindedly male. And, paradoxically, given Klaus' acknowledged debt to social history, the socio-economic and institutional aspects of the literary culture of labour are mostly ignored in favour of what is in essence a biographic and thematic approach. Finally, by focusing solely on the interests of writers to the total exclusion of readers' responses, Klaus' framework is, in a manner of speaking, sturdily supply-sided.

Ironically, then, Klaus has written a work on radical literature which, save for its subject matter, replicates in miniature the conceptual and methodological paradigms of conventional historiography and literary criticism. Yet merely by identifying a forgotten body of literature, and by revaluing — to use a Leavisite phrase which Klaus himself employs — the significance of some works that are already familiar, he has performed an original and stimulating task for which critics and his-

torians should be grateful. Their challenge now, and his, too, is to develop a framework by which these rich new materials can be most creatively and constructively investigated.

Graham Carr
Concordia University

K.D. Brown, ed., *The First Labour Party: 1906-1914* (London: Croom Helm 1985).

THIS IS A COLLECTION of articles aimed at specialists in the history of the British Labour Party. (All others are advised to learn about the topic by going to Ross McKibbin's *The Evolution of the Labour Party, 1910-1924*.) Brown's anthology has an introduction, titled "The Edwardian Labour Party," and twelve chapters written by twelve different authors: "Ideology and Composition," "The Labour Party in Scotland," "The Labour Party in Wales," "Labour in the Municipalities," "The Labour Party Press," "Labour and the Trade Unions," "Labour and Education," "The Labour Party and State Welfare," "Labour and the Constitutional Crisis," "Labour and Women's Suffrage," "Labour and Ireland," and "Labour and Foreign Affairs: A Search for Identity and Policy." Few of the articles sparkle, but all are amply footnoted and based on comprehensive research.

"The Labour Party in Wales" portrays the strengths of the often ignored Lib-Labs, trade union officials who entered Parliament as Liberal MPs, but who also represented the special interests of labour. One Welsh miner entered Parliament as a Liberal in 1905, and 21 years later was joined by three more in 1926. These men had long records of accomplishment and considerable support in their communities; and yet three years later the Miners Federation of Great Britain voted to affiliate to the Labour Party, thus bringing Lib-Labism to an end.

"Labour in the Municipalities" examines labour interest in municipal socialism, an idea which was best expressed in *The Socialist and the City*, by F.W. Jowett, who before entering Parliament in 1906 had been a councillor on the Bradford City Council and chair of its health committee. Actual labour accomplishments, as compared to hopes, were rather modest before 1914; but the article does show that many labour people were not obsessed with dreams of centralized state power.

"The Labour Party Press" describes some of the myriad little local papers that provided a kind of bulletin board for the local movement. All were precariously financed, and most lasted only a few years, but collectively they played a very important role. The article also describes a much more ambitious venture, *The Daily Citizen*, which was launched by the Labour Party in October 1912 with an initial expenditure of £40,000. For a brief time it reached a circulation of 250,000, but readers drifted away, and it died in June 1915 after absorbing over £200,000. Many who were ready to vote labour undoubtedly did not wish to read a labour paper. The capitalist press then and now provides livelier reading. Some Labour Party hopefuls still harbour dreams of a successful national newspaper, but the prospects in the present seem as remote as they proved to be in 1912.

One of the themes which recurs in several of the articles is the Labour Party search for a clear identity. Keir Hardie and the other founders of the party were socialists, but they deliberately kept the label out of the party name. But if the Labour Party was not explicitly socialist, how was it different from the Lib-Labs whom Hardie had so often attacked? The answer was that Labour, unlike the Lib-Labs, was independent of the Liberal Party and could, therefore, better defend the interests of working people. The forty-two Labour MPs, however, owed

their success to a secret electoral pact in which the Liberals agreed to abstain from running candidates in some constituencies in return for Labour abstaining in others. The winning Labour candidates had only faced Conservative opponents and had, of course, relied on Liberal as well as Labour votes. This was not a robust kind of independence.

"The Labour Party and State 'Welfare'" shows how hard it became for the Labour Party to maintain an independent position as the Liberal government, elected in 1906, proceeded to enact an ambitious programme of social welfare, which included old age pensions, free school lunches, unemployment insurance, and medical insurance, partly financed by increased income and estate taxes. All the Labour MPs could do was to vote for the legislation while criticizing it for not going far enough. The Lib-Labs might have done as much. "Labour and the Constitutional Crisis" describes Labour as a junior partner to the Liberal government in its battle with the House of Lords for rejecting the radical budget of 1909. The Labour MPs voted for the Parliament Act of 1911 which took away much of the lords' power, but had little impact on the outcome. "Labour and Foreign Affairs: A Search for Identity and Policy" deals with the one area in which many Labour MPs were in opposition to the Liberal government, arguing for less armaments and a policy of European neutrality in opposition to Lord Grey's upholding of the Triple Entente with France and Russia. But even here, the most effective and persistent of Grey's critics were radical Liberal backbenchers. Hardie and his associates had succeeded in creating a Labour Party machine and a respectable contingent in Parliament, but in 1914 that party still seemed to lack a clear purpose and a coherent ideology.

Melvin Sheffiz
SUNY, Binghamton

Alex Callinicos and Mike Simons, *The Great Strike — The Miners' Strike of 1984-5 and Its Lessons* (London: Pluto 1986).

"YOU HAVE BEEN FIGHTING the legions of hell," A.J. Cook, the miners' leader during the general strike of 1926, told the members. Arthur Scargill could have told the members the same thing at the conclusion of the 1984-5 strike. They had struck for a year; during that time they experienced the most draconian measures that a right-wing government like Thatcher's could devise to force them back to work. In the end they were forced to submit — literally starved back to work in some cases. Yet they returned to work under their union banners and in some cases led by pipers. Callinicos and Simons rightly conclude that the strike was "one of the most epic struggles ever waged by workers anywhere," and that the men and women who endured the longest major strike in British history "were all heroes, every one of them."

With these sentiments, most socialists would agree. They would agree also with the authors' conclusion that the miners were deserted by the Labour Party and betrayed by the TUC — both of which refused to lend practical aid. Also uncontroversial is their contention that the strike was engineered by the government as part of its campaign against the trade union movement. The authors make this case simply and convincingly. But far more problematic is their main thesis that the miners failed in large part because of the inadequacies of their own leaders. This point they hammer home throughout the book. Miners' leaders are portrayed as vacillating and tainted by a reformist/bureaucratic outlook. Only rank-and-file organization by militants could have won the strike, by providing mass pickets to persuade the Nottinghamshire miners to join the strike and by preventing supplies of coking coal from reaching steel mills. The NUM leadership dampened these

plans. The history of the strike was one of "repeated upsurges of initiative and activity from below, each in turn sat upon by branch and area officials."

But the authors do very little to prove this conclusion. On the most important question of the strike — how to get the Notts miners out — they are naive in attributing Notts intransigence to weak area and national leadership. They ignore the fact that in three successive strike ballots in January 1982, October 1982, and March 1983 the Notts miners voted for strike action by only 30, 21, and 19 per cent respectively. In March 1984 in a ballot to decide whether to strike over the biggest pit closure programme in NUM history they managed only 26 per cent in support of a strike.

But this is the problem with Callinicos and Simons' argument. Always they ignore the difficult questions that faced NUM leaders and pose a simplistic solution based on more militancy. "A strategy of mass picketing could have brought victory." It is debatable whether mass picketing could have stopped steel production or closed power stations and the docks. But in making this case the authors should have given proper emphasis to the fact that steelworkers themselves were extremely hostile to stoppage of steel production, fearing they would lose their jobs. When the dockers came out in support of the miners in the summer of 1984 they were brought out by militant shop stewards. But within a few days it was the militants who had to give in in the face of clear opposition to a support strike by their members.

These are difficult facts for socialists to accept. But lack of support by the trade union movement as a whole must be accepted as a fact and not simply glossed over if, as the authors want, we are to learn the lessons of the strike. Callinicos and Simons reject the lessons learned by the left miners' leaders, who want a broad democratic alliance of all groups and organizations on the left in order to win

popular support for militant unions like the NUM and, eventually, to achieve socialism. But if this strategy is to be rejected, than Callinicos and Simons must suggest a realistic alternative. The notion of great class struggles fought successfully by a vanguard of militant workers like the miners is not realistic. The strike showed that at the very least they require the support of other trade unionists. One would have thought that a strategy involving collaboration with all groups on the left — including the hated Labour Party — is necessary if striking workers are not to remain isolated in the future.

Also problematic is the authors' attitude to one of the most serious issues of the strike — whether the NUM should have called a national strike ballot. It did not, and there are very good justifications for the decision. But Callinicos and Simons' justification for no ballot is weak and would annoy many trade unionists. They conclude, rightly, that the ruling class cares nothing for democracy. They give examples to show this. Thus they conclude, "Socialists should be equally pragmatic about ballots." But socialists will only alienate workers if they adopt the same cynical attitude towards democracy as their enemies. Moreover, this is a peculiar attitude for the authors to adopt, since they continually complain of "leadership from above." Clearly, in crucial situations such as when workers have to decide whether to strike, Callinicos and Simons would be happy to have workers led by an educated élite — by people with proper Marxian understanding, unlikely to be swayed by the propaganda forces of the state.

Criticism of the NUM leadership could be constructive, but to put this forward as the main error of the strike will do nothing to promote an effective strategy in future struggles. The first step to good strategy is good analysis; in this respect Callinicos and Simons' book is disappointing.

Frank Roberts
Simon Fraser University

David I. Kertzer, *Family Life in Central Italy, 1880-1910: Sharecropping, Wage Labor and Coresidence* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press 1984).

THIS IS A STUDY of family organization and co-residence among sharecroppers and peasants in Bertalia, Bologna, a parish located in the central Italian agricultural region of Emilia-Romagna. "Our intention," Kertzer writes, "is to move the Italian case more to centre stage in the current debate over changing patterns of coresidence in Western European history." The impact on family life brought about by transformations in nineteenth-century agriculture and by urban and industrial growth have dominated this literature. Recent scholarship has shattered conventional images of a stable pre-industrial rural world isolated from a capitalist market economy and of extended family arrangements collapsing under the weight of urban and industrial expansion. The early revisionist work of Peter Laslett and his colleagues at the Cambridge Group for the History of Population and Social Structure indicated that pre-industrial populations in western Europe typically lived in simple nuclear family households. This "discovery" undermined the supposed link between industrialization and the nuclearization of the family. Further studies have confirmed that the transformation of rural populations into urban and industrial peoples involved ongoing, complex processes. We now know, for example, that many pre-industrial "peasants" engaged in proto-industrial production and many rural labourers worked for wages rather than simply for a portion of the produce.

However, Laslett's work created its own orthodoxy by ignoring "exceptional" cases where pre-industrial complex family formations did exist. It is this challenge that Kertzer takes up. In nineteenth-century central Italy, he argues, complex households were common; among share-

cropping families such households predominated. Differing significantly from the English model Laslett assumed to be the case for western Europe generally, a substantial minority of Bertalia residents for the period 1880-1910 lived in complex households. Given life-cycle factors, it is likely that most residents spent part of their lives in such households. The young and elderly were especially likely to live in complex rather than simple family households. Arguing that these findings have a wider significance, Kertzer further suggests that central Italy may have been typical of other regions in Europe where sharecropping economies were prevalent.

In early sections, Kertzer describes the Bologna economy after 1860, the spread of rural capitalism and the agrarian crisis of the 1880s, and the demographic and occupational changes that accompanied urban and industrial growth at the turn of the century. By 1880, sharecropping, which for centuries had dominated central Italy, had declined due to expanding capitalist agricultural enterprises and the development of local industry. An agrarian crisis served to speed up the pace of mechanization in agriculture and cash crop production. As landowners sought larger and more heavily capitalized commercial farms, many sharecroppers fell into debt, lost their farming contracts, and were forced to join the growing ranks of rural and urban workers.

Kertzer next turns to the central concern of the book: the relationship between mode of production and household composition. Whereas agricultural labourers (*braccianti*) typically lived in simple family households, sharecroppers commonly resided in three-generation multiple family households comprised of elderly parents, unmarried daughters, married sons, daughters-in-law, and grandchildren. That a large minority of Bertalia residents — 43 per cent in 1880 — lived in complex (mostly multiple) households is explained by the presence of sharecropper families,

which were three times more likely than *braccianti* to reside in multiple households. This pattern of co-residence is linked to the particular form of economic and social organization that characterized sharecropping. Unlike *braccianti*, who worked for wages on the large estates, a sharecropper household was the site of production; running the farm demanded the labour power of all the members residing within the household. The sharecropper's annual contract, which bound the entire family to work the landowner's farm, also obligated the family to provide capital in the form of farming implements and furnishings. Ancient feudal ties were evident in the family's contractual obligation to pay tribute, replace lost family members with hired help (at the family's expense), and permit the landowner to inspect the family at will. The contract had considerable repercussions for household composition "for it meant that there could be no coresidence without the full-time participation in the household unit of production." In an effort to maximize labour power and optimize productivity, sharecroppers naturally sought the largest family possible. At the same time, *braccianti* unable to earn sufficient wages in agriculture sought non-agricultural jobs in public works, railroads, and manufacturing (sugar refineries and food processing plants).

Whereas Laslett practically denied any link between economic change and family forms on the grounds that nuclear families predated the industrial era, Kertzer wants to document whether changing economic conditions affected co-residence patterns in a region where complex households were common. He goes to great pains to prove that this period did indeed witness significant economic and social change, especially in the occupational structure where the number of *braccianti* entering the urban industrial work force dramatically increased. However, despite tremendous population growth and substantial economic change,

Kertzer's comparison of household composition data for 1880 and 1910 shows "virtually no aggregate change in the coresidential pattern of the people of Bertalia" in 1910 and hence "no support to the nuclearization thesis." Though the number of households almost doubled in this period, the proportion of simple and multiple types (roughly 64 per cent and 55 per cent respectively) remained unchanged. According to Kertzer, no decline occurred in the frequency of complex households between 1880 and 1910 because the *braccianti*, who had been numerically dominant since 1880, were simply making the transition from one form of wage labour (agriculture) to another (urban/industrial) and thus continued to reside in simple households. Similarly, sharecropper families still represented a substantial minority within the parish in 1910 and continued living in complex households. Indeed, the frequency of multiple households among sharecroppers actually increased slightly during the period. But the explanation seems incomplete. Why did the entry of increasing numbers of sharecroppers into urban wage labour at the turn of the century — a point Kertzer stresses in an earlier section — not result in fewer sharecropper (multiple) households in 1910? A "slight" increase in the frequency of multiple households among sharecroppers could hardly have offset the increasing proletarianization of this class.

Least satisfying are the final chapters on migration and kinship as Kertzer performs much fancy quantitative footwork to produce few conclusive results. Somewhat ironically, the findings indicate that central Italy was very typical of other western European and North American pre-industrial communities. We learn that pre-industrial residents experienced high rates of mobility, though such movements were local in scope and confined largely to intra-provincial moves. While mobility rates were high for all occupations and ages as well as for both sexes, migrants

were most likely young workers. Kertzer's calculations also confirm Lutz Berker's thesis that simple households usually underwent an extended family phase to take care of the elderly. Tracing extra-household kin links for residents at ten-year intervals, he found that most households with kin links to other households had ties to no more than four such households; that daughter links were more frequent than son links because women left the parental home upon marriage; that kin ties linked relatives from different occupations; and that persisters were more likely to have kin than immigrants. Unfortunately, Kertzer provides no insight into the character of kin networks. We do not learn whether individuals valued such ties or even how often they saw each other.

Kertzer's study makes an important contribution to the growing literature on co-residence and family organization. A convincing materialist argument is given for the presence of pre-industrial complex households in Bertalia. Of course, additional community studies are necessary to confirm Kertzer's thesis that sharecropping regions fostered complex households. A few references to several studies of communities in southern France, particularly in the Pyrenees, are hardly conclusive, especially when they refer to (often temporary) stem family arrangements of landholding peasants and not to sharecroppers.

To his credit, Kertzer considers the ways in which economy, family formation, and family strategies affected women within a sharecropper household organized along patriarchal lines. Stressing male privilege in the public sphere, Kertzer notes how the male head of the household directed the family enterprise and acted as the family's liaison in the wider community. Whenever decision-making was shared, married sons, not women, participated. Aside from a brief reference to the vulnerability of daughters-in-law forced to obey not only

their husbands and fathers-in-law but also their husband's mothers, Kertzer fails to address adequately women's oppression within the family. He stresses instead the separation of the spheres and the independence of sharecropper wives who apparently wielded tremendous domestic authority over the household and the other women within it. While this avoids the pitfall of attributing male power to feminine passivity, it underestimates the remarkable extent to which sharecropping women toiled with their men in the fields — a point Kertzer himself concedes — at the same time as it obscures important questions regarding domestic labour, gender relations, and relations between women of differing status residing under the same roof. It is not enough to assert simply that (some) women exercised power within the domestic sphere without also exploring the limitations that patriarchal forms imposed on female power both inside and outside that sphere.

The author's uneasiness with qualitative sources accounts for the inadequate treatment of social relations. Only rarely does he discuss actual sharecroppers and peasants in Bertalia, and these portraits are taken from heavily biased middle- and upper-class sources and they are clumsily stuck onto the end of a chapter. Consulting folklore sources might have provided new insights. In a recent study of Sambucca, western Sicily, Donna Gabaccia effectively used proverbs to supplement her statistical findings indicating that contrary to conventional images of southern Italians as extremely (if not amorally) familialist, nineteenth-century Sicilians lived near friends and highly valued their friendships. Finally, Kertzer sets up a confusing dichotomy between "urban" and "industrial" jobs. True, railways predated (though they also stimulated) industrialization, but it is misleading to call railway jobs in 1910 non-industrial urban jobs but sugar refinery jobs industrial. Yet, none of these weaknesses seriously detracts from Kertzer's important "redis-

covery" of the allegedly mythical pre-industrial complex household.

Franca Iacovetta
York University

Albert Szymanski, *Class Struggle in Socialist Poland* (New York: Praeger 1984).

THE LATE ALBERT SZYMANSKI was an all too rare type of American academic — he was a dissident. Like many who write about Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union he had an axe to grind, but his was a pro-socialist, not an anti-Soviet one. However one feels about his personal biases — which he never attempted to conceal — his work is worth reading if only because it is in such sharp contrast to mainstream western scholarship.

Class Struggle in Socialist Poland is a study of the rise and fall of Solidarity. Szymanski's central thesis is that "those who identify with liberation movements and the advance of socialism should have welcomed the Polish military's actions" in suppressing the world's most famous union. On the whole he makes a pretty good case, if one accepts his framework. His argument is strengthened by using "almost entirely pro-Western, anti-Communist sources to establish the facts."

Szymanski contends that Solidarity's leadership intended to overthrow the existing social regime in Poland and replace it with a more market-oriented economy open to western capital penetration. He does not have much difficulty establishing at least a *prima facie* case for this. In November 1980 Solidarity leader Lech Walesa volunteered that "I am not a socialist," a remark which was amply confirmed a few weeks later with his judgement that the election of Ronald Reagan was "a good sign to the world and Poland." A year later, as his union was moving inexorably towards a showdown with the government, Walesa advised the

Washington Post that "Poland may not appear a profitable investment for you now. But if we can succeed with what we are doing here, it will benefit you in the long run."

The preponderance of religious symbols at Solidarity functions, the papal ring-kissing, and the demands for privileged media access and educational status for the Roman Catholic church should perhaps have given pause to those on the left who hailed Solidarity as a model for workers east and west. Another key element of Solidarity's ideology to which Szymanski draws attention was a rather ugly strain of Polish nationalism manifested by explicit identification with the rightist anti-Semitic inter-war regime of Jozef Pilsudski. The *Wall Street Journal* of 12 November 1981 reported that "The Pilsudski cult has burgeoned openly this year. . . . In Gdansk, the birthplace of Solidarity, the shipyard was renamed in Mr. Pilsudski's honor at a gala ceremony."

Solidarity's September 1981 national congress (to which the leadership provocatively invited Irving Brown, a well-known CIA labour operative in post-war western Europe) marked the point of no return. The congress adopted a draft economic plan which called for "dismantling most central directives and seek[ing] to make enterprises self-financed entities whose strategies and product mixes are shaped by market forces rather than by state plans." This was pretty clear. Walesa was to make it even clearer at what was supposed to be a secret meeting of Solidarity's top leadership in Radom ten days before the military crackdown:

After all, let us realize that we are bringing this system down. Let us at last realize this. If we agree to have private shopkeeping, buy up state farms, and ensure complete self-management, this system will cease to exist. . . . No change of system can take place without blows being exchanged. . . .

In the event, blows were exchanged but it was Solidarity, not the "system"

which ceased to exist as a result. Szymanski argues that this was as much a result of political as military factors and despite its identification with Solidarity the bulk of the Polish working class had not entirely abandoned hope in the possibilities of socialism. He notes that in the last weeks before the showdown, popular support for the confrontationalist "radicals" was melting away and he points to the relative ease with which Solidarity was suppressed as evidence of his hypothesis. Certainly the Polish military believed that Solidarity's working-class base was not anxious to bring the system down. The decision to play the tapes of the Radom meeting over national radio was designed to discredit the union's leadership as "anti-socialist elements" and thereby justify the imposition of martial law.

On a more general level Szymanski argues that the popularity of the post-war socialist property transformations is widely underestimated in the West. He cites various U.S. Army and Radio Free Europe reports to support this contention and points out that the working class benefited substantially in terms of standard of living, educational opportunity, and social mobility. In 1971 for instance, a Polish miner earned as much as a doctor or a professor.

There are points where Szymanski's enthusiasm for "socialism" Polish-style runs away with him. An example of this is his assertion that "there was a genuine, working class/peasant revolution in Poland in 1944-48 that was protected, but in no way caused, by the presence of the Soviet Army." He even claims that the "Polish revolutionary process" was "very similar" to what occurred in Nicaragua in 1979. He is unable to produce any evidence ("pro-western" or otherwise) to support this fanciful interpretation and so has to content himself with repeating it several times throughout the book. The truth is that Poland went "socialist" by Kremlin fiat as the lines hardened in the

Cold War. The nationalization of industry and redistribution of land were widely popular and involved tens of thousands of workers and peasants, but there was no mass uprising à la Nicaragua nor even any significant working-class mobilizations of the sort which accompanied the "Prague Coup" of 1948.

Kremlin fiat historically played a rather large role in what Isaac Deutscher referred to as "The tragedy of the Polish Communist Party." The Polish CP, heir to a long Marxist tradition, was regarded by the Bolsheviks as the best section of the young Comintern. But as revolutionary enthusiasm waned in Russia in the late 1920s and the 1930s the Polish group was repeatedly purged and then finally liquidated outright in 1938 as incorrigibly "ultra-left." Several years later, as the war was drawing to a close and it was becoming apparent that Poland was to fall within the Soviet sphere the Kremlin scrambled to put together an organization which could serve as an administrative apparatus for what was to be its satellite. Far from being a party of revolutionists the reconstituted communist party was from its inception a party of bureaucrats, hand-raisers, and careerists.

If Szymanski's partisan approach sometimes gets the better of him, he is by no means simply an apologist. He makes some incisive criticisms of the Polish regime's longstanding policy of subsidizing unproductive peasant smallholders (who are organically hostile to any kind of socialism) and the concomitant attempts to placate their earthly representatives in the clerical hierarchy. It is hard to argue with his conclusion that in the final analysis, "The problem with Poland was not too much socialism, but not enough" — particularly if one takes that to include the political, as well as the economic, dimension.

Thomas Rutman
Toronto

John Riddell, ed., *Lenin's Struggle for a Revolutionary International. Documents 1907-1916: The Preparatory Years* (New York: Monad Press 1984).

THIS VOLUME OF DOCUMENTS, the first in a series on the history of the early Communist International, begins with the proceedings from the 1907 Stuttgart congress of the Second International. It is an appropriate opening since it was at the Stuttgart congress in the aftermath of the 1905 revolution in Russia that Lenin and his followers, with others such as Rosa Luxemburg, began the lengthy and difficult process of constructing an anti-war, internationalist current within the Second International. The intention of this volume is to present the key discussions and debates that occurred between the future leaders of the new international and various anarcho-sindicalist, centrist, and reformist currents.

The documents, well translated and often appearing for the first time in English, cover more than Lenin himself. Forgotten voices such as Alfred Rosmer, Nikolai Bukharin, Gregory Zinoviev, Karl Liebknecht, Karl Radek, and Christian Rakovsky are again heard. As the names suggest, the book largely limits its choice to the two countries where the debates were focused — Russia and Germany. Unfortunately, given their role in society at the time, too few women's voices are included.

Nonetheless, there is considerable relevance in these debates for labour history and political studies in Canada. As David Bercuson noted in his *Confrontation at Winnipeg* (1974), "Lenin's success fired the imagination and spurred the efforts of socialists throughout the world." The ideas of the collection under consideration were central in the labour and socialist politics of Europe as well as in the Russian revolutions of February, and particularly October, 1917.

Following the conference at Stuttgart came the outbreak of World War I and the

reactions of various parties and political currents in the labour movement to it: the Zimmerwald conference and the development of the Zimmerwald left; the war and revolutionary crisis in Czarist Russia; the war and the crisis of German social democracy; and finally, the split in the Second International. This volume's collection of documents covers each of these in turn, ending on the eve of the Russian Revolution of February 1917. Given limited space the most appropriate way to indicate the relevance of the 604 pages of this book is to comment briefly on the three main themes of the debates covered: war; colonialism and nationalism; and bureaucracy and reformism.

By the time of the Stuttgart congress in 1907, two phenomena were evident: first, that a major war was looming; and second, that the majority of parties in the Second International counterposed reform of their respective capitalist societies to fundamental social change. Underestimating the depth of crisis, August Bebel, the central leader of the German Social Democratic Party (SPD), sought to encompass both reformist and revolutionary currents in one party. In his view: "No one in German ruling circles wants war." (25) At the same time he agreed that the international should oppose war preparations — preferably all protests should go through the SPD's parliamentary deputies. Jean Jaures, the leader of the French Socialist Party, argued that conflict in the International arising from competitive European powers could be resolved by an "international court of arbitration." (30) His moderate perspective was opposed by a strong minority delegation in his own party. In the end, with the aid of Luxemburg, Lenin and Julius Martov, the congress reaffirmed previous international resolutions against "militarism and imperialism."

Nonetheless, when World War I broke out, the volume documents how most socialist members of European parliaments supported "their" government.

voted for war credits, and in some cases, such as Belgium and France, even joined war cabinets. The "Great War," as World War I was then called, proved indeed to be the greatest slaughter known to humanity up until that time. The 1916 Battle of Verdun alone took the lives of some six hundred thousand German, French, and other allied soldiers. As the war dragged on many worker supporters of socialist parties affiliated to the Second International lost whatever enthusiasm they might have had for the conflict.

International leaders, such as the SPD's Karl Kautsky, reflected these anti-war sentiments. Yet in rejecting an outright pro-war position he also opposed the clear anti-war views of Lenin and Zinoviev as articulated in their pamphlet "Socialism and War" (1915), which is reprinted in the text. Downplaying the pro-war trajectory of the International, Kautsky argued that it was "not an effective tool in wartime" as essentially it was "an instrument of peace." (148) His article, entitled "Internationalism and the War" argues that although "taking sides in war according to your national point of view clearly endangers the International . . . we certainly can rally behind a war fought to fend off enemy invasion." (146) The essence of Kautsky's position is perhaps best contained in his own slogan of "struggle for peace; class struggle in peacetime."

Trotsky's critical anti-war reply to Kautsky, entitled "War and the International" (150), is a valuable inclusion lending balance to the debate. It was first serialized in the Paris Russian-language daily *Golos (Voice)*, edited by the Menshevik leader Julius Martov. When a German translation began to circulate in the German underground, editorial notes inform us that Trotsky was sentenced *in absentia* by the imperial government to several months in prison.

A second theme, running throughout the documents of the first volume published in this series concerns the relation-

ship between the European workers' movement and the peoples of what is today termed the Third World. Riddell's editorial choice is to be commended here for its balanced presentation. Readers can judge for themselves in the debate between the left in the Second International, which fought to embrace the struggle of the "oppressed nations" against colonialism, and the moderate pro-war wing which thought otherwise. Hendrick Van Kol, a leader of the Dutch Social Democratic Labour Party, for example, held that providing aid to Africa was "a theoretical pipedream."

Suppose that we bring a machine to the savages of central Africa, what will they do with it? Perhaps they will start up a war dance around it. . . . Perhaps they should send some Europeans to run the machines. What the native peoples would do with them, I do not know. . . . Perhaps the natives will destroy our machines, Perhaps they will kill us or even eat us. . . . Therefore we must go there with weapons in hand. . . . (14)

Such racial and pro-imperial views enjoyed a surprisingly wide hearing among the relatively high income layers of the working classes in the European parties which constituted the majority of the Second International.

Lenin's Struggle for a Revolutionary International also contains excerpts from the discussion of the immigration commission initiated at the Stuttgart conference. Here, Morris Hillquit, a leader of the Socialist Party in the United States, proposed that the International support restrictions on the immigration of Asian workers. This debate echoes Canada's west coast history on the perils of the "yellow race." Hillquit claimed that Chinese and Japanese immigration "threatens the native-born with dangerous competition and . . . unconscious strike-breakers." At the same time, he admonished how he had "absolutely no racial prejudices against the Chinese. . . ." (17)

Related to what was termed the "colo-

nial question" was the "national question." Again, the historical documents of labour politics grapple with social issues still topical. In "The Socialist Revolution and the Right of Nations to Self Determination," Lenin argued that "Socialist parties which did not show by all their activity, both now, during the revolution and after its victory, that they would liberate the enslaved nations and build up relations with them on the basis of a free union — and a free union is a false phrase without the right to secede — these parties would be betraying socialism." (354) The world, he said, was divided into oppressed and oppressor nations, the nationalism of the former being progressive, while that of the latter, reactionary.

A third important theme in the documents published here concerns the rise of industrial capitalism, its expansion throughout the world — "imperialism" — and the resulting social stratification and socio-political consequences. Most members of the now-divided Second International favoured its reunification following the war. Even some anti-war social democrats held that the crisis of the International was due to what they termed the "opportunist" or "social chauvinist" positions of individuals under the extreme pressures of war. The Marxist wing, and it is principally Lenin, Zinoviev, and Trotsky that we hear from, held that blaming the war and individual leaders was not sufficiently explanatory. They maintained that it was necessary to understand how the "pro-imperialist" views of leaders of the International originated in the pre-war "opportunist" (reformist) currents and found their material base within sections of the working classes themselves.

They sought both explanation and verification in the earlier writings of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels utilizing the notions of a "labour aristocracy" and a "labour bureaucracy." In his article "The Collapse of the Second International," Lenin argued that "opportunism was engendered in the course of decades by

the special features in the period of the development of capitalism, when the comparatively peaceful and cultured life of a stratum of privileged workmen 'bourgeoisified' them, gave them crumbs from the table of their national capitalists, and isolated them from the suffering, misery and revolutionary temper of the impoverished and ruined masses." (20)

While the above illuminates the core of Lenin's position, a single sentence cannot capture the richness of the debate. The major article included in the collection is Zinoviev's "The Social Roots of Opportunism." (475) Here he analyzes both the "revisionist" ideologies of German social democrats and their social basis. Zinoviev's research reveals that a high proportion of SPD members were from the better-paid sections of the work force. Unskilled workers composed only 14.9 per cent of the organization. In part, this situation came about as unionized workers and skilled workers were largely synonymous. Beyond the economics of the development of a "labour aristocracy" and a "labour bureaucracy" Zinoviev analyzes the social stratification of the work force from the available data, mainly the case of Berlin, then links the material condition of the upper stratum to its ideological drift into reformist and "social chauvinist" politics.

The related, but distinct, notions of a labour aristocracy and a labour bureaucracy have long been controversial among labour historians and industrial sociologists. Most have avoided the notion of a labour aristocracy — a notable exception being E.J. Hobsbawm in his book *Labouring Men* (1964). The notion of a labour bureaucracy, on the other hand, has been widely utilized. Indeed, it has been the key explanatory variable for many social theorists. But the concept, as employed by Lenin and Zinoviev, is not equitable with Max Weber's "ideal type" nor with that of most contemporary writers. In the Marxist usage employed, bureaucracy is not simply an administra-

tion carrying out decisions. Rather, it involves power and privilege for the bureaucrats. Although this section of the text avoids the balance of views manifest in earlier sections, for labour historians and sociologists the discussion on the linkage between ideology, social stratification, and bureaucracy is perhaps of most interest.

The final section of this collection of documents is appropriately entitled "Toward the New International." Again, some hitherto unavailable material is presented. Resolutions and programmatic submissions of Second International conferences, such as the one at Kienthal, record a debate on the appropriate basis for political unity and the future of the International. Manifest on the horizon is the founding of the Third International but this is the subject of the next volume in the series. The richness of historical debate on still relevant social questions, the extreme care taken in translations, and the context notations by the editor make this volume an excellent beginning to an important new series.

Christopher Schenk
Toronto

Mark Halström, *Industry and Inequality: The Social Anthropology of Indian Labour* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1984).

THE POST-INDEPENDENCE government of India has consciously encouraged industrial development within two sectors: a large-scale sector and a small-scale sector. The large-scale sector was emphasized in the three five-year plans initiated under Nehru (1951-66) as he sought to vitalize an underdeveloped and export-oriented economy through the creation of large, Indian-controlled units in primary industries (steel production, mining, power, and petrochemicals). This emphasis continued under Indira Gandhi; and it has seen the government direct 10 to 25

times as much investment capital into large industry as towards small. In fact, the bulk of investment in large industry has come from the government, while in small industry the larger share has been raised by small entrepreneurs. This has been a deliberate strategy: primary industry has been seen as a base for more diversified, small-scale industry. At the same time, India has chosen the path of industrial as well as agricultural self-sufficiency; and the government has used licensing controls both to limit the presence of foreign firms and to cut imports by substituting domestic products for imported ones.

Although the government concentrated on large industry, it held high hopes for the small-scale sector. Gandhi's belief in the value of handicrafts and village industries (spinning and weaving, paper-making, and pottery) exerted a powerful influence in the Nehru years. The advocates of a free and open economy, untrammelled by bureaucratic controls, also made their mark. The idea that small-scale industry was a necessary complement to large-scale industry was present from the beginning. Following Gandhi's principles, the government has subsidized cottage industries and reserved spheres of production for them. It has also tried to disperse modern industrial production by encouraging small industries. It is difficult to show that handicrafts have benefited, but small industry has. In modern India, workshops with a handful of employees using modern machinery or ingeniously adapting older technology, are integral to the economic system, supplying large factories or competing with them. Such shops make machinery parts, electronic components, pharmaceuticals, and plastics as well as textiles, ceramics, and wood, paper, and leather products. They may pay low wages and be housed in primitive sheds, yet they produce with precision technologically sophisticated objects. They fall well short of the Gandhian ideal because they are, with few

exceptions, dependent on the business of large industry and on the subsidies and licensing practices of government; but they now provide a large part of India's industrial output.

In an earlier book, *South Indian Factory Workers*, published in 1976, Mark Halström argued that the modern Indian economy has created a major division in the population: on one side of the boundary are those employed in the large-scale sector, and on the other, those in the small. In this book he revises that view. He still maintains that for industrial workers in India, a job in a large firm is far more desirable than in a small shop. Large firms come under the Factory Act; small ones do not. In matters of health and safety — ventilation, space, lighting, hazards around machinery, chemicals, and noise levels — conditions in many small shops (and in some factories) are horrifying, but small shops are subject to no regulation or inspection. Workers in these shops have no protection in the matter of minimum hours, or days off each week, or more extended leave. Laisser faire rules supreme: the laws that exist remain unenforced. A more important immediate concern of most workers is that large firms pay more: they are unionized and they can afford it. Still more importantly, a job in a large firm offers more security (Indian workers expect unions to fight for security first and wages second). In *South Indian Factory Workers* Halström suggested that it was security that separated the few from the many. People with money or property, with government jobs, or with permanent jobs in factories and offices were the few within the citadel; the rest were the many fighting to get in. This vision suggested an élite class of workers, employed within the large-scale, regulated, and organized sector, who had entered the citadel and who were sharply distanced from those in the unorganized sector outside.

Now Halström says that the boundary is not as clearcut as he had thought. *South*

Indian Factory Workers is a study of workers in four engineering factories in Bangalore. *Industry and Inequality* is based on fieldwork done most intensively in Bangalore and Bombay, but also in Calcutta, Ahmeddebad, Ludhiana, Poona, Kanpur, Faridabad, Ranchi, Hyderabad, Madras, and Trivandrum, a list that includes eight of India's ten largest cities. Most of this fieldwork was done from 1975-7, the period of Indira Gandhi's emergency rule when civil liberties were suspended, strikes banned, and when the Indian government was exceedingly edgy about criticism. Halström says that he and the people he interviewed — workers, union leaders, and employers — were conscious of the situation and careful about where they met and what they said. Some of the fieldwork was done after Mrs. Gandhi's election defeat in 1977; and Halström has been able to amass plenty of material. He has come to the conclusion that, while individuals can be placed within one sector or another, families cannot.

If there is a sharp difference between the worker in a small shop and the employee of a large factory, it is that the latter tries to keep his wife at home and his children in school, while the former sends them out to work. The disposable income of the two families may be very close. Nuclear families themselves are not independent, but elements of extended families that operate as economic units even though households may be miles apart. A factory worker with a secure job is obliged to feed and house relatives who come in from the country looking for temporary or casual work. The competition for jobs at all levels is intense and it is through personal contacts and networks of family friends and neighbours that jobs are won. These networks, however, bridge the organized and unorganized sectors. There is, Halström has decided, no wall between sectors, but a continuum on a steep slope.

The argument is convincing; but the

value of the book goes beyond that. It is rich in descriptive material and suggestive detail, and provides a remarkable portrait of entrepreneurship, markets, and technology as well as labour in the small-scale industry of modern India.

Hugh Johnston
Simon Fraser University

Verity Burgmann, *'In Our Time': Socialism and the Rise of Labor, 1885-1905* (Sydney, London, and Boston: George Allen and Unwin 1985).

THIS BOOK IS a revisionist history of the genesis of the Australian Labor Party. Burgmann argues that previous historians have overlooked or underestimated the importance of those whom she calls 'first wave socialists' in the formation and early successes of the Labor Party. "The protagonists in standard labour histories are the individuals who rode to personal success on the back of the labour movement; forgotten, or confined to brief mention or odd footnote, are those who remained agitators, who articulated the ideas that galvanised the movement. . . ." It was, Burgmann maintains, not elected Labor Party representatives of ALP officials but these agitators "who at each step encouraged the working class to think of itself as a class with interests opposed to that of the employing class." (3) And that was a crucial factor in facilitating the Labor Party's early successes at the polls. To support this argument, Australia's early socialist movement is described state by state, from 1885 to 1905.

The first Australian socialist group formed in 1872, with links to the International Workingmen's Association in Europe. The Democratic Association of Victoria was a short-lived effort, however, and permanent groupings did not emerge until more than a decade later, in the late 1880s. Radicalism was stimulated by the bitter strikes and the economic depression of the early 1890s, especially

the maritime strike of 1890. Ending in defeat, this strike prompted many unionists to turn to political activity, where they hoped to accomplish by legislation what they had failed to gain by striking. The labour movement's new-found faith in the political process led to the launching of the ALP.

While acknowledging the strike's role as a catalyst to political activity, Burgmann sees the reaction of socialists — a widespread endorsement of the parliamentary route to socialism — as the crucial turning point, one that other historians have failed to emphasize. She argues that the socialists' conversion to political activity and their subsequent endorsement of the fledgling ALP provided the party with key recruits. These socialist supporters had neither prior links to the established parties nor any commitment to the endless Australian debate over free trade, and so helped foster the new party's image as an independent political force. From their ranks came many an articulate leader; Burgmann cites the example of the 1891 New South Wales election, when "at least eight" of the 35 Labor MPs elected were members of the Australian Socialist League. (82)

Burgmann's thesis, that socialist enthusiasm was a key ingredient in the creation of Australia's labour parties, carries with it a dismissal of 'labourism,' which is described as "an adaptation of colonial liberal values to a working class reality rather than an ideology in its own right." Burgmann argues that labourism lacked the vitality of socialism, that it alone could not inspire the working class to build a new and independent political party. Labourism triumphed as the eventual ideology of the ALP "simply because the socialists . . . were fundamentally mistaken in their belief that socialism could be reached through the parliamentary process. Though socialism sowed the seed, Labourism reaped the harvest." (195)

Burgmann insists that not only did the early ALP gain substantial benefits from

socialist participation, but she also offers convincing proof that the traditional, Whiggish interpretation of this period — concentrating on the emergence of an ALP assured of both longevity and success — misses the sense of *fin de siècle* Australia. Her narrative suggests that the early socialists were a free-wheeling, dynamic lot and — at least until the 1890s — were far from unanimous in either their analysis of capitalism or their programme for achieving socialism. Organizations were formed and split; economic theories and political innovations, both indigenous and foreign, were argued over, accepted, or rejected; experiments in cooperative business ventures and communal settlement schemes were pursued by some and condemned by others. About the only shared belief was the optimistic assumption that the socialist millennium was at hand.

The book provides an excellent account of the various initiatives of Australia's early socialists. An entire chapter, for example, describes William Lane's attempt to build a socialist "New Australia" in Paraguay. Burgmann attempts to make sense of this experiment by giving the history of two settlers in New Australia, as well as an outline of Lane's career. Her description of the departure from Sydney of the first group bound for New Australia captures something of the single-minded determination of these pioneers. When health authorities discovered measles among the children and began to bar some from leaving, parents camouflaged similarly infected children with liberal amounts of raspberry jam. Good humour did not always prevail: a disgruntled mother complained about the baby food purchased for the trip: "I have always fed my baby on Patent Groats and I ain't going to change for anybody — Socialist or no Socialist." (19) Burgmann writes well, with an eye for detail that makes the book both enjoyable and enlightening, an encouraging reminder that political history need neither be tedious nor neglect social history. Although

addressed to an Australian debate, the book deserves a wider audience.

Australia's first wave socialists channelled their energies into support for reformist strategies. As these failed, enthusiasm dissipated. Burgmann argues that of all the disappointments none was as significant as the outcome of the decision to support the ALP. She concludes that "the state socialists failed dramatically to realise 'Socialism In Our Time' through parliament, and in attempting to do so, did much to disarm the forces of first-wave socialism." (197) Enmeshed in the liberal democratic process, Labor MPs moved further and further away from their roots in the labour movement and the working class. The foreword to the book offers a personal endorsement of Burgmann's analysis. It is written by George Petersen, himself a Labor MP and he admits that "as one who has seven times woken on a Sunday morning to find that 20,000 men and women have voted for him, it is humbling to confess that I am not at all sure why they should elect me to parliament, as the representative of a bureaucratic political machine over which they have no control."

Jeremy Mouat
University of British Columbia

Edward D. Beechert, *Working in Hawaii: A Labor History* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press 1985).

PLANTATION WORKERS in Hawaii have developed unusually strong, effective unions: the purpose of this book is to explain how and why. It covers two closely related themes: the formation of a wage labour force in the sugar industry and the emergence of the union movement.

Beginning with a brief survey of Hawaiian life before European contact, the author explains how the inception of foreign trade precipitated the breakdown of communal institutions. Then he moves

into the early nineteenth century and the core of his story, which focuses on the ongoing efforts of foreign sugar planters to create and control a plantation labour force. Hawaii experienced a succession of labour systems. When the decline of the native Hawaiian population through endemic disease undermined the planters' efforts to transform them into wage labourers, the government in 1850 legalized indentured servitude. The opening of a preferential market in the United States stimulated the rapid expansion of sugar cultivation after 1876. Planters sought to meet their acute need for workers by importing thousands, first from China, then from Japan and finally from the Philippines, in addition to smaller numbers from Portugal, Spain, and Puerto Rico. Thus in Hawaii as in many other sugar producing areas, the demand for labour, outstripping native supply, gave rise to a heterogeneous labour force composed of several distinct nationalities. Not surprisingly, cultural differences divided the workers, making unity against the growers difficult to attain: most early strike actions (from 1890 through 1938) involved only one ethnic group.

Ethnic diversity aside, Hawaiian sugar workers differed from their counterparts in the Caribbean and elsewhere in that many in Hawaii found alternatives to work in the cane. After a few years, some returned home; others went to work on rice or pineapple plantations or moved to the cities as dock or craft workers; still others migrated to the United States mainland. Such mobility meant the planters faced an ongoing problem of labour replenishment. Although outside opportunities may have made workers less prone to assert their rights on the plantations, they also created links between urban and rural areas and between Hawaii and California that in certain periods stimulated labour organization.

A second circumstance favouring unionization was the fact that Hawaii fell under United States laws after 1900. The

annexation of Hawaii to the United States in that year opened the prospect of ending indentured servitude. This precipitated some of the first labour protests on the islands, aimed at compelling the planters to implement the law instituting free labour. The crucial period of worker organization did not come until the 1930s and early 1940s, however, when federal legislation and its enforcement through the National Labor Relations Board encouraged Hawaiian longshore, sugar, and pineapple workers to affiliate with the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union. Recognition of collective bargaining and the first industry-wide sugar strike took place in the early 1940s, followed by rapid gains for those workers not displaced by the mechanization of the plantations in the 1950s. Beechert ends his account in 1959 when Hawaii became a state of the United States and the Hawaiian labour movement became fully integrated into national labour institutions.

The strength of this study lies in its detailed portrayal of the interaction between sugar growers and plantation labourers. One comes away with a clear understanding of the sugar growers' initiatives to solve the problem of labour scarcity, the limits on such initiatives posed by U.S. laws restricting Chinese immigration and favouring free labour, and the workers' responses. The growers' initiatives often inadvertently furnished the issues for organization; the workers' responses stimulated new growers' actions meant to reassert control. The book is also informative on the timing of the successive waves of immigration into Hawaii, on the legal dimensions of worker management and protest, and on labour organizations and strikes. The research — in sugar company, sugar grower association, and union archives — seems thorough.

Despite a few fascinating comments on the role of Japanese newspapers and Buddhist temples in providing support for

Japanese labour organization in the early twentieth century, Beechert does little with the recent socio-cultural approaches to labour history. Perhaps because the author deplures ethnic identifications as an impediment to effective unionization, he is not sensitive to the workers' experience of ethnic difference and the changes wrought by the end of immigration in 1934 and the emergence of a new generation of Hawaiian-born workers. Although Beechert says he means to study the evolution of worker consciousness, the book gives little concrete sense of the social activities of production, of differences between plantations, and of workers' perceptions of all this.

Furthermore, the reader who is not already familiar with Hawaiian history may be somewhat confused by the lack of context. The evolving organization of the sugar industry, market trends, and the interaction of power-holders in Hawaii with the United States government must have influenced grower-labourer relations. The role that such structural factors played in shaping the opportunities and limits of plantation owners and workers, however, is not made explicit.

Nevertheless, this book should interest historians of American labour because it sheds light on the influence of urban organizing in the United States on labour relations in a very different rural society. The book also should appeal to researchers investigating the sugar economy in other parts of the world, but the reader must work hard to draw out the comparative significance of the Hawaiian case, for the author does not do it.

Catherine LeGrand
Queen's University

Joan Kelly, *Women, History, and Theory* (Chicago: University of Chicago 1984).

THIS VOLUME OF essays represents the best of Joan Kelly's work in women's history. Written mainly in the 1970s, these

five essays appeared posthumously in 1984, two years after her death. The introductory material provided by Kelly and some of her closest associates places these essays in historical context. Kelly describes in the preface how she moved from an interest in Renaissance Italy's fascination with perspective, proportion, and scale to an engagement with the new vantage point provided by feminism. Both feminist theory and Marxism inform Kelly's work, which centres on women's experiences in Europe before 1800. Kelly's contribution, however, extends far beyond these geographical and time limits because of her commitment to grappling with conceptual and theoretical issues relevant to women's history as a whole. These contributions form the basis of the discussion which follows.

Kelly viewed feminism as a "vantage point" from which historical change and continuity might be re-examined. From this vantage point Kelly raised questions basic to the entire discipline. In "The Social Relations of the Sexes" (1976) she developed those ideas formulated in the early 1970s on historical periodization, categories of analysis, and theories of social change. Asserting that "the relation between the sexes is a social and not a natural one," Kelly provided some of the clearest challenges to past historiography and theory. She challenged historians to examine critically the relevance of accepted periodization for women's history, as well as suggesting forcefully (along with Natafie Zemon Davis), that sex must be a social category of analysis equal in importance to class and race/ethnicity. Finally, she began to suggest how historians might integrate Marxist and feminist approaches in trying to understand social transformations.

This essay was followed by the publication of "Did Women Have a Renaissance?" (1977) which emphasized the need for historical specificity in the analysis of the social relations between

the sexes. In rejecting the accepted wisdom about the equality of Renaissance women, Kelly established some criteria for measuring women's position in the context of specific time periods, class, and race configurations. Kelly urged that the regulation of women's sexuality be compared with that of men; that women's economic and political roles be examined within the context of the education necessary for work, property, and power; and that women's cultural roles in shaping society be examined as well as the ideology surrounding women. The inquiry into property and power relations and the examination of the private/public dichotomy evident in the early essays continued to engage her in later essays, especially "The Doubled Vision of Feminist Theory." (1979) In the latter she proposed that feminist theory had been blinkered by acceptance of the nineteenth-century public/private dichotomy which presumed that men inhabited a public sphere while women remained in a separate private/domestic sphere. Kelly demonstrated how these assumptions permeated theory about women in the past and how they have continued to be reflected in contemporary radical-feminist and socialist-feminist writings. "The Doubled Vision" argued for the recognition of overlapping socio-sexual spheres as a more adequate reconstruction of women's past; Kelly, moreover, hypothesized that as public and private spheres diverged, women lost control over productivity, property, and their persons, a point of view also put forward by Mary Ryan.

The insistence on the "doubled vision" illustrated her conceptual approach to women's history; thus, class and sex/gender interrelationships were equally important in her formulations. Kelly was particularly concerned with ideology and consciousness and how these intersected with the actual social relations of men and women. Consciousness was key in her analysis and she used insights derived from Marxist theories of ideology to

analyze both patriarchy and feminism. As the authors of the introduction point out in reference to courtly love, she identified "a problem only conceivable from a Marxist vantage point but given shape through feminist questions — that is, how to explain the origin of apparently deviant or resistant values in the culture and their function as 'ideals.'" (xxi) Kelly fathomed how such values could serve as a limited power base for women while at the same time providing an accommodative ideal.

Kelly's understanding of the interconnections among class, sex/gender, and race led her to view patriarchy as the product of specific historical conditions. Likewise she wrote about early feminism as the product of historical circumstances and extended our conceptual vision of feminism back into the past. "Early Feminist Theory and the 'Querelle des Femmes'" (first version published in 1982) argued for a "four hundred year-old tradition of women thinking about women and sexual politics in European society before the French Revolution." (66) This essay was to have comprised the first chapter for a book on feminist theory. While she never completed this work, her notes suggest that she viewed the feminist tradition as "comprehensive and cumulative;" (xxiv) feminist theory, she maintained, emerged when women living on the margins of a dominant culture experienced the "discrepancy between the real and the ideal." This consciousness of discrepancy produced oppositional values which challenged misogyny and defended women as a social group. What Kelly has tried to do then is to describe a process, a consciousness, which she perceived at the core of the feminist tradition. This historically specific consciousness was intimately tied to material realities. Her analysis of history, of women, of patriarchy, and of feminism, rooted both in Marxism and feminism, invited the reader to transcend dichotomous thinking and to actualize the "doubled vision" both in the

realm of historical reconstruction and in the realm of history.

Kelly's insights remain central to women's historical experiences and their conceptualization. Other historians have incorporated and built on these contributions. What remains crucial, however, is the necessity to push these insights further, to complete the task of writing a comprehensive history of the feminist tradition which includes the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. This project entails the incorporation of several different strands of a feminist movement which differs from the early feminism discussed by Kelly. The development of feminist social movements in the modern period suggests new dimensions to the feminist consciousness Joan Kelly sought to illuminate for us.

Linda Kealey
Memorial University
of Newfoundland

Helen Remick, ed., *Comparable Worth and Wage Discrimination* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press 1984).

IN VIEW OF the increasing pressure in both Canada and the United States to expand the public sector coverage of equal pay for work of comparable worth (equal value) and (perhaps more controversially) to extend the legislation into the private sector, this book of essays provides a very useful discussion of the issues involved in developing and implementing such a policy. Overall, the book provides a balanced view of the subject. While it is clearly the case that most of the authors are in favour of a comparable worth policy (and provide evidence supporting the need for such legislation), the editor does not approach the topic wearing rose-coloured glasses. Space is given to outlining various difficulties that are encountered in trying to implement such a policy and, where possible, attempts are made to suggest constructive solutions to the problems. Both

protagonists and antagonists of comparable worth legislation can learn something from this approach.

The book is divided into four major sections: an introduction; "Technical Issues in Job Evaluation;" "Four Approaches to Assessing Wage Discrimination;" "Legislation and Litigation;" and a final section presents the conclusions.

In the introduction, a paper by Steinberg explains the nature of the problem addressed by a comparable worth policy and discusses the efforts to achieve this policy in the context of equal pay and employment policy in the United States. England's paper, as well as that of Shepela and Viviano, presents an interesting review and assessment of the various socio-economic and psychological hypotheses which attempt to explain occupational segregation by sex. These two papers seem to emphasize two points. First, it is unlikely that there is some single, simple explanation for the occupational segregation of the labour force by sex; rather there are a number of causal factors involved. Until we have further empirical analysis, moreover, we are unlikely to determine, for certain, which of the various hypotheses is the most useful. Second, in view of the above, both papers conclude that attempts to get at the male-female wage differential solely through a policy of job integration by affirmative action (a policy that would probably be attractive to private sector employers because it would be less costly and less disruptive) is likely to be at best a very slow process and, at worst, may not succeed at all since we are not sure precisely what has generated the segregation. I think this view is correct and would add further that while a policy of job integration may benefit new entrants to the labour force, it may do little to help the women who are currently being discriminated against, and who may be unwilling or unable (for many reasons) to move into the traditional male occupations.

In the section on technical issues in job evaluation, the thrust of the three papers is to analyze critically the key tool used in implementing a comparable worth policy — the job evaluation scheme. Beatty and Beatty provide a useful overview of the various job evaluation methods that can be used and discuss some problems (limitations) associated with them. A number of technical problems are addressed, and I think one of the main conclusions of this paper can be interpreted as a warning: while advocates of comparable worth policy propose replacing the (discriminatory) market mechanism for determining wages and salaries with a job evaluation process, there is the danger that, unless extreme care is exercised, the job evaluation scheme itself may be sex-biased. Such bias can creep in, for example, if the selection of compensation factors reflect the characteristics of male jobs; if the weighting of the compensation factors reflect male norms; if the key or benchmark jobs used to determine internal wage structures are themselves sex-biased.

The concern regarding bias in the job evaluation plan is also raised in Treiman's paper, which focuses specifically on the problem of choosing weights. Using data from the April 1971 *Current Population Survey* (U.S.) to simulate a job evaluation scheme and its application, Treiman shows that when compensation factors are not highly correlated with one another, changing the weights assigned to them can change the ordering of jobs with respect to their relative worth (because it changes their points score) and can hence affect their relative pay. Unless there is a consensus on the choice of factors and factor weights, therefore, job evaluation schemes may be relatively advantageous to certain social groups, such as white males. Having recognized this, however, it should be noted that there is some empirical evidence which indicates that there is, in fact, considerable correlation between some compensation factors.

Hence the problem of appropriate weighting may not be of great concern.

The final paper in this section by Remick also provides food for thought. She points out that the application of detailed job evaluation analysis to women's jobs, particularly the so-called 'nurturant' occupations (nursing, for example) will force many people (both women and men) to confront their cultural perceptions of such jobs with actual job content, and thus hopefully bring about a re-examination of the relative worth of such occupations.

In the third section ("Four Approaches to Assessing Wage Discrimination"), three of the four papers outline methods by which the degree of discrimination can be assessed, and all four discuss methods of adjusting compensation. Remick's paper outlines the Washington State study in which regression analysis determined that the compensation in female-dominated jobs was only about 80 per cent of that in male-dominated jobs of comparable worth. Similar results were found by Pierson, Koziara, and Johanneson in a case study of a public sector union. Using regression analysis to determine the (male) weights for the various compensation factors, they then compared the wages that females actually received with those they would have received (for a given point score) had they been compensated in the same way as males. The results indicate that, on the average, males earned approximately 18 per cent more than females in comparable jobs. The Treiman, Hartman, and Roos paper uses a more aggregate approach to assess the wage differential, regressing average occupational wages on four job characteristics and two individual characteristics. By this method, they found that 26 percentage points (60 per cent of an overall 43 percentage point gap) of the differential was due to differences in the rate of return on the given characteristics of male- and female-dominated occupations.

In terms of correcting the observed

male-female wage differentials, several procedures are outlined in this section, although the three papers by Remick, Pierson, Koziara, and Johannesson, and Treiman, Hartman, and Roos seem to favour estimating a salary line for the male-dominated jobs and then raising the wages in female-dominated jobs to that line. The paper by Bergman and Gray argues in favour of a wage realignment where the newly realigned wage structure would be similar to that which would exist in the absence of sex discrimination. The authors envisage this realignment as a two- or three-stage adjustment process, the first stage being initiated by a job evaluation comparison of male and female jobs.

The final major section of the book provides a useful and informative discussion of comparable worth legislation and litigation in North America. In an interesting paper, Cadieux outlines articulately the Canadian legislation and summarizes a number of cases that have been dealt with in the federal jurisdiction. Her discussion makes it clear that an equal pay for work of equal value policy not only can work, it already has worked in this country. Mary Heen's paper discusses some post-Gunther legal issues that are not yet resolved in the United States (what evidence needs to be presented to prove a Title VII compensation discrimination claim) and provides some guidelines for assessing cases before a "comparability" lawsuit is filed under Title VII. Dean, Roberts, and Boone argue, moreover, that advocates of a comparable worth policy should not limit their activities to the confines of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Rather, they should also be looking at some of the state equal pay acts and fair employment practices legislation with regard to pursuing comparable worth. Alice Cooke's paper complements this approach by discussing developments in selected states. And last but not least in this section, the paper by Portman, Grune, and Johnson provides a useful

assessment of the role of labour in the push for pay equity between males and females in occupations of comparable worth.

In concluding, let me say that the book is comprehensive and touches on most of the issues pertinent to the comparable worth controversy. Moreover, the survey of the literature technique used in several of the papers is quite useful, particularly for those people who would like to do further reading in this area. From my viewpoint as an economist, however, the one aspect of the problem which does not seem to have been dealt with sufficiently (although it is discussed to some extent in the conclusions) is an analysis of the likely impacts in the labour market when wage adjustments of this sort are actually made. How will employers react, for example? Will they reduce their demand for females by attempting to substitute males and/or capital in the production process? Will total employment in female occupations decline? For readers interested in such potential problems, and for policy-makers interested in designing legislation that would attempt to minimize such adverse effects, some discussion of these problems would have made a useful addition to the book.

Roberta Edgcombe Robb
Brock University

Kathryn M. Borman, Daisy Quarm, and Sarah Gideonse, eds., *Women in the Workplace: Effects on Families* (Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation 1984).

THE SOCIAL significance of the dramatic increase after World War II in the employment of American women with children is the main concern of this book. Between 1940 and 1980, women's labour force participation increased from 27.4 to 51.1 per cent. By 1980, over 45 per cent of married women with children under six were employed. This study adds to the burgeon-

ing literature that is attempting to understand the implications of this phenomenon. Specifically, *Women in the Workplace* broaches the question of how the workplace, social services, and public policy should respond to such changes in employment patterns.

The outcome of a multidisciplinary conference held at the University of Cincinnati in 1981 which included scholars of psychology, sociology, history, anthropology, and public policy, this edited book is, at least at first glance, strikingly coherent. It is organized into nine chapters, plus an introduction, all of which are clearly presented, stating their purposes, providing summaries of their arguments, and examining their policy implications. The coherence of the book is further emphasized by the fact that several of the writers refer to each other's work. Despite the different objectives of the various articles, they all tend to share a basic underlying assumption that families cannot be understood in isolation from their social context. As the introduction notes:

Americans see work, in which individual family members spend much of their lives, as a world separate from the family and do not adequately recognize either the consequences of work for individual and family lives or the contribution of the family to the workplace. Government has largely refrained from concerning itself directly with the family's well-being until it has overtly failed in its responsibilities. (3)

In attempting to rectify this situation, the authors have examined in particular how public policy could be reformed to deal with problems concerning early childhood development, the provision of child care, the construction of gender, the mutual interrelations of work and the family, the contradictions in American women's lives, the costs of traditional sex roles, the conceptions of kinship, and the interplay of gender roles and the state. Only Bernard Farber's chapter on conceptions of kinship and the family reproduction cycle does not fit well into the overall concern with public policy, women's work, and the family.

The professionally presented coherence of this volume, however, is offset by the degree to which the articles vary in their quality and significance. Some of the chapters are unnecessarily tedious. They seem to be more concerned with providing an appearance of scientific objectivity than with dealing with the important matters at hand. Terms are often carefully defined, for example, but are not placed within a general theory which would allow a fuller understanding of the issues. The earlier chapters, which tend to draw on received psychological wisdom concerning the needs of young children, are especially disappointing. Though this book is devoted to stressing the significance of the social context, authors such as Sroufe and Ward are prone to generalize about "natural" needs and propensities. They refer, for instance, to playing and games as being the very activities that fathers naturally enjoy engaging in with their children. The authors do not suggest that these kinds of inclinations have anything to do with a specific social and cultural structure. The social context is further mystified by the way Sroufe and Ward fall back upon the notions of "choice" without indicating what its social basis might be. They imply that some people are able to exercise choice while others are not; they do not analyze how the social context produces these vast differences in choice. Their analyses only go so far as to suggest that "where there is choice, we would encourage parents to delay onset of day care for as long as possible and, especially, to make the transition of full-time substitute care gradual." (53) Another problem is that such injunctions are based on inconclusive experiments. Shaky findings do not discourage these authors, however, from prescribing public policy and parental behaviour. Between the sixth and twelfth months of a child's life is not, they warn, the "optimal" time to begin full-time out-of-home care. And if daycare is necessary it should be so designed that

children would receive "individualized" care. Exclusive relationships are the order of the day, but not an understanding of the social context within which relationships occur. At least Lamb's chapter provides a more subtle analysis which stresses the importance of "indirect" effects such as cultural values on maternal employment and its consequences.

It was not until I reached chapter 4 that I began to warm to this book. Borman and Frankel, adopting Rosabeth Moss Kanter's structuralist model, provide a refreshing analysis of linkages between the world of work and children's games. They argue that the full participation of females in complex games such as soccer and football and adult managerial work is constrained by parallel structures of gatekeeping, socialization, and interpretation of behaviour. Mortimer and Sorenson's review of literature on the mutual interrelations of work and the family is also useful. But their analysis does not take us very far. For instance, in attempting to explain the large differences between the incomes of women and men, they refer to occupational segregation. One is left asking: why does occupational segregation exist? In exploring the theme of contradictions in women's lives in the United States, Glazer's chapter does take us a good deal further. For Glazer, the "double day" of most women is riddled with contradictions. By participating in the work force, women's freedoms are not necessarily advanced. Their responsibilities for domestic work are still major and their power in the marital relationship still constrained. These problems, she argues, can only be solved if society is dedicated not only to profits but also to people. The relationship between families and the workplace must be understood within the specific historical phenomenon of monopoly capitalism and its ideology of separate spheres. In a following chapter, Quarm examines some of the negative consequences of such an ideology: poverty of women and children, the double

day, high female mental illness rates, and male violence against women. Grubb and Lazerson conclude the volume with an insightful examination of the ambiguous relationship of gender roles and the state. As they note, the politicization of gender roles during the past several decades has given women access to state power previously denied them by the ideology of women's roles as "private" and familial. But the resort of women to the state has had ambiguous consequences, in particular because of the contradictory effects of capitalism in shaping gender roles and the continued link of women to the "private" realm of childrearing. The same agencies of government have served the purposes of both feminists and anti-feminists alike.

As this book proceeds it tends to incorporate more fully the social context, examines issues more critically, takes women's lives more seriously, and in the end is quite satisfying.

Arlene Tigar McLaren
Simon Fraser University

Laurie Larwood, Ann H. Stromberg, Barbara A. Gutek, eds., *Women and Work. An Annual Review* Volume 1 (Beverly Hills: Sage Publications 1985).

WOMEN AND WORK is the first volume in a series intended to highlight the importance of women and work as a topic, to provide a multidisciplinary approach, and in so doing, to contribute to the development of this scholarly field. Its editors are open to a broad range of subjects and formats, but do not plan to publish single empirical studies (as opposed to case studies) or narrowly based reviews.

The series is off to a promising start. The eleven essays in this book are varied, stimulating, and useful. They range from the compact summary of "Women in the Labor Market: The Last Twenty Years" to a disheartening case study of "Women in Toxic Work Environments," with stops along the way for a three-article sym-

posium on current views of earnings differentials, as well as for articles such as "Work and Family Linkages" and "Sex Segregation in American Higher Education." With such diverse offerings, it is difficult to generalize about findings. The persistent tendency for women to earn less than men and to be stuck in low-wage female occupations are preoccupations for many of the contributors. A number of the authors, dissatisfied with the two dominant theoretical models as mutually exclusive explanations of the earnings gap between men and women, maintain that elements of both are valid. As Janice Fanning Madden puts it, "No statistical study has been able to explain the major part of the sex-wage differential by differences in productivity. No analytical model has demonstrated convincingly how sex discrimination in the labor market can persist." She concludes her sophisticated article, "The Persistence of Pay Differentials: The Economics of Sex Discrimination," by commenting that "the research literature truly contains something for every partisan, but no complete answers for the scholar." The models are inadequate, not only on the grounds of economic logic, but because the growing number of case studies, statistical refinements, and longitudinal studies prove the sex-wage differential to be an astonishingly complex series of phenomena.

This book is a good source for catching up on the most recent research and literature on a wide variety of questions pertaining to women and work. Each of the articles has interesting points to make, although inevitably some chapters are more convincing than others. While there are essays focusing both on demand and supply side factors, overall, those dealing with demand were intellectually denser and more satisfying. Madden's piece on sex discrimination is balanced by June O'Neill's supply side exploration of women's investments in human capital and choice of jobs. O'Neill reduces the wage gap not attributable to productivity

differences way down to 10 to 20 per cent and maintains that "in basically competitive markets, forces are at work to erode discrimination." She implies that part of women's proclivity for household work possibly is owing to innate traits, and having dismissed overt barriers restricting women's choices as relics of the past, does not look at the more subtle ways in which gender affects opportunity. Carolyn Dexter, in an article on women and the exercise of power in organizations, suggests that owing to their family-centred socialization, women bring with them into the labour force attitudes and interpersonal skills inappropriate for managerial positions in large organizations. Hence they fail to get promoted as readily as their male colleagues and need to resocialize themselves. Her depiction of women's characteristics and role in the family is so bluntly drawn and so stereotyped, however, that her effort to shift responsibility to women does not prove as convincing as her distinctions as to which kinds of supervisory positions are most likely to be open to them based on managers' conservative assessment of subordinates' or clients' willingness to tolerate females in charge.

On the other hand, in "Discriminating Between Attitudes and Discriminatory Behaviors: Change and Stasis," William Kahn and Faye Crosby provide a brief but penetrating look at the way in which specific characteristics of organizations reinforce discriminatory behaviour. This is often an unintentional outcome, the authors maintain, flowing from the way people are accustomed to seeing the demands of the job. Sharon Harlan offers a gem of a case study in "Federal Job Training Policy and Economically Disadvantaged Women," showing how programmes, which from the outside might be viewed as wonderful opportunities for women to increase their human capital so as to make them more productive, serve mainly to prepare participants for low-paying entry-level jobs. Sometimes this is

owing to conventional assumptions about appropriate work for women, but as often it occurs out of the complicated political and practical factors which constrain the development of an ambitious training programme. Hurlan's article, which focuses on women with no hope of going to college, is a needed counterpoint to the introductory overview by Blau and Ferber which offers a more convincingly optimistic view of women's progress in the labour force than any study I have seen recently. They manage this, however, by dealing mainly with university-educated women, by assuming that women are working in the areas for which they have trained, and by not referring to the likely restructuring of the entire labour market.

The articles by Madden and O'Neill constitute a dialogue of sorts, but many of the other authors appear to be talking past each other. Blau and Ferber offer recent evidence that women's and men's labour force and domestic responsibilities are finally moving towards some point of convergence, but O'Neill in her essay, and Veronica Nieva in "Work and Family Linkages," ignorant of this assertion, go on assuming that male partners spend scant time on housework. Although Dexter lays much of the blame for non-promotion at the door of would-be women managers' female socialization, Blau and Ferber suggest that "resistance to upward mobility of women is even greater than to their entry into nontraditional occupations." James Rosenbaum, in an in-depth study using one large corporation over time, casts doubt on whether job evaluation schemes will ever be objective enough to contribute to gains for women, while Alice Kessler-Harris, asking that we cease obliging women to mimic men's behaviour in the workplace, and that we return to the older idea that women's differences require accommodation, looks to job evaluation as a means of redress for women. She advocates these schemes to permit women to do their usual social roles while being rewarded for the skills,

initiative, and values they as individuals bring to the labour force. Kessler-Harris and Nieva, by the way, are the only two contributors to suggest that the workplace should adjust to suit the needs of family life, rather than vice versa.

Although they differ in their points of view and in the disciplines they study, the authors are similar in other ways. Of the thirteen contributors to the volume, only one was trained or works west of Illinois. All work in the northern United States, although one was educated in the upper South. Perhaps next year the editors can broaden the geographic base of their contributors while maintaining the very high standards this volume establishes.

Anita Clair Fellman
Simon Fraser University

Paul Willman and Graham Winch, *Innovation and Management Control: Labour Relations at BL Cars* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1985).

THE COLLAPSE OF the British motor vehicle industry in the 1970s has been the subject of a number of studies. Willman and Winch have contributed to this debate by examining the introduction of British Leyland's new Metro product line at Longbridge. The study focuses not on the collapse of the industry, but rather on its attempts to rejuvenate itself.

By the mid-1970s the future of British Leyland, the sole British-controlled volume car producer, looked bleak. After significant losses in the early 1970s, the Labour government was forced to inject large sums of cash into the company to prevent its collapse. In the process, the state became BL's major shareholder. The initial recovery strategy was based on the Ryder Report and called for an expansion of output and employment. This strategy proved difficult to implement and by 1977 management began slashing employment and output levels. There were general fears that the government might refuse fur-

ther funding, which would lead to the breakup of BL and the almost certain demise of Austin and Morris, the volume car divisions. The Metro project, the key to BL's revised recovery strategy, was widely viewed as the company's and the work force's last chance.

Willman and Winch challenge the thesis that BL's troubles were the result of poor product choices. They argue that labour relations played a critical role in the company's failure and therefore would play a critical role in any recovery, claiming that the key to understanding the Metro project is management's desire to reform shopfloor social relations and in particular the "restoring" of managerial control.

Precisely how management lost control of the shop floor is not outlined well. We are led to believe that the loss of managerial control in the 1960s was the product of shortsightedness in the inter-war period by the two key British vehicle-making moguls, Austin and Morris, who failed to provide a managerial structure consistent with large-scale production. Labour's ability to gain greater control of shopfloor activity is explained by the post-1945 spread of trade unionism and shop steward organization in the industry. The problem with this scenario is that it is unclear if British management ever had direct control of the shop floor in the vehicle industry or that British labour ever lost the authority it had grown accustomed to during the nineteenth-century era of craft production: it is misleading to talk about management regaining control it may never have had. It also raises the question of why the arrangement of power-sharing between management and shopfloor workers, which had worked well prior to the 1960s, failed.

The strength of the Willman and Winch volume is the detailed analysis of the decision-making process surrounding the Metro launch. BL management had decided by 1976 that their recovery strategy would be based on investment in a

capital-intensive automated production process designed to produce vehicles in volume. The decision to invest in capital and not labour, as the authors put it, reflected managerial concerns about labour practices in the late 1960s, and the National Enterprise Board's preference for subsidizing investments in capital rather than subsidizing wages. The authors also discuss the decision to adopt a well tested, but rather inflexible, automated production process. The reluctance of British management to adopt the newer, more sophisticated, flexible automation systems, which were still being tested in the mid-1970s, provides an interesting insight into the conservative nature of British managerial decision making. It also raises concerns for the company's survival should the Metro fail to sell as well as expected.

Most readers will find the description of labour participation in the Metro launch and the eventual reform of shopfloor labour relations of great interest. The authors stress that labour welcomed investment in new technology as a way of saving jobs. Initially, management formally approached labour regarding participation in the implementation process. But it is clear that management had already decided on the basic design of the new production process. At best, labour was being consulted in order to smooth the introduction. Management was not attempting to draw on labour's reservoir of production knowledge. By 1979, even this thin façade of consultation was removed. The appointment of Michael Edwardes as BL's new chairman, the election of a Conservative government, and the deteriorating position of the company's balance sheet invited a new hard line in labour relations.

The redistribution of shopfloor authority played a critical role in altering BL's labour productivity. In a major departure from post-war practices, effort norms were no longer set mutually by management and the shop stewards. Effort norms

were to be set "scientifically" by industrial engineers, insulated from the pressures of shopfloor bargaining. The stewards were stripped of much of their authority. The role of the unions in negotiating for labour was also challenged as BL management appealed directly to labour through postal ballots and moved unilaterally to reform shopfloor practices. Whatever the roots of British labour's authority on the shop floor, the Edwardes' reforms insured it would not survive into the 1980s.

In their conclusions, the authors return to the question of what motivated this change in technology and social relations. They argue that there was a link between the decision to market the Metro as a volume car and the decision to reform industrial relations. They argue that management assumed that only with tight managerial control could a high quality product be made in volume. Why this is the case is not at all clear. This is particularly true in the British context, where prior to 1960 British workers had a tradition of producing quality vehicles with limited managerial supervision. Of more interest is the authors' argument that reform of the shopfloor authority structure was made necessary by management's desire to gain greater control of the effort bargain. According to Willman and Winch, it was these reforms that made the dramatic increase in labour productivity associated with the Metro possible.

This book will be of interest to those considering labour's participation in the restructuring of industries facing closure. The book also provides a window on current reforms of shopfloor practices throughout the industrial world. At Longbridge, there was no need to disguise managerial intentions in the late 1970s. Labour was offered one choice: accept a new managerially imposed effort bargain or accept the closure of the plant. The analysis leads one to ask whether management's current interest in "Quality of Working Life" programmes and in

Japanese-style labour participation have objectives all that different from those found at BL.

Wayne Lewchuk
McMaster University

Tom Juravich, *Chaos on the Shop Floor: A Worker's View of Quality, Productivity and Management* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press).

THE PRODUCTIVITY AND quality problems afflicting industry in the United States have been widely discussed in recent years. From Tom Juravich's vantage point as a participant observer on the shop floor of a small New England wire mill, these problems are the result of the style and actions of management.

Sociological studies of industrial work in the United States have tended to focus on sprawling unionized workplaces owned by large corporations. Yet, as Juravich notes, a significant, and in his view, growing, proportion of manufacturing workers are employed in small shops. In the fall of 1980, Juravich went to work as a machine mechanic in one such shop located in a small New England city. The company he worked for employed about 150 workers in its mill. Like many such companies on the "periphery" of manufacturing, "National Wire and Cable" was locally owned and not unionized: it paid wages much lower than those paid for similar work by unionized firms in the area.

As Juravich sees it, the belief that most industrial workers are employed in large plants is one of four characteristics of the "contemporary image of the industrial workplace." Another is the assumption that contemporary industrial work requires little skill. To challenge this view, Juravich introduces the concept of "craft knowledge," which is very similar to the idea of "working knowledge" developed by Ken Kusterer, who is cited with approval by Juravich.

The production of a "three-wire

assembly," one of the company's main products, involved a series of "simple," "repetitive" tasks performed by nominally unskilled women. However, as a result of poor quality materials, and outdated and poorly maintained machinery, production was far from automatic and required the assemblers to make frequent decisions. In making decisions, they drew on the craft knowledge which they had accumulated from their experience working with the machinery, tools, and materials they encountered on the job. Juravich himself, who repaired and set up machines, also found that he developed craft knowledge so that he eventually knew more about the machinery he worked on than management did. The nature of his knowledge of the idiosyncracies and problems of the machines was sufficiently intuitive that it could not easily be reduced to written rules and procedures.

A third characteristic challenged by Juravich is the belief that the workplace is the site of rational and planned control of workers. Far from being rationally organized, the mill was an anarchic environment. Chaos and confusion resulted from the frequent interruptions in production caused by machine breakdowns and poor materials, and from frequent changes in the production procedures, high turnover, and the shifting around of workers.

Juravich sees two sources for the disorganization which was symptomatic of the quality and productivity problems he seeks to explain. In part, it is a function of the mill's small size and the fact that it subcontracted much of its work from larger corporations. It was difficult to formalize and routinize operations when much of the company's output was produced by a few workers in short production runs lasting a few days. Competition and fluctuating demand for the company's products resulted in limited profits and cash reserves making it difficult for management to do more than plan for the short term.

The primary source of chaos, according to Juravich, was an autocratic management style. Management, concerned with exerting control, did not allow workers to participate in decisions involving changes in the production process. Yet, in order to solve its quality and productivity problems, and to reduce the chaos and confusion on the shop floor, management would have to draw on the craft knowledge of workers by letting them participate actively in decision-making. Management encountered many problems when it attempted to implement productivity and quality improvements that could have been avoided had the workers most directly affected by the changes been consulted.

The fourth and final conventional assumption that Juravich calls into question is the belief that workers dislike their jobs. Juravich found that, in order to survive on the shop floor, workers attempted to create meaning by performing their jobs as well as they could. They derived "pride and dignity" from using their craft knowledge to produce quality products on schedule. Yet their efforts to make their work meaningful and something to be proud of were constantly made difficult by the chaos created by management.

By studying a small, non-union mill, Juravich has made an important contribution towards filling a gap in our knowledge of industrial work in the United States. By focusing on management, he has pointed to a factor that has not received sufficient attention in discussions of quality and productivity. One weakness of the book is Juravich's tendency to argue that what he found in a small non-union mill can be found throughout industry in the United States. It is true that quality and productivity problems can be found in large plants as well as small. Juravich also correctly notes that as a result of "disinvestment," antiquated and poorly maintained machinery can be found in many industries. The suggestion, however, that there is a common "Ameri-

can management style" cannot be accepted on the basis of the limited evidence presented by Juravich.

On the basis of Juravich's own evidence, one important difference between small non-union shops and larger unionized shops can be suggested. In his shop, productivity and quality problems stemmed in part from high turnover and the lack of training: few workers stayed on the job long enough to develop the kind of craft knowledge that was so essential to the whole process of production. In larger unionized shops, higher wages, benefits, seniority systems, and other improvements negotiated by unions tend to result in lower turnover so that overall, workers are better trained and gain more craft knowledge. There is also a greater likelihood that large firms, both union and non-union, will have quality circles and quality of work life programmes that are designed, often explicitly, to tap workers' craft knowledge. Juravich tends to discount these programmes, but they may, in at least some cases, result in a different management style and/or some success in dealing with quality and productivity problems. While there may be problems common to all firms, large and small, union and non-union, there are important differences that Juravich does not discuss when he offers generalizations about quality, productivity, and management in the United States.

Robert Wrenn

University of California, Berkeley

Christopher Eaton Gunn, *Workers' Self-Management in the United States* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press 1984).

THE BELIEF THAT workers should own, control, and organize the work they do is a logical reaction to industrial capitalism. Gunn has managed, on the whole very successfully, to combine history, theory, and empirical evidence with practical hands-on facts and recommendations

resulting in the first comprehensive study of self-management in the United States.

Gunn begins by analyzing the defining and facilitating conditions for workers' self-management of firms in the context of a capitalist economy drawing on historical evidence and on the theoretical and empirical work of Jaroslav Vanek, Paul Bernstein, and Branko Horvat. The results are summarized in a table of ten defining and facilitating conditions for workers' self-management in the United States. The conditions form the heart of the book.

It is the first condition that establishes the parameters of the following nine; they deal with the economic and financial characteristics of self-managed firms, their management structures, and the need for internal and external support in a generally hostile environment. Condition one stipulates that "control and management of the enterprise is the right of all people who work in it, and this right is based on their work role, not on any requirement of capital ownership. Management is based on direct or both direct and representative democracy and equality of voting power among all who work in the enterprise." (35)

The following case studies of the Forest Workers' Cooperatives established in Oregon, Montana, Washington, Idaho, and California in the 1960s and 1970s, the Plywood Manufacturing Cooperatives of the Pacific northwest established between 1921 and the early 1950s, and two recent worker takeovers of established firms, are evaluated in their performance against the ten conditions. The analysis so far is largely firm-specific, detailed, and comprehensive.

Of particular interest, and frequently missing in the literature on self-management, is an analysis of the role of union locals in company takeovers. This shortcoming is addressed through studies of the Rath Packing Company and the Denver Yellow Cab Cooperative Association (DYCCA), where takeovers were initiated and carried out through union

action. The Independent Drivers Association, (IDA), the dominant union within the DYCCA, has seen its role change considerably. While the day-to-day working routine has not changed dramatically, the overt hostility that characterized bargaining has given way to a more cooperative approach. Grievances are now resolved by a drivers' committee within the co-op structure. The fact that management now works for labour has apparently led to a considerable reduction in hostility that existed in the days prior to the establishment of the DYCCA.

The creative involvement of union locals in the takeover of established firms represents an unusual picture. Unions in capitalist society, especially in times of economic stagnation, have traditionally been forced into defensive postures. With union density decreasing and concession bargaining gaining ground, unions in the United States have lost much of their offensive militancy. Nevertheless, a small but increasing number of unions have taken the offensive against plant closures and the pressure of employers for concessions.

The case of the International Association of Machinists (IAM) District 100 against Eastern Airlines is perhaps the best documented recent example of what a determined and well organized union can achieve. Similar instances have taken place in Canada with the worker occupation of the Bendix plant in Windsor, the Houdaille Bumper Plant in Oshawa, and the Windsor Bumper Company. All three occupations were the direct result of decisions taken by the UAW Canada in response to the increasing number of plant closures and the loss of thousands of jobs. It is precisely this kind of union initiative that may lead to takeovers of existing firms.

The last major section of the book locates worker self-management in the broader context of political and economic options and limitations for the expansion of self-management in the United States.

Gunn recognizes that short of fundamental political and economic changes, the most likely road to worker self-management is through buying control of a given enterprise. Workers at the Rath Packing Company were able to do that through payroll deductions into an escrow account. Quite apart from the formidable obstacles involved in the buy-out model to worker self-management, the author realizes that most employee ownership schemes in the United States have been constructed on premises of "blue-collar capitalism," which raises the important issue of the development and growth of a new consciousness.

Self-managed firms operating in a market economy will have little control over external factors affecting the firm. Thus, the development of a network of supportive organizations and the establishment of linkages or coalitions with other oppositional organizations committed to change is essential. The rise of new social movements, especially those of women, blacks, and environmentalists is an established fact today and the call for linkages, or as Aronowitz calls it, a new political bloc, is based on concrete, if limited experience.

A comparison of contemporary Employee Stock Ownership Plans (ESOPs), Quality of Working Life innovations (QWL), and various management-initiated participatory schemes with the ten defining conditions of workers' self-management, leads the author to reject these schemes as falling outside the scope of workers' self-management. Looking at the Canadian scene, he would exclude the takeover of what is now Tembec Forest Products Ltd. as well as the QWL initiative at the Shell chemical plant in Sarnia. Workers' control must be accompanied by total ownership. Gunn goes on to argue that perhaps the most critical determinant of whether change at the level of the firm could lead to broader oppositional change in society lies in overcoming traditional

employer-employee relations and the system of wage labour.

Most American workers' co-ops have been alternative rather than oppositional organizations. This distinction, made by the author, is crucial. Alternative organizations offer their members a different way of living and working but they do not confront the power of capital with a view to radical social change. Only oppositional organizations do that. The Forest Workers' Cooperatives have at times demonstrated oppositional character.

Even the most successful ESOPs that lead to total worker or union ownership would have to be defined as alternative rather than oppositional organizations. It would have been helpful if the author had discussed more fully the rapid expansion of ESOPs, QWL, and similar plans including the response by major unions to these initiatives since they indicate an important new factor on the labour relations scene. ESOPs have increased from 843 plans covering 520,000 workers in 1976 to 5,700 covering 9.6 million workers in 1984.

One major union, the International Association of Machinists (IAM) headed by William Winpisinger has developed its *Rebuilding America Act* with a strong focus on controlling the right of private capital in mergers, plant closures, and capital mobility. Part of the act calls for the creation of a development bank that would facilitate workers' control over their pension fund investments. A U.S. government study, released in 1981, reported a total market value of assets in employee pension funds in the private sector of \$326 billion, to which should be added \$100 billion held by public sector pension plans. While worker/union control over these vast funds is more or less non-existent, major unions in the United States, in addition to the IAM, are beginning to formulate policies to gain control over these funds.

The obstacles and limitations to workers' self-management in the United States are awesome. The author realizes that

should self-management gain a toehold in any sector of the economy, it would be seen as subversive and would be confronted by the full power of the private sector. All too often change efforts lead to social democratic reforms, defined by the author as a highly mediated form of capitalism. Social democratic movements tend to work through existing institutions of capitalist society rather than by confronting them.

Given the current situation within the United States, which does not even approach the level of social democracy as it is practised in many west European countries, Gunn still hopes that a viable progressive coalition of forces that expect to see their aim realized best through genuine non-capitalist alternatives is a realistic option for action. It is almost, but not quite, as if the author would support the words uttered by Branko Horvat many years ago when he argued that just as the market eventually corroded the feudal structures from within, the growth of participation from its most primitive form of joint consultation towards full-fledged self-management cannot be anti-socialist in spite of the attempts to misuse it for the preservation of the status quo.

Gerry Hunnius
York University

William DeFazio, *Longshoremen: Community and Resistance on the Brooklyn Waterfront* (South Hadley, MA: Begin and Garvey 1985).

WILLIAM DEFAZIO calls his book a "theoretical ethnography," suggesting that the theoretical concepts emerged from its qualitative interviews, but to this reviewer the theory and the ethnography remained separate. The ethnography records the daily lives and attitudes of 35 Brooklyn longshore workers who have been supported by a Guaranteed Annual Income (GAI) won by the International Longshoreman's Association as a

response to the containerization of port facilities during the 1960s. These workers are required to present themselves for work every morning at a hiring hall where they stay for perhaps an hour. Mostly they seek to avoid the rare and unlikely call to work and in fact have worked only a few days in recent years. After the early morning check-in they are free for the day.

Contrary to many predictions and established verities, DeFazio's work suggests that receiving income without working has done these people no harm. They seem to feel that they have earned this income by virtue of the decades of painful labour that preceded the union settlement. They have a strong sense of solidarity among themselves, with other workers, with the union, and, in some ways, with the community. Their awareness of politics has expanded with their leisure. They spend considerable time discussing issues with one another as well as pursuing individual forms of leisure (for example, gambling) and are generally not bored. The important factors that distinguish their experience from the demoralization that affects other forms of "welfare" seem to be that the amount of income is adequate; there is a feeling of entitlement; and they are part of a group network that supports their feeling of entitlement.

The case of the GAI raises for DeFazio, and his editor, Stanley Aronowitz, in a lengthy introduction, issues concerning the significance of automation, post-industrialism, and the severing of production and consumption, issues that have been relatively muted on the American left during the economic recession of the 1970s and early 1980s. As Aronowitz notes, the last clear challenge to the idea that social life and rewards must be organized around work was made by the authors of the Triple Revolution statement of 1963. Both DeFazio and Aronowitz discuss the relevance of the GAI example to a range of theories concerned with the nature of advanced

capitalism such as those of Daniel Bell, J.F. Lyotard, Jean Baudrillard, Nicos Poulantzas, and Jurgen Habermas. Aronowitz calls special attention to the value of Hannah Arendt's distinction between work and labour (that is, creative vs. necessary exertion) to any discussion of the significance of automation. Although these theoretical discussions were too sparse to be of great value, and were sometimes overstated (as in DeFazio's characterization of the longshore workers as "practical Marxists"), this book is important for putting once more on the agenda an issue that in the long run will be decisive for the future of capitalism as a social system.

Eli Zaretsky
Wright Institute

Ellen Meiksins Wood, *The Retreat From Class: A New "True" Socialism* (London: Verso 1986).

IN THE 1840s Marx and Engels railed against the "true" socialists, an idealist contingent of would-be transformers of the world who held that the development of socialism was rooted, not in the needs of a particular class, but in the "interests of Human Nature, of Man in general, who belongs to no class." For these "true" socialists, ideology was everything and, according to Marx and Engels, they believed "that all *real* cleavages are caused by *conceptual* cleavages." Ellen Meiksins Wood adroitly introduces her polemical dissection of recent attempts to displace the working class from the core of the revolutionary socialist project with reference to these "true" socialists of the 1840s. For anyone at all familiar with the current outpouring of studies of language, of the new social movements, and of the much-proclaimed end of class politics — all of which shove class struggle into some arcane and obscure laneway and declare that socialism will be made via some other

more well-travelled route — this “true” socialism of the 1840s is strikingly familiar.

Wood reminds us that the proliferation of radical chic in the 1980s, whether openly proclaiming its anti-Marxism (Laclau and Mouffe) or purporting to be decked out in fashionable *marxiste* garb (Hindess and Hirst, Gavin Kitching, the Gareth Stedman Jones of recent publication), has seen earlier days and is not so much the political breakthrough of its promise as it is an unconscious return to the worst forms of utopian voluntarism, a descent into the counsel of despair that intellectuals offer all too readily when *there appears no quick fix for the socialist habit*. Many oxen get gored, neatly and efficiently, in this book: Poulantzas, with his stress on the primacy of the political over the economic, his elevation of ideology over exploitation, and his willingness to see “democracy” as some kind of panacea bridging the capitalist and socialist camps, is depicted correctly as the anticipation of the themes of the new “true” socialists: those such as Gorz, Laclau, and Mouffe, who have bidden farewell to the working class most decisively, are analyzed as the architects of nothing more than a dressed-up pluralism and possibly something worse, an inhibiting pessimism; the recent writing of Gareth Stedman Jones, in which the politics of Chartism and the Labour Party are seen to be expressions of the non-correspondence of class, social conditions, and political mobilization, is scrutinized and illuminatingly revealed as little more than the theoretical and historical rationalization of “electoral principles,” a distortion of the history of the working class that leads shamelessly towards social democratic ends; America’s radical duo, Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis, are exposed briefly as little more than champions of the potential of liberal democracy.

Others, too, are hoisted on their own petard, as Wood is extremely capable at

stripping away the façade of socialist intent to expose the flawed reasoning and class trajectory of the new “true” socialists. Particularly refreshing is her uncompromising characterization of Michael Ignatieff, whose commentary on the British miners’ strike stabbed the workers’ movement in the back with its attack on militancy and an idealist call for a “language of trust built upon a practice of social comradeship.” Perhaps Ignatieff, whom Woods regards disdainfully as “the darling of the British literary press, their favourite repentant socialist and resident progressive,” wanted the miners to take some time off from the beatings they sustained to brush up on their *etiquette* the better to cultivate civilized discourse with the police and Thatcher’s advocates in the metropolitan boutiques or academic tea-rooms.

If all this sounds a bit negative it is because the literature and ideas Wood is hammering away at are so politically muddled, objectionable, and ultimately antithetical to working-class interests and socialism. For those who want something a little more upbeat, Wood does provide a brief explanation of why Marxists have historically insisted on the centrality of the working class in the socialist transformation. Moreover, using the writing of Raymond Williams, she develops against the new “true” socialists the orthodox Marxist view that the only way in which a socialism that does indeed address “universal human goods” can be created is through the active agency and struggle of the working class.

Wood is thus to be congratulated for taking on the ideas and personalities associated with what she labels a new “true” socialism. As far as she takes her critique, she takes it well. But there are two gnawing questions that should stick in the mind of even her most ardent supporters.

The first relates to just how and why this new “true” socialism arrived on the scene. Throughout Wood’s text Perry Anderson appears as a principled critic of

the idealism of western Marxism and the "randomization of history and politics" associated with the Althusserians and post-Althusserian new "true" socialists. No doubt Anderson's contributions in *Considerations on Western Marxism* and *In The Tracks of Historical Materialism* are significant. But it is surely obvious that while Anderson's selected *writing* contains much of merit, his self-professed and easily identifiable political *practice* contains other, and, from Wood's perspective, less admirable impulses. For it is Anderson's own *New Left Review*/*New Left Books* that has introduced many of the new "true" socialists and their Poulantzian/Althusserian antecedents to English-speaking audiences. It was in the Anderson-Nairn takeover of the *New Left Review* in the early 1960s that the stated political project of introducing the discourse of continental, especially Parisian, Marxism, to the much-maligned empiricism of the English socialist and workers' movement, was first articulated. And for the next twenty years the eclecticism of Anderson and others at the helm of the review and *New Left Books* has nurtured, among many tendencies and writers, the theories and theorists of the new "true" socialism. This is not to say that Wood should have spent a great deal of time castigating her own publisher, but it is to suggest that it is a bit much to take at face value Anderson's rather self-serving remarks in his *In The Tracks of Historical Materialism* without so much as raising an eyebrow about Anderson's own involvement in the rise of the new "true" socialism.

The second question that will eat away at many readers of *The Retreat from Class* is Wood's skirting of the problem of class organization. She ends her text with the entirely appropriate conclusion that the victories and defeats won and suffered by the working class show us "what might be accomplished if the labour movement had a political instrument ready to do its job," but throughout her book there is precious

little comment on just what that political instrument might look like or be about. Indeed, if the new "true" socialists err in writing off the working class because it has not made a revolution, Wood tilts her arguments towards a subdued attachment to mass spontaneism. Against thoroughly élitist dismissals of the power and capabilities of the working class, Wood draws a little too bluntly a dichotomization of leaders and led: "In the case of the Russian Revolution, for example, should we say that it was the Bolshevik leadership who conducted the class struggle; or was it rather the workers and peasants who constituted the revolutionary force, the force whose interests, social power, and capacity for collective action determined the nature and course of the revolution." A page later she quotes favourably a *Sunday Times* critic of the mainstream historian of the Russian Revolution, Leonard Shapiro: "What brought the Bolsheviks to power was their success in articulating the demands welling up from below." (73-4) In her quickness to pillory the new "true" socialists for their insistence that socialism will only come with the intervention of enlightened intellectuals, Wood thus backs away from dealing with the role and place of a disciplined vanguard in the making of a conscious proletarian element capable of leading the working class to socialist victory. Surely the experience of the Russian Revolution does not suggest that the Bolsheviks merely articulated the demands of the masses, though they did, or that the historically-developed party and the class power of workers and their allies in the dispossessed peasantry were somehow separable in terms of what explains how the working class first took power. Rather, the 1917 revolution was a decisive demonstration of both working-class power and the necessity of a proletarian party, armed with a programme and willing to act on it, in the struggle to create socialism.

Wood is too unconcerned with these realities, a little too ready to descend into

abstractions. She claims, for instance, that, "the taking of power is no doubt a necessary step in the transformation of society, but it is an instrument, not itself the object, of class struggle." (193) The abolition of class itself, according to Wood, is what socialism is really all about. And to be sure, she is right. But until socialists address how power is to be won so that classes can be abolished, even those, such as Wood, who know well the bankruptcy and banality of the retreat from class evident in so much of the pseudo-socialist writing of the 1980s, will share a little ground with the new "true" socialists that they distance themselves from. For do they not all want the illusive movement — the one of class, the other of the multitudinous sectors — that will somehow bring socialism into being?

Bryan D. Palmer
Queen's University

R.E. Pahl, *Divisions of Labour* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell 1984).

REFLECTING OUR economic approach to contemporary society, there has been a tendency, particularly but not exclusively by economists, to treat work primarily as what people do for pay, in the formal labour market. A major challenge to this narrow approach came with the upsurge of women's studies, since unpaid work in the home — "women's work" — had tended to be ignored. This resulted in a downgrading of the importance of women in the economy, particularly in the reproduction of the labour force, and consequently a downgrading of women themselves. In addition to women's contribution to the family, however, men also contribute to family self-provisioning, performing such tasks as home and car maintenance and repair, gardening and hunting, of which no record is found in official statistics.

A second major challenge to the narrow economic conception of work came

with the discovery of the "underground," "black," or informal economy, an economy of considerable size unreported in our measures of economic welfare. But perhaps the most fundamental criticism of our traditional treatment of labour and work, at least in the orthodox neo-classical approach, is that labour is seen as an individual, autonomous unit responding to an economic calculus rather than as one member of a family unit devising collective work strategies to "get by" in a changing economic and social environment.

In *Divisions of Labour*, R.E. Pahl sets out to correct this parcelized approach by studying the content, type, divisions, life-cycles, class attitudes, and market orientation of work in Britain, both through a study of the history of family work strategies, and through a case study of one contemporary local region in southeast England, the island of Sheppey. Summing up his goal, he says:

Work has to be understood both historically and in context: it has changed in the past, it is changing now, and it will continue to change in the future; above all, work done by members of households is the central process around which society is structured. (14)

In the historical half of the study, Pahl advances a number of arguments intended to counter what he considers to be popular contemporary myths, most specifically the conception of the "right to work." He means by the right to work the belief that the average (male) worker is entitled to regular, full-time, waged work, a phenomenon that he argues has occurred only once in Britain for any sustained period, during the 1950s and 1960s. Using historical material he attempts to show that this has not been the pattern in the past and, previewing the second half of the study, is not the pattern of today or of the future.

In its stead Pahl argues, the historical pattern has been one of constant adaptation with all members of the family moving between self-provisioning, wage

labour, and by-employment (secondary occupations or crafts) as opportunities occurred and as the needs of the family unit dictated. The Industrial Revolution, and the Marxist analysis of its effects, led to an overemphasis on the market subjugation of male wage labour (women were always a small fraction of the industrial wage labour force) to the neglect of women's irregular, by- and provisioning employments.

Women were not, he argues, economically idle. Nor for the most part were they confined to the home and home work. This did not occur until the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the product of an upper middle-class reform ideology made possible by the rising real incomes of male wage-earners in this class. Yet this development was frequently impoverishing to the working class. The peak of female domesticity occurred in the inter-war years:

The development of new, cheap forms of transport, coupled with the growth of new estates of council or privately built estates at the edge of the major towns and cities, intensified the physical separation of homes (for women) and work (for men): women worked at home in housing estates and suburbs; men were employed elsewhere. . . .

For these new "good" mothers, life in their new, clean homes was not a life of leisure, but nor was it a life of misery and toil. Housework expanded to fill the time available and . . . new technology created more work, not less. (74-5)

However, this was but a brief interlude. Women began to re-enter the labour market in a major way in the second half of the twentieth century, particularly with the expansion of service and clerical employment. Work was, as it had been before, often impermanent and part-time. But now there was a major difference. Women were continuing in full-time waged work after marriage. Moreover, Pahl argues, this is increasingly necessary for the family strategy because of the deindustrialization of Britain and the decline in regular male waged jobs since the 1970s.

How do working-class families cope with the erosion of male employment in contemporary Britain? This is the subject of the field research reported on in the second half of the book. The simple answer is a return to the shifting strategies of earlier eras, primarily the employment of wives and other members of the family unit. But Pahl also found some rather unexpected results. The poor and unemployed do not appear to respond to the current situation by increasing their self-provisioning or by entering the underground economy. Indeed, Pahl suggests that rather than expanding in response to the decline in employment, the underground or informal economy is contracting. This leads to the rather depressing conclusion that access to money brings productivity and activity, including self-provisioning work, while lack of money destroys productivity, activity, and initiative.

The major result is that, in contemporary Britain, the distribution of work "is becoming increasingly unbalanced" creating a polarization of families between the haves and have-nots. "The new line of class cleavage is now between the middle mass and the underclass beneath it." (313, 324)

There is a great deal to admire in *Divisions of Labour*, not least of which is the attempt to integrate patterns of work, household strategies, economic change, class, and ideology into a holistic theory. It is perhaps this scope that contributes to some confusion and a lack of clarity in the argument, that produces some contradictions, unexplored byways, and weak generalizations. The choice of Sheppey for detailed study can be criticized because its advantage as a research site (isolated, geographically contained, and with a homogeneous but unique industrial history based on a naval dockyard) make it atypical for purposes of generalization. One can also criticize the rather rambling, anecdotal description of the study area. But these are annoying weaknesses rather

than fatal flaws and should not deter students of work and labour from a careful consideration of this ambitious, and at times controversial, book.

Paul Phillips
University of Manitoba

William B. Gould IV, *Strikes, Dispute Procedures, and Arbitration: Essays on Labor Law* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press 1985).

DESPITE BUFFETING BY neo-conservatives, liberal institutionalism remains the hegemonic vision in American labour relations law. With their roots in the Commons school and its legislative heritage, and the Norris-LaGuardia and Wagner Acts, writers in this tradition have fashioned a sophisticated account of the compulsory collective bargaining regime as an effective reconciliation of property rights and worker interests. As Karl Klare has put it, these writers have "understood the need for theory to go beyond the horizon of the intrasystemic 'interests' of the parties. While liberal collective bargaining law justifies itself by reference to a conception of 'industrial democracy' that ultimately rests on management decision making and command in the workplace, the hallmark of liberal labor law is its active promotion of workers' rights in certain well-defined and circumscribed contexts. The complexity and nuances of liberal collective bargaining doctrine have made it a remarkable contribution to post-World War II American political thought."

In *Strikes, Dispute Procedures, and Arbitration: Essays on Labor Law*, William B. Gould IV has gathered some twenty years of his writing. The collection includes scholarly articles, bibliographical notes, and popular commentaries. Despite the sometimes incongruous appearance of discontinuity that is the effect of facsimile publication, the under-

lying logic of the pieces collected here is seamless.

As the author puts it, he begins "with the assumption that the right of free men and women to withhold their labor and to engage in various forms of economic pressure is one of the most fundamental rights that can exist in a democratic society," and proceeds to work through the implications of his view that "in modern industrialized economies that are interdependent, . . . other interests as well as the right to strike are at stake." The result exemplifies the strengths and limitations of the liberal institutional approach.

Gould is well placed within the liberal institutional paradigm. He was assistant general counsel for the UAW in 1961-2 and attorney for the National Labor Relations Board in 1963-5. He has taught law at Wayne State, Harvard and (currently) Stanford, and is chairman of the law and legislation committee of the National Academy of Arbitrators. Gould knows very well where the lesions are to be found in the regime he and his colleagues have fashioned. His topics are an itinerary of the trouble spots: public employee bargaining; wildcat strikes; labour injunctions; and rank-and-file dissent.

The injunction question will serve as an example. The Norris-LaGuardia Act of 1932, which banned the use of federal court injunctions to frustrate peaceful strikes, signaled the end of some 30 years of judicial terror against the American labour movement and the ascendancy of the liberal institutional alternative. But in 1970, in its celebrated *Boys Market* decision, the Supreme Court held that the courts may enjoin wildcat strikes that occur in violation of a collective agreement provision prohibiting strikes during the term of the agreement.

Gould recognizes that *Boys Market* poses a dilemma for liberal institutional theory that cannot easily be resolved. Renewed judicial intervention in strike situations is viewed as dangerous because of the common law's hostility to collec-

tive action. At the same time, the courts intervened in *Boys Market* to give binding effect to the provisions of a collective agreement and, incidentally, to bolster the authority of arbitrators. Gould supplies an extensive and thoughtful analysis of the decision in its legal context. He is at his best here, showing how the decision might be narrowed, its ill effects minimized, the tables turned. At the end of the day, however, the issue proved to be intractable in principle, if not in practice. And here the limits of liberal institutionalism are approached, where finely honed analytic discourse must give way to blather:

Most significant is the improved position in which labor unions now find themselves in the United States. The relationship between organized labor and capital can no longer be generalized into one involving unequal parties in an atmosphere of bitter social strife. Indeed in some instances, it is the unions which now hold the cards of power. The labor movement cannot evade the responsibility of contractual sanctions when it has voluntarily entered into the collective agreement for the benefit of its members.

Gould is committed to the right to strike in theory and the alternative of arbitration in practice. He has a great deal to say about the relationships between arbitrators and courts, about the implications of binding arbitration on relations between unions and their members, and above all about the trade-off between liberty and community that justifies the substitution of arbitration for the strike in various circumstances. He has next to nothing to say, in this book at any rate, about the substantive issues that arise in either rights or interest arbitration or about a theory of arbitral decision making that might sustain his optimism. The closest we come to these issues is in a discussion of interest arbitration for public employees, where labour market comparability is advanced as a criterion. The problem is not so much the age of the chestnut (the article was published in 1969) as the absence of any attempt to

address the shrinking usefulness of "freely bargained" comparisons in a model that contemplates next-to-universal arbitration.

Canadian law is sufficiently different from American that most of Gould's detailed analyses do not travel well. For example, the legal problem of differentiating wildcats in violation of negotiated no-strike provisions from wildcats in response to employer unfair labour practices simply does not arise here, where strikes during the term of agreements are prohibited by statute. The specifics aside, though, liberal institutionalism has its distinguished Canadian practitioners, Paul Weiler being among the most notable, and the distinctive Canadian paradigm bears many resemblances to its American cousin. Both have much to recommend them in their decency, their concern with fairness, their disdain for arbitrary power, and their commitment to expanding the legitimacy of workers' collective action. Neither, it seems to me, can be expected to burst the bounds of pragmatism, where the normative becomes the transformative, and where the law casts off its chains.

Paul Craven
York University

Eric Schragge. *Pensions Policy in Britain: A Socialist Analysis* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul 1984).

DURING LAST YEAR'S turmoil at Dalhousie University concerning the administration's attempt to appropriate \$8 million from the university's pension funds, I was stopped on the street by neighbours and persons I knew only slightly who urged professors to "do anything you have to, protect your pensions" — leaving me with the impression that we were involved in that most rare event, a strike with a lot of community support. Similarly, the announcement that the first Tory budget would slow down the index-

ing of Canadian state pensions mobilized the senior population into protest and political activity and the government rushed to retreat from its position. In short, pensions are the most politically popular single item on the welfare state agenda. Even medical care benefits can be whittled away with fewer political consequences. The most conservative of governments and parties feel they must at least rhetorically disavow any tampering with the pension system. Why then have pensions never met the hopes that the electorate holds for them, hopes for a secure, poverty-free old age for virtually everyone.

Governments are constrained to offer modest proposals regarding pensions by the necessity to demonstrate effectiveness in fostering conditions conducive to a healthy balance of payments, high productivity, and robust capital accumulation. Otherwise, governments face a strike by investment capital, or a capital drought and an onslaught of press denunciation. In fact, as Eric Schragge shows, governments of several stripes are re-active rather than pro-active in the welfare realm.

How, then, have advances in pensions ever occurred in late capitalist societies? Schragge's book gives us many good answers to this question.

In the first place, advances have occurred only incrementally, from an inadequate initial base. In comparison with pre-war state charitable activities and the contributory but non-universal national insurance, the Beveridge/Keynes scheme seemed a great advance. The nature of the advance has meant that over a period of 40 years state non-means-tested pensions have worked their way up from less than one-fifth to less than one-third of the average industrial wage in Britain and are not proposed to escalate to 44 per cent until 1988. This left 54 per cent of the elderly below a realistically defined poverty line in 1979.

Pensions have remained inadequate

through several periods of reform not only in level of benefits but also in coverage. No plan has yet been so universal as to cover women labouring in the home or those whose contribution history was interrupted.

Schragge wishes us to measure pension achievement against a standard of true universality. He points out that certain basic assumptions about pensions have never been challenged within British parliamentary processes. These assumptions are rooted in an acceptance of capitalism itself. It is not questioned by parties aspiring to power that guaranteed non-means-tested pensions must be tied to a substantial history of work for wages, nor that workers should contribute from their wages to the pension scheme, nor that redistribution of income and power is to be pursued elsewhere than in the pension instrumentality except to a limited, minimal, and unavoidable extent, nor that a private market system of pensions should be accepted or encouraged for those persons whose market power can gain them this privilege. These assumptions form the outer limit of pension reform. Their impact is to preclude a guarantee of a stable, independent, and poverty-free old age to all survivors.

Schragge sets out to explain the changes which have occurred and to demonstrate the forces and conditions that shape changes in pension policy. He compares and contrasts the major reform proposals of the war and Labour governments (Beveridge, Crossman and Castle) and those of the Tories (*Phillips and Josephs*).

The comparisons show substantial differences between parties and within the same party before and after 1970. The comparisons also reveal a basic similarity between parties in both periods as to the role of pensions in the economy and the relative reliance upon state or private provision.

Before 1970 both parties accepted a substantial and leading role by the state in the whole field of welfare provisions and

pensions in particular. This was expressed specifically in the acceptance that universality was a necessity. After 1970 the conservative definition that universality was impossible of achievement and undesirable in its impact defined the parameters of the argument to an increasing extent. Labour found itself forced, not only to acknowledge and accommodate the existence of a private market in pensions (as they had done all along), but to encourage private market provision in any attempt to reform the system towards adequacy. This shift moved welfare in general towards the residual role espoused by the conservatives in an economy defined by the market.

This is not to say that vast struggles did not take place in the formulation of pension policy nor that strides towards adequacy did not occur. In terms of benefit adequacy Labour's Castle plan of 1978 gave strong assurance against inflation erosion to the total income of retirees who receive state and private pensions, gave formal equality to women's pensions, set firm standards for the private pension system, and for the first time guaranteed that the exchequer's contribution would escalate (from the historic 18 per cent) with increasing participant contribution. The Castle plan also reinforced the mild redistributive effect of pensions between low and high wage earners. Schragge judges these changes to be enduring at least up to 1998, the date promised for full maturity of the plan.

Earlier battles had been fought and won regarding the introduction of earnings-related contributions rather than flat rate contributions, and the payment of price-related benefits rather than flat rate benefits. The victory in these battles, however, did not always represent a change towards equality or a substantial improvement of adequacy for present recipients of pensions. Just as frequently or more so they represented a promise of future improvement.

In this explanation of the forces shap-

ing pension change, Schragge rejects reliance upon one-factor theories. He gives short shrift to liberal notions of altruism, personality, or "maturity" of the electorate in accounting for change. Nor does he stop with Marxist functionalism, though he acknowledges Gough's central point that the state must insure the reproduction of labour and the maintenance of those unable to work. He gives a much greater role to the welfare state as a manager of conflict between the interests of labour and capital within parameters which insure capital accumulation. In particular he carefully connects the response of governments in the welfare arena with the specific economic problems and conflicts encountered during their terms of office. He devotes many pages to specifying the economic contradictions and dilemmas which underlay the policy discussions behind each white paper.

Every writer who adopts a complex form of analysis such as this makes him- or herself vulnerable to dispute as to the importance of any single factor in explaining the historical particulars. Thus, for example, the objections raised to Piven and Cloward's emphasis on agitation and social movement may be applied to Schragge's assignment of importance to class struggle as a determinant. Evidence of specific agitation on pension reform is thin, though in Britain in 1971 (and in the United States in the late 1940s) it was clearly present. However it is possible to accept Schragge's logic that the relative strength and activity of the labour movement coincides rather neatly with advances in pension adequacy, while the softening of universal goals coincides with a period of labour disarray. Moreover, it is clear that the zero sum economics of this decade constrain both the quantity and quality of welfare. Schragge's achievement is to bring together all these factors into a convincing argument with the kind of detailed documentation one would expect of a doctoral dissertation.

In fact one might wish for a bit less

detail and certainly one would prefer rather less British administrative jargon. Keeping track of the proper names associated with British governments and a chronology of developments presents a chore. The shame in these little faults is that the comprehensive political economy spelled out in the book would be much more useful to North American students and alert lay readers if they were not overwhelmed by British detail.

I hope that Schrage will expand on the solutions offered in his conclusion. Essentially, he envisages the devolution of welfare state functions upon the trade unions and local cooperatives. Throughout the book he is careful to explain that welfare advances are inextricably bound to changing forms of social control in which, in the pensions example, the worker is bound ever more firmly to selling labour power and doing the bidding of his/her employer throughout a work life. The devolution of pension administration to trade unions or worker-managed pension plans would reduce dependence upon employer and state, bring pension issues home to the grassroots, and create a project of self-management that would take us in the direction of liberation.

David P. Williams
Dalhousie University

Charles Handy, *The Future of Work: A Guide to a Changing Society* (Oxford and New York: Basil Blackwell 1984).

THE PLACE ONCE filled by utopian socialism has been occupied in recent decades by a loosely structured movement of countercultural futurism whose founding spirits include E.F. Schumacher, Ivan Illich, and Lewis Mumford. The new utopians seek to replace our conventional vision of a high-growth, high-tech future with something gentler. Their keywords are small, simple, voluntary, decentralized, ecological. They abhor both economic and technological determinism. In

labour studies, countercultural futurism pervades books such as Barry Jones's *Sleepers, Wake!: Technology and the Future of Work* (1982) and James Robertson's *Future Work* (1985). It furnished some of the ideological agenda of the 1977 GAMMA Report in Canada.

But it is nonsense. Handy asserts, to imagine there will ever again be "full-time" jobs for all. Thanks to the forward push of technology, we have progressed from the industrial era to the era of services and information. As automation liquidates more and more jobs, even service and information jobs, people will work for pay fewer hours a week, fewer weeks a year, and fewer years in a lifetime. The 50,000-hour career will replace the old 100,000-hour model. More people will opt for part-time jobs, and payment by fees rather than by wages. More people will choose self-employment. Labour costs will be cut to help facilitate successful competition in the global marketplace. But all this will be made palatable by wise public policies that curb exploitation and by the arrival of a new cultural paradigm that devalues the importance of material wealth. "Longer lives and shorter jobs," Handy concludes, "will tend to mean lower incomes. Some no doubt will get richer, but most will feel poorer, financially, at least for a while. The new world may have more wealth of well-being, but, for most people, less conventional wealth."

The Future of Work, by a British management scholar and former oil executive, keeps its world view under wraps much of the time, but the author is clearly attracted to the countercultural vision. The old "full employment society" is well past its peak, he writes. What should, and perhaps will, take its place is a society that values work above jobs. In Handy's preferred future, everyone will work as much as they like, and jobs, meaning work for pay, will be shared out fairly, with everyone assured a decent livelihood through a national income scheme or its

equivalent, no matter what an individual's fate is in the job market.

The new world will also bring significant changes in education and family life. In a chapter on education, Handy urges expanded investment in vocational education (in schools, homes and workplaces) to prepare young people for the more demanding jobs of the future. As children stay at home longer to learn trades, and as reduced incomes in later life make the cost of maintaining separate households prohibitive, families will grow larger again. Three generations may routinely live and work under the same roof. Busy, convivial homes may replace the lonely dens found in our modern suburbs.

For the most part, *The Future of Work* is addressed to British readers and to the special needs of Britain, but with shifts of emphasis here and there, the trends it identifies and the message it purveys can apply to any emerging post-industrial society. The message itself is typical of the milder varieties of countercultural futurism. There is the usual pious hope that corporations will not be unduly greedy, that governments in a capitalist environment can legislate social justice, and that values will miraculously change as a new paradigm descends from the sky. Austerity will suddenly seem comfortable. Odd jobs and piecework in the home will suddenly seem chic. Dwindling real incomes and early retirement will suddenly seem fair. Because people adopt new priorities and assign new meanings to old words, all will be well.

Regarding other matters, Handy has little or nothing to say. He is oblivious to the Orwellian implications of his remarks on language. On the economic and social dynamics of late capitalism, the future of the global economy, the plight of labour in the Third World, the impact on work of militarism and the arms race, and the realities of racism and structural poverty throughout much of the developed world, he is mostly silent.

As a guide to current trends in the capitalist workplace, *The Future of Work* serves well. Anyone hoping to use it as a prescription for progress, however, will find it less useful than the visions of the utopian socialists of the nineteenth century. Like them, Handy has no credible strategy for getting to his utopia. But at least their utopias were utopian. The paradise of countercultural futurism sounds as much like fun as the prospect of camping in the woods with all the folks, forever. Nice for two weeks perhaps, but enough is enough.

W. Warren Wagar
State University of New York
at Binghamton

C. Stewart Doty, *The First Franco-Americans. New England Life Histories From the Federal Writers' Project, 1938-39* (Orono: University of Maine 1985).

DÈS LE PREMIER coup d'oeil il se dégage de l'ouvrage sur les Franco-Américains préparé par C. Stewart Doty une aura de compétence et de travail bien fait. Comme les ouvriers dont il a longuement observé le témoignage, Doty aborde son objet avec franchise, exactitude, et un certain amour du détail qui ne laisse pas place à une improvisation hâtive. Dans le genre, *The First Franco-Americans* reste un des meilleurs livres qu'il m'ait été donné de consulter sur la vie quotidienne des émigrés canadiens-français aux États-Unis, surtout parce qu'il s'en dégage une impression de professionnalisme, de simplicité et un profond désir de se mettre vraiment à l'écoute des hommes et des femmes qui ont vécu l'odyssée du grand déplacement vers la Nouvelle-Angleterre. Dans ce cas, Doty a su éviter l'écueil du commentaire complaisant, ou cette espèce d'idéologie populiste qui fait que parfois ce type de livre ressemble à des fourretout, où s'exprime une somme hétéroclite et inégale d'idées et d'opinions sans tami-

sage préalable. La présentation visuelle est également soignée, les photographies bien choisies et reproduites sur des presses de qualité.

Fort heureusement aussi, Doty a su puiser à une seule source historique l'ensemble des témoignages qu'il a colligé dans son livre, ce qui donne à l'ouvrage une indéniable unité de lieu et de temps, et rend les différents chapitres comparables entre eux. Les textes recueillis par Doty ont tous été rédigés au cours des années trente, au plus fort de la grande dépression, alors que des milliers d'écrivains et de journalistes américains étaient réduits au chômage et à la misère. Conscient de la détresse vécue par toutes les catégories de travailleurs, le New Deal de Roosevelt avait en effet mis sur pied à travers le Work Progress Administration (WPA) un ensemble de programmes destinés à un grand éventail de professions, dont le Federal Writers' Project, qui entre autres avait subventionné la collecte de milliers de récits de vie puisés à même le vécu américain. Ces textes sans prétention demeurèrent enfouis à la Bibliothèque du Congrès, à Washington, jusqu'à ce qu'un premier inventaire de ce matériel inédit soit fait par l'institution en 1982. C'est de ce corpus apparemment inépuisable que sont sortis la vingtaine de témoignages contenus dans *The First Franco-Americans*, tous écrits par des gens qui le plus souvent partageaient avec leur informateur une connaissance profonde des conditions sociales ainsi décrites. Bien sûr, une certaine part d'édition critique s'exercera de la part du responsable du livre, mais sans que l'on sente de cassure avec l'esprit premier du texte, sans que soit étouffé la fraîcheur et la naïveté de certains intervenants. Chaque chapitre est habilement amené par Doty et sa documentation en général appuie bien les entrevues d'époque, sans en diminuer ni la portée, ni la pertinence. Peut-être aurait-on souhaité toutefois que l'éditeur précise un peu plus quels critères ont présidé au choix des textes, et selon quelle

les années trente un âge plutôt avancé, et leurs propos nous ramènent parfois à la période qui suivit immédiatement la guerre civile américaine. Presque toutes également étaient nées au Canada et appartenaient à cette génération qui avait connu l'émigration de première main et avait gardé un souvenir indélébile de leur pays d'origine. Assez typiquement, il se dégage de leur propos un optimisme qui surprend par son ampleur, sauf peut-être dans le cas plus marginal des ouvriers du granite de la ville de Barre au Vermont. Une foi irrésistible envers les États-Unis et le système capitaliste de production anime les témoignages, surtout ceux recueillis à Manchester et à Old Town, comme si aucun obstacle humain, aucune injustice sociale n'avait pu contenir ou décourager la marée montante des émigrants en provenance du Québec. Le cas de Philippe Lemay, retraité, travailleur du textile dès l'âge de huit ans et premier contremaître francophone à la Amoskeag Manufacturing Co., reste patent:

Our American overseers were always fair and just to us and it is fair and just to admit it. They were fine men and knew their business. They never bothered those who did their duty. We can certainly be thankful to them for their decent treatment of us.

Plusieurs des entrevues contiennent des perles semblables, qui finalement révèlent beaucoup l'état d'esprit des Franco-Américains de la première génération quant aux conditions sociales qui leur avait été réservées dans les usines et les Petits Canada de la Nouvelle-Angleterre, et que des études aujourd'hui montrent avoir été plutôt sombres. Le livre de Doty excelle donc, parce qu'il ne s'agit pas d'un ensemble de textes manipulés par une plume consciente d'elle-même, à nous faire entrer dans l'intimité touchante d'individus abandonnés à leur intervieweur, rivés sur leurs sentiments et leur vécu, et livrés passionnément au déroulement des différents épisodes de leur existence. Il n'y intervient pas ce processus de distanciation critique qui caractérise les

écrits et les documents de source secondaire. Je reconnais bien là, pour l'avoir pratiqué moi-même en Nouvelle-Angleterre, la vitalité et la spontanéité qui émanent des entrevues en direct qui, quand l'informateur est de qualité, peuvent fournir au chercheur ses meilleurs intuitions.

Seront toutefois déçus qui consulteront le livre de Doty pour y trouver une image de la vie franco-américaine du temps. Bien sûr, comme le dit l'auteur, l'histoire de cette émigration a trop souvent été écrite en fonction des critères d'une certaine élite professionnelle et cléricale francophone, bien retranchée dans les forteresses institutionnelles de la Franco-Américaine qu'elle avait grandement contribué à ériger sur le plan du leadership. Les ouvriers émigrés n'en vivaient pas moins à leur manière une intense culture d'origine rurale québécoise ou acadienne, et qui est loin de se résumer comme les entrevues le suggèrent à des veillées du bon vieux temps ou à des prières en famille. Le malheur est qu'aucun des écrivains engagés par le Federal Writers' Project ne possédait, malgré leurs multiples talents, une idée même vague de la culture d'origine des gens qu'ils couchaient sur papier. Bien sûr Woonsocket était la ville la plus française d'Amérique après Québec, devant même le Montréal du début du siècle, mais rien par exemple dans l'entrevue auprès d'Henry Boucher de Woonsocket n'y paraît; en toute chose l'écrivain du WPA ne voit en lui qu'un simple ouvrier victime des conditions sociales de son temps. *The First Franco-Americans* a un peu en fait le goût inachevé d'une de ces fameuses galettes de sarrasin chères au palais des émigrants, et qu'on aurait fait cuire d'un seul côté.

Pour cette raison le livre de Doty n'est pas à mon avis du tout représentatif du niveau d'assimilation culturelle ou d'américanisation propre au monde franco-américain des années trente, même en maintenant l'hypothèse dans ce domaine

de la domination disproportionnée des élites locales. Il faut aussi se méfier du contenu factuel des entrevues, dont beaucoup présentent des opinions farfelues, comme celle d'un des frères Morin de Old Town qui, sans doute émigré directement aux États-Unis depuis son village natal, croyait que Rivière-du-Loup était avec 7 000 âmes une des plus grosses villes du Canada et que tous les citoyens du Québec savaient faire usage de la langue de Molière. Beaucoup parmi les personnes interviewées n'auraient sans doute pu relire qu'avec grande peine dans les dossiers du WPA le texte les concernant.

Faut-il en vouloir à Doty de partager un peu ce *blind spot* des premiers auteurs du volume: l'essentiel de ses sources sont américaines et rédigées en anglais, toutes intéressantes et pertinentes qu'elles puissent être. Il est vrai que la littérature et la culture franco-américaine ne se laissent pas pénétrer facilement, même d'un point de vue québécois, tant elles oscillent et vacillent à la frontière de deux mondes, portant en quelque sorte au plus profond d'elle-mêmes, comme au sein de toute population immigrante d'ailleurs, les germes d'une assimilation progressive à la société d'accueil américaine. Le tout est de savoir bien mesurer ce cheminement parfois imperceptible et indéniable vers les valeurs et la langue d'une autre société, et dans ce but les témoignages du Federal Writers' Project doivent bien être le pire des outils. Ces textes ne constituent pas non plus comme le prétend Doty le premier témoignage fourni par l'histoire quant au vécu historique franco-américain. Déjà en 1883 le curé J.-A. Chevalier, de Manchester, NH, avait décrit les conditions de vie des ouvriers francophones de sa ville devant la commission Blair, établie par le sénat américain pour étudier les rapports entre la classe ouvrière et le capital industriel; sans compter une masse considérable d'ouvrages littéraires parus en français au Québec et en Nouvelle-Angleterre dès la fin du dix-neuvième siècle, et qu'il serait

trop long d'énumérer ici. Malgré cette inexactitude de taille les conclusions et les réflexions de Doty dans son *afterword* sont très valables et devraient mener à de nouvelles recherches prometteuses pour notre compréhension de l'histoire ouvrière franco-américaine.

Pierre Ancil
Institut québécois de
recherche sur la culture
Montréal

Marie Lavigne Yolande Pinard, *Travailleuses et féministes: Les Femmes dans la société québécoise* (Montréal: Boréal Express 1983).

CE RECUEIL D'ARTICLES constitue une réédition augmentée d'un ouvrage publié en 1977 et intitulé: *Les Femmes dans la société québécoise* (repris ici en sous-titre). On y retrouve les huit essais de l'édition originale et sept nouveaux textes en plus d'une présentation complètement transformée. L'ensemble du livre s'intéresse aux activités que les femmes ont exercées dans la société québécoise depuis 1880 et, à ce titre, s'inscrit dans le premier courant historiographique de l'histoire des femmes alors que les pionnières, puisqu'il fallait bien commencer quelque part, orientaient leurs recherches vers le travail salarié, le militantisme féminin et le discours véhiculé par les élites. Il s'agissait alors de démontrer que les femmes, malgré le silence de l'histoire à leur sujet, avaient effectivement oeuvré dans la sphère publique et cela, en dépit des obstacles dressés contre elles.

Depuis la première édition, l'histoire des femmes a élargi son champs d'étude pour y inclure la sphère domestique, diversifié ses sources afin de mieux rendre compte de son objet et remis en cause les fondements mêmes de la discipline historique en proposant l'utilisation de nouveaux outils conceptuels et méthodologiques. Le bilan historiographique proposé par Lavigne et Pinard en guise d'introduc-

tion tente de refléter cette évolution. Leur texte permet d'apprécier l'ampleur des recherches effectuées ou en cours, suggère quelques pistes et hypothèses intéressantes mais ne fait qu'effleurer les nouvelles approches théoriques qui, depuis quelques années, proposent d'articuler sphère privée et publique afin de mieux comprendre l'expérience historique vécue par les femmes. La plupart des articles sont d'ailleurs assez décevants à ce chapitre, leur objet d'étude se limitant au rôle joué par les femmes dans la sphère publique et marchande.

Les six premiers essais dont trois apparaissaient dans l'édition originale (ceux de Cross, Lavigne et Stoddart, et Gagnon), concernent le travail salarié. Les contributions de Cross, Trofimenkoff, et Lavigne et Stoddart examinent le travail salarié féminin de la fin du dix-neuvième siècle aux années quarante et dressent un portrait général des conditions de travail, salaires et secteurs d'activités réservés aux femmes. Ces articles font surtout état de la discrimination subie par les femmes sur le marché du travail et de l'opposition dont a fait l'objet le travail salarié féminin sans que l'un ou l'autre ne soit articulé à l'ensemble des rapports sociaux. L'article de Johanne Daigle sur l'évolution de l'Alliance des infirmières présente un cas intéressant de syndicalisation au sein d'une profession féminine perçue comme une vocation par un patronat lui aussi majoritairement féminin. La période étudiée, 1946-66, est marquée par la prise en charge par l'État des services hospitaliers dont l'auteurs analyse les conséquences pour le métier et la syndicalisation des infirmières. Elle souligne leur volonté autonomiste qu'elle associe à la fois à l'inadéquation des structures syndicales et au désir des infirmières de professionnaliser leur métier.

La situation des femmes dans le mouvement syndical québécois fait l'objet de deux articles de Mona-Josée Gagnon. Dans un premier texte, paru dans la première édition, elle constate, par l'étude de

l'évolution des trois centrales syndicales (CSN, CEQ, FTQ) entre 1940 et 1970, que ces dernières se sont trouvées à la remorque des idéologies sociétales en ce qui concerne leur perception du travail salarié féminin. Dans un deuxième aussi inédit, «Les Comités syndicaux de condition féminine,» l'auteure analyse le phénomène de réapparition de ces comités au cours des années soixante-dix et examine leur fonctionnement et les limites de leurs possibilités d'action au sein des structures syndicales actuelles. Elle constate en outre, que malgré la présence de ces comités, les femmes sont encore minoritaires aux postes-clés en raison des problèmes qu'elles rencontrent à cumuler travail domestique, salarié, et militantisme syndical.

Avec les deux articles suivants, on aborde un autre facette de l'activité visible des femmes. «Des Débuts du mouvement des femmes à Montréal» de Yolande Pinard et «La Fédération nationale Saint-Jean-Baptiste et les revendications féministes au début du 20^e siècle» de Lavigne, Pinard, et Stoddart retracent les origines de deux mouvements féministes, le *Montreal Council of Women* et la Fédération nationale Saint-Jean-Baptiste, décrivent leurs activités et leurs luttes et définissent les courants idéologiques auxquels ils se rattachent. Le texte de Ghislaine Desjardins sur les cercles de fermières nous permet de constater que les revendications des féministes bourgeoises n'ont pas toujours été partagées par l'ensemble des femmes. Ce mouvement de femmes rurales, voué à la défense de leur fonction de productrices condamnait en effet la lutte des féministes urbaines pour l'obtention du droit de vote. L'auteure y voit plusieurs raisons: la perception faussée que les fermières avaient des revendications féministes, susceptibles à leurs yeux de détruire la famille, et le désintérêt des féministes elles-mêmes à sensibiliser les femmes rurales sur cette question. On peut toutefois se demander si l'auteure ne sous-estime pas l'influence exercée par

l'État et l'Église sur ces cercles tant leur prises de positions et leur perceptions des fermières et de leur rôle présentent une belle unanimité conforme à l'idéologie cléricalo-nationaliste. De même, l'hypothèse voulant que la valorisation des industries domestiques par les cercles ait «permis à l'agriculture québécoise de ralentir le processus d'intégration du grand capital,» (243) nous semble hardie.

L'étude des communautés religieuses de femmes, tout comme celle des femmes rurales d'ailleurs, est relativement nouvelle et constitue un apport important à cette deuxième édition du recueil. Les articles de Marta Danylewycz et Micheline Dumont portant sur les religieuses proposent une réévaluation de leurs activités et, dans le cas de Dumont, de leurs motivations. Pour Danylewycz, les préoccupations sociales des féministes laïques au début du siècle auraient permis un rapprochement avec les communautés religieuses de femmes également impliquées dans les services sociaux et de santé. Cette collaboration aurait finalement débouché sur une lutte commune pour l'accès des filles à l'éducation supérieure, ce que l'amène à associer les religieuses aux premières luttes féministes. Dumont va plus loin en suggérant que les communautés religieuses de femmes, en raison du rôle important qu'elles ont joué dans les institutions scolaires et hospitalières, auraient constitué une «forme déviée de féminisme,» (279) les postulantes voyant là leur seule chance de s'affirmer dans une société qui n'admettait pas qu'une femme exerce d'autres fonctions sociales que celles d'épouse et de mère, à moins de porter le voile. De même, la possibilité de faire carrière sans entrer en communauté depuis 1960 expliquerait la baisse spectaculaire du recrutement et les nombreuses «sorties.» Ce rapport entre condition féminine et vocation religieuse, bien que séduisant, semble sur-estimer les possibilités offertes par la vie en communauté en ce qui a trait à la «réalisation personnelle.»

Qu'il soit question des travailleuses ou des féministes, la plupart des articles soulignent que les limites de leurs activités et de leurs luttes ont été définies par une société masculine imprégnée de l'idéologie clérico-nationaliste. C'est ce que viennent étayer les textes de Trofimenkoff et Stoddart sur Henri Bourassa et la Commission Dorion par une analyse du discours de l'homme politique et des juristes à l'égard des femmes et de leurs revendications. L'article de Stoddart jette un regard nouveau sur le rôle des féministes dans la mise sur pied de cette commission et souligne qu'elle a été beaucoup plus une tentative de justification du statut des femmes dans le Code civil qu'une véritable enquête destinée à la transformer.

Ainsi, les trois principales préoccupations des premières historiennes, travail salarié, militantisme féminin, et discours idéologique, sont couverts par ce recueil. Les ajouts par rapport à la première édition démontrent d'ailleurs que ce champs de la recherche n'a pas encore été complè-

tement exploré. Les femmes rurales et les religieuses, entre autres, constituent deux groupes encore mal connus. Les articles à leur sujet proposent des pistes et hypothèses intéressantes mais qui devront être abordées en fonction des nouvelles problématiques développées depuis quelques années. Trop souvent en effet, ces articles se contentent de souligner la contribution et/ou de dénoncer l'oppression subie par les femmes dans la société québécoise sans en expliquer les fondements. Afin d'en arriver à une intégration du privé et du public, du masculin et du féminin comme le souhaitent les éditrices, l'histoire des femmes devra questionner la division sexuelle du travail et la construction de l'identité de genre ce qui lui permettra d'atteindre un niveau d'explication plus satisfaisant de la place des femmes dans les rapports sociaux.

Denyse Baillargeon
Université de Montréal

Labour/Le Travail 15 published Richard Coe's review of Edoardo Masi's *China Winter*. That review was edited for length and Professor Coe feels that the resulting deletions changed the politics of the review. Especially important, in his view, were cuts of material emphasizing the accomplishments of the People's Republic and the critical solidarity with which both Professor Coe and Edoardo Masi view the Chinese experience. As Coe wrote, "The accomplishments of the People's Republic should not be underestimated." We regret any misunderstandings that these deletions may have caused.

G.S. Kealey
B.D. Palmer
