An objective of this collection is to bring the history of the Australian labor movement to international attention. The editors introduce the collection with a brief overview of Australian labor history, emphasizing differences between the Australian and American experiences. The introduction argues that a unique aspect of Australian labor history is “laborism,” which is defined as the central place of the labor movement in Australian culture, as compared with the more marginal position of the labor movement in America. In Australia, this centrality is reflected in the embedding of trade unions and labor in the state through wage-fixing tribunals, a social security system designed to support the families of male wage earners, and the Australian Labor Party’s strong links to the trade union movement. The introduction is informative and especially benefits from the insights of David Palmer, an American historian teaching at Adelaide’s Flinders University. However, the introduction was apparently written later at the suggestion of an American reader and has thus not been fully integrated into the structure of the book.

This book is published at a time when laborism has been seriously challenged and weakened by globalization; in this context one of its central goals is to suggest possible ways forward for the Australian labor movement and for labor history. Most of its seventeen articles are based on papers delivered at the 1995 Australian Labor History conference in Adelaide; these are augmented by additional articles commissioned by the editors.

In order to give coherence to its disparate contributions, the book has been divided into six parts each with its own introduction: “Culture, Gender and Australian Workers,” “Organized Labor and Political Culture,” “Working Class Communities and Political Identity,” “Australian Egalitarianism: Reality or Myth,” “Alternative Identities,” and “Intellectuals and the Working Class: Australian Labor History Reconsidered.” These all represent important issues at the center of current debates in the labor movement and the academy. However, with only two to four articles in each section there is not sufficient room for comprehensive discussions to take place.

For example, in part three, “Working-Class Communities and Political Identity,” the editors admit that the two contributions that follow, one an historical study of labor identity in the Queensland town of Ipswich before World War One and the other on Labor and Anti-Communism in the New South Wales town of Wagga Wagga in the 1950s, “have at first glance a superficial resemblance” (196).

Most of the sections have problems overcoming the “superficial resem-
blance” of contributions, thus inhibiting any meaningful development of the themes they address. Part five, “Alternative Identities,” suggests new directions for labor history to take. Yet in its articles: examining racism toward the indigenous workforce in a Central Desert community, immigrant workers in colonial Australia, clashes between Anglo-Celtic and Italian workers in Port Adelaide in the 1930s, and homosociality in the mining town of Broken Hill, there is too great a diversity in time and space to develop a complex discussion of the issues at hand.

This book demonstrates the need for more transnational and comparative research in order to place the Australian experience in broader contexts. The only comparative article in the collection, Chris McConville’s “Waterfront Unionism in Three Ports: Buenos Aires, Melbourne and San Francisco, 1919–1934,” shows the value of comparative research in exploring the different impacts of the power of the state on labor movements in three countries. It would seem, given the lack of comparative studies in the collection, that Australian labor history needs to more actively address comparative research to place the Australian experience in the context of international debates.

A focused discussion of women and workforce issues is confined to an article by Glenda Strachan on class and the development of nursing as a profession. Evidence of the uneasy position of gender in Australian labor history was illustrated during the Adelaide conference which, due to poor communications, clashed with a “Women and Labor” conference held at the same time in Sydney. Gender and workforce issues were central to the Sydney conference, addressed by Jennie George, the first woman secretary of the Australian Council of Trade Unions, and by American historian Alice Kessler-Harris, who spoke at both conferences.

The final section of this book disappoints in its reconsideration of Australian labor history. Ray Markey and Verity Burgmann are well-respected historians, but Markey’s short piece on the NSW Labour Council does not seriously address the reconsideration theme. Burgmann’s article, retracting her verdict announced a few years ago that labor history was dead, is not entirely convincing in its argument that issues of class are now reasserting themselves over identity politics within the academy. Labor history, with its emphasis on mateship, pioneering labor, and progressive government, has had an important place in Australian historiography. Reasons for the decline of labor history in the academy, discussed by Terry Irving and Sean Scalmer in part four, are worthy of more focused consideration. Alice Kessler-Harris pointed out at the conference that American labor history has been reinvigorated by its confrontation of gender, race, and culture issues. Terry Irving, a former editor of *Australian Labour History*, argues that this journal moved to accommodate broader perspectives in social history in the 1980s. This advance now needs to be carried forward by more forcefully confronting issues such as the increased participation of women in the workforce, the repositioning of the relationship between the labor movement and the state, and the future of laborism, given the impact of globalization and the implications of a complex, culturally-diverse workforce.
This book is dedicated to Don Dunstan, a former Premier of South Australia who died not long before the 1995 conference and who is remembered for leading an Australian Labor Party government that epitomized the pursuit of progressive and imaginative new directions in the 1970s. Though it raises interesting issues, it does not achieve the level of imaginative rethinking representative of the Dunstan tradition. It contains interesting insights into Australian labor history for American readers, but, in terms of that history’s reconsideration, it is a step rather than a leap forward.

Renate Howe
Deakin University, Victoria, Australia


At the beginning of the twenty-first century, Poland, one of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization’s newest members and poised to enter the European Union sometime in the next few years, has begun perhaps one of its most stable periods in recent history. Divided for centuries between Russian, Prussian, and Austrian empires, Poland was able to preserve its language and cultural identity until its independence in 1918. Of nations involved in the Second World War, Poland was perhaps the most thoroughly devastated by that conflict, emerging only to be locked under the strict gaze of Moscow until the beginning of the last decade. In the wake of 1989 and the opening of borders and archives across Central and Eastern Europe, the experience of Poland has much to teach us.

Exploring the period immediately following the Second World War, one is confronted with several Polands, all marked by unique and often disparate experiences. Several major cities, including Warsaw and Gdansk, were largely destroyed in the war and required almost complete reconstruction. Cities in the areas ceded to Poland at Yalta, the largest of which were Wroclaw and Szczecin (previously Breslau and Stettin), had been predominantly German for centuries, and were almost completely evacuated of their German inhabitants. Such cities had to be not only largely rebuilt due to war damage and sabotage, but also repopulated with settlers from other parts of Poland. New state-planned cities like Nowa Huta near Krakow were also being planned and built at roughly the same time. All of these cities needed workers to aid in the reconstruction and to settle and work in local industries. Many of those who came migrated from rural areas in search of opportunity; a goal of the early political parties and later the state itself was to condition these new workers in ways that would conform to the long-term goals of the communist state.

For many reasons this conditioning was a difficult task. Parts of Poland were already heavily industrialized. Large industrial centers like Lodz and Katowice had long-established working-class identities and strong labor traditions, especially in the mining and textile industries. Such traditions often proved too strong
to be co-opted by the state or party, and remained a thorn in the side of the communist government until they were largely responsible for bringing about its end in 1989.

The core of Padraic Kenney’s book is a well-researched comparative study of two very different cities: Wroclaw and Lodz. Kenney sets the stage for his comparative study by explaining the political situation of the time. Here we are introduced to an urban Poland where Communist (PPR) and Socialist (PPS) parties vied for representation among workers in the factories, all while factory management established party links and quickly became itself a virtual arm of the state. The PPR held more influence in areas like Wroclaw, whereas the PPS often represented more seasoned workers in places like Lodz and was initially seen by some as a possible forum for dissent.

Kenney goes on to explore the vast textile industry of Lodz, left virtually untouched by the war and already nearly a century old. Using clear statistics, information from archives, and personnel files of particular factories, Kenney is able to paint a portrait of a stable and well-developed industry and culture. Both men and women were well represented in Lodz’s workforce and active in labor unions before the war; there are even accounts of successful sit-down strikes at some of the Lodz factories. In his description of Lodz Kenney also utilizes interviews, both from archives and some conducted on-site. These interviews go a long way in illustrating the “moral community” of working-class culture in Lodz, and create a personal normative dimension to this book which makes it all the more readable and, in a word, human.

Such interviews likewise capture the confusion and disorganization of Wroclaw, the Polish “Wild West.” Due to its overnight status as a vaguely organized composite Polish city, Wroclaw lacked such a moral community according to Kenney, and was thus far more susceptible to the state’s efforts to consolidate and “stalinize” local culture. More open to the possibility of individual opportunity, especially in the competition and “Worker Hero” programs that were the hallmark of state initiatives of this period, Polish Wroclaw in its early years was disproportionately young, male, and from a rural background. Fewer than half of those who came stayed for more than a year.

Though it is often said that the population of the Polish city of Lwow, ceded to the USSR at Yalta and now a part of the Ukraine, was simply “transferred” to Wroclaw, Kenney shows us that this “official” history had only a slight resemblance to reality. Those few who were transferred were primarily transportation workers, who, incidentally, were among the few in Wroclaw to hold frequent strikes in this period (160, 165). The majority of Wroclaw’s workers at this time had little established identity; there were few existing traditions into which to be absorbed, thus paving the way for the cultural predominance of state and ideology.

Yet it was not long before the state began to show far too many visible contradictions to be unequivocally accepted anywhere in Poland. Here Kenney sheds a vivid light on how, in order to keep the symbolic picture of “harmony” among the various “strata” of Polish society (Peasants, Workers, and Intelli-
genceja), the state felt that class identity needed to be swept under the rug. Of course this was an impossible task, not only in places like Lodz, but even in Wroclaw; it was rapidly becoming clear that an aristocracy had developed among high-ranking officials. Here Kenney provides us with accounts of the general disillusionment of workers in the face of such contradiction, for example, workers uncomfortable vacationing with wealthy, sophisticated party officials at resorts in the Tatra mountains, or simply not vacationing at all, unable to conceptualize such an idea of leisure. “Avant-Gardist” Heros of labor competition, though held up as examples of ideal citizens to other workers, often went otherwise unacknowledged or forgotten by the state.

But Kenney also illustrates the economic problems that help to make this more than a clear-cut story of worker vs. state. In order to encourage competition among workers, bonuses and salaries eventually rose to unsustainable levels; when those levels could no longer rise, workers were pushed harder and harder simply to avoid cuts in pay. The resulting widespread alienation became sufficient to generate dissent among workers across Poland, and remained a central source of discontent up until 1989. Yet it was in older industrial centers like Lodz that this discontent was the most clear and coherent. There it took the form of a “moral community” whose values opposed official ideology and were repressed by the state, thus engendering and solidifying such dissent. Places like Wroclaw were not necessarily void of such community, but could more realistically be said to have been caught in the middle.

All of this is most evident in the few years immediately following the war, when Poland’s differences were most acute, and when the stalinist system tried, and largely failed, to create the new culture it had envisioned. Many factors can be cited for its failure, but the wealth of information Kenney provides lends indisputable the significance of working-class culture and identity to the activism and perseverence that was to reclaim Poland decades later.

Many of Kenney’s sources are cited here for the first time in any English-language publication. His is an indispensable work for understanding an oft-neglected (outside of Poland) yet tremendously important chapter in Polish and European history. In addition, it offers insights of international importance into labor, cultural identity, and class dynamics that only Poland can teach us.

Peter Nekola
New School University


In the 1940s, under the combined impact of war, occupation, liberation, and cold war, a series of new departures in the realm of theology, party politics and apostolic missions left a profound imprint on European Catholicism. One of the products of this period of ebullience in European Catholicism was “Christian progres-
sivism,” a tendency arising among the multiple branches of a fledgling Left Catholicism, then in its prime. Christian progressivism emerged out of the creative confluence of Catholic social movements and the communist experience. Nowhere in Western Europe was this phenomenon as prominent as in France.

Whereas French-speaking Belgium also experienced powerful new Catholic apostolic missions, it had no nationally prominent Communist Party. Italy was home to a powerful Communist Party but did not have the same degree of innovative apostolic missions. Only France had both: new vibrant Catholic social movements like the worker priests and a visible presence of Communists in all walks of life. It is this unique confluence of divergent ideological and activist tendencies which Yvon Tranvouez targets in his study. However, as the subtitle makes clear, the author chooses to focus solely on the crisis years of French progressivism, ending with the condemnation of progressivism’s quintessential journalistic product by a papal edict on February fourth, 1955.

Tranvouez furnishes a highly analytical survey of this Christian progressivist milieu, focussing on the men (and women!) behind the journal *La Quinzaine*, the object of papal attention in early 1955. Some of the very best pages of this stimulating study describe the loose and variegated social, activist, and political background of these Catholic believers and concentrate on the reconstruction of their social networks. Such networks emerged and thrived in several corners of the thirteenth arrondissement in southeastern Paris, the editorial home of *La Quinzaine*. This fortnightly publication never sold more than 7,500 copies, though the readership far exceeded this limited number. Like many other Left Catholic publications in Europe at that time, most subscribers did not originate in the working class milieu, belonged to the lower clergy, were frequently members of the teaching profession, and, though Tranvouez does not explicitly say so, were overwhelmingly male. So what was the unique contribution of *La Quinzaine*?

As Tranvouez ably demonstrates, the authors and readers of *La Quinzaine* stood at the crossroads of traditional Catholic social doctrine and the questions posed by capitalist modernity and its Marxist critique. Traditional Catholic doctrine, including its activist wing such as social Catholicism or Catholic trade unionism, had been deeply marked by the twin condemnation of liberalism and Marxism as the double-headed hydra of capitalist modernity. Both ideologies and political movements were to be equally combated and opposed. Christian progressivism questioned this approach. While remaining highly critical of capitalist practices, they refused to cover the Marxist response with the same blanket condemnation. Furthermore, rather than viewing the blue-collar working class as a passive and suffering mass, Christian progressivists viewed industrial workers as active shapers of their own destiny. For *La Quinzaine* “the modern world is a new and internally coherent world which is built up bit by bit around the workers’ movement” (213). But unlike some Christian activists who began to postulate a strict separation between religious and political spheres, the milieu that found its expression in *La Quinzaine* refused such a dualism and never tired to insist that both spheres continuously reinforce each other. It is this unusual admixture of ideas and practices that led Christian progressivists on a
collision course with papal authority that ultimately disintegrated under the combined impact of Vatican edicts and the Cold War.

Yet for all its erudition and recovery of detail, Tranvouez’s work is not without some shortcomings. A minor drawback derives from the nature of this book as a collection of previously published individual articles. Only three of the book’s twelve chapters are original pieces and, though most chapters are fundamentally reworked and expanded, a number of repetitions remain in the text. Thus the chronology and inner logic of the resultant text is not as straightforward as desirable. Also, three of the included former articles are somewhat marginal to the main topic discussed.

But more importantly, the careful analysis of Christian progressivism suffers from an unfortunate conceptual flaw. Christian progressivists, though highly critical of capitalism, began to abandon traditional Catholicism’s equally fundamental critique of Marxism. Yet they merely abandoned one orthodoxy in favor of another. Christian progressivists around La Quinzaine identified Marxism almost exclusively with Soviet-style Communism and its satellites abroad. Tranvouez never problematizes this peculiar view. Given the context of France in the early 1950s, it is perhaps somewhat understandable that Moscow-oriented Communist parties were regarded by Christian progressivists as the sole major living Marxist challenge to the capitalist orthodoxies of contemporary France. Still, this recognition was not only one-sided, but it came at a price.

As Tranvouez makes clear, La Quinzaine, highly critical of Atlanticist politics, never fundamentally challenged the social realities and the politics of the Eastern bloc. With few exceptions, the Soviet camp was regarded as the camp of peace, and criticism of Eastern bloc policies, though not entirely absent, were incidental to the paper’s political line. It is difficult to second Tranvouez’s repeated claim that La Quinzaine “did not adopt a monolithic language” (153). Be it in the 1950s or in earlier decades, most “fellow-travellers,” for all their occasional specific critiques of certain Communist practices, could be safely placed in the Communist camp. It makes little difference that some supporters of Christian progressivism were closer to the French Communist Party than others and that some eventually, especially in the wake of ‘1956,’ moved on to more independent positions.

La Quinzaine’s and Tranvouez’s virtual identification of Marxism or working-class politics with Moscow-oriented Communism leads the author to draw an unwarranted and unnatural divide between such fellow-travelling progressivists and other protagonists of French Left Catholicism. Thus, Tranvouez lumps those unorthodox Catholic leftist critics who expressed an equal revulsion of American and Soviet claims and practices firmly in the traditional social Catholic camp.

Tranvouez never writes this in such clear-cut fashion, but the argument, apparently, goes like this. Social Catholicism refused to accommodate either capitalism or Marxism. Communism with a capital “C” was the contemporaneous incarnation of Marxism. Therefore, anyone continuing to criticize Communism remained imbued with the values of traditionalist Catholicism. Thus, conveniently, only Soviet-style Communism is defined as actual Marxism, and other
Left Catholic critics are lumped into the anti-Marxist camp. Tranvouez, of course, is acutely aware of the presence of alternative strands of Marxist and indeed communist thought, including anarchism. But despite some such references strewn throughout his text, the entire logic of his argument serves to construct precisely this somewhat short-circuited understanding of political and theological realities I depicted above, neatly coinciding with the Cold War divide.

For all his skillful and detailed discussion of French Catholic progressivism, Tranvouez is thus unable seriously to pursue another key dimension of this particular brand of Left Catholic thought and practice. Large portions of an entire generation of Christian activists (but not only Christians and not just in France), desperate to improve the fate of their compatriots, felt compelled to temper their critique of actual Communist practices for the supposed benefit of a larger cause. Only by beginning to dissect their motivations can one begin to comprehend why, to mention but one salient example, such a life-long fighter for social justice and a post-capitalist, non-alienating future world, such as Marie-Dominique Chenu, could publish, in the pages of La Quinzaine, an obituary of Josef Stalin that Lavrentii Beria would not have objected to. In his brief discussion of this incident, Tranvouez does suggest as one of the motivations for this crypto-Communism by Catholic progressivists “that giving in to anticommunism would mean, in short, to cut oneself off from the working class, from the masses, from the people” (155). But Tranvouez never follows up on this idea. To begin to understand this particular and by no means unimportant dimension of Catholic progressivism, one could turn precisely to those Left Catholic thinkers who are classified by Tranvouez as modern-day traditionalist social Christians. Rather than posing a binary opposition of Christian progressivists on one side and social Christians on the other, it would do well to consider broadening the progressive side. It would then emerge, perhaps, that criticism of traditional social Catholic doctrine was not limited to “fellow-travellers” alone.

Having said all this, however, it is well worth emphasizing that large portions of this work are not only convincing demonstrations of the relevance and reality of Christian progressivism, but they draw attention to an important element of French political and cultural life in the Cold War decade that has been unduly neglected for forty-odd years.

Gerd-Rainer Horn
University of Warwick


As the European population grew after 1100 CE, bishops and princes in the thinly settled regions northeast of what we now call Germany took to generating revenue and labor power by recruiting qualified migrants to newly chartered cities
and villages. Often the charters granted access to German law rather than the Slavic or Scandinavian codes and practices that had previously prevailed. German law afforded both merchants and peasants greater individual freedom and more secure claims to property than did earlier legal arrangements. Soon German-speaking cities such as Danzig and Riga were booming as crossroads in the exchange of northern goods for the manufactures of Central and Western Europe. In their hinterlands, German-speaking farmers intensified cultivation and shipped agricultural products to centers of international trade. Fairly soon, however, strengthened coercive monarchies and mercantile federations such as the Hanse extracted revenues and exerted top-down controls that increased inequality between insiders and outsiders of the newly expanding political economy. We might call the whole process Europeanization. Within Europeanization, however, what caused what? How did German law, semi-autonomous cities, intensive farming, exclusive trading federations, developmental states, and proliferating markets interact? Decades of vigorous, often vitriolic, debate among historians have not yet produced a clear-cut victory for the view that well-articulated markets did the crucial work, for the riposte that new forms of force-backed exploitation caused the transformation, or for any alternative to those competing explanations.

Social theorists, social scientists, and historians have not been debating globalization for decades, but they have produced a similar set of disagreements. In *The Ends of Globalization*, Don Kalb and his colleagues do not propose to resolve all debates. Instead, they seek to introduce concrete, empirically grounded, theoretically pointed, and historically informed analyses of social processes into studies of globalization and its discourses. They focus on “social power relationships, local development paths, territorially engraved social institutions, and the nature of and possible action within social networks,” as Don Kalb’s acute introduction to the volume puts it. The papers issue from a 1996 conference on globalization and inequality at the University of Utrecht. The collection accordingly gives Dutch authors more than the usual opportunity to reach the large English-speaking audience for discussions of globalization. The book’s editors group their stellar contributors into five nebulae: 1. temporal and theoretical perspectives (Göran Therborn, Saskia Sassen, Michael Hanagan, Erik Olin Wright, Paul Hirst, and Giovanni Arrighi); 2. (unequal) flows of money and goods (Nico Wilterdink, John Schmitt, Jan Reijnders, Jan Luiten van Zanden); 3. (likewise unequal) flows of people (Richard Staring, Ivan Light, Rebecca Kim, Connie Hum, Jack Burgers, and Alejandro Portes); 4. globalization and cultural identity (Don Kalb, Marco van der Land, Peter Kloos, Alan Warde, and Orvar Löfgren); 5. global institutions and the future (Bart van Steenbergen, Jos de Beus, and Richard Falk).

Although such a varied and distinguished set of authors necessarily disagree on many points, in general they converge on a few claims:

- the world has experienced more than one moment of globalization, conceived as something like increasing connection of its far-flung segments
yet the globalization of the last few decades differs from its predecessors at least in centering more fully than its predecessors on flows of information and finance capital

despite some superficial convergences, greater connection produces significant differentiation of world areas and populations from each other as a function of a) their locations within the full set of flows and b) previously existing local institutions and networks

competing accounts of globalization—notably those stressing the benefits of market and information integration, those arguing cultural homogenization, and those featuring inequality—generally couple with competing prescriptions and world views

market-centered accounts are even more defective than the rest, because they misconstrue both the processes by which world-wide connections occur and their variable impacts on different parts of the world

to treat globalization as an inexorable natural process is to concede power to its relatively few beneficiaries and to ignore its grounding in powersustaining institutions

They disagree, in contrast, on whether states are losing power to finance capital, on the extent and character of changes in capital-labor relations, on the role of labor-displacing technologies, on the persistence or dissolution of regional economies, on the significance of foreign investment for local and national income inequalities, on whether globalization-driven changes in urban labor markets underlie international migration flows, on causes of recent changes in inequality, and therefore on likely effects of different intervention strategies.

Among the book’s authors, the theses of Saskia Sassen come in for greater empirical challenges (notably from Richard Staring, Ivan Light, and Jack Burgess) than any others, but that is partly because she has long since articulated concrete arguments that are actually open to refutation by means of local and national evidence. Outside of migration and urban labor forces, contributors have trouble bringing observations of places and organizations to bear on the book’s main controversies. While Alejandro Portes, for example, provides his usual lucid analysis of transnational migrant communities, he does not connect that analysis with the major points at issue in the book. Even Orvar Löfgren’s engaging vignettes of changes in technologies of movement and communication serve mainly to raise doubts about any possible generalizations.

Don Kalb’s stirring introduction makes two weaknesses of the book’s chapters all the more visible. First, Kalb rightly insists that public discussion of globalization involves a rhetorical contest, an effort to persuade. Yet beyond Kalb’s opening remarks and occasional jabs at rejected views, no author takes on the task of analyzing the competing rhetorics currently in play, the terms of the contest, or the stakes of its outcome. Second, Kalb’s call to analyze “institutions, networks, re-territorialization, and localization” implies concentrating on ethnography and historical reconstruction at local and regional scales in order to
observe how variable forms of connection actually produce their effects. The book includes smart stylized history by Michael Hanagan. It includes Alan Warde’s informative report on who eats foreign food in London, Bristol, and Preston. But it lacks that confrontation between globalization theories and terre à terre historical ethnography the present confused discussion so sorely needs.

Charles Tilly  
*Columbia University*


This bibliography is quite an impressive effort. It is extensive, thorough, structurally sound, and contains excellent indexes. In short, it is a truly useful tool for anyone who, for scholarly or political reasons, takes an interest in Trotsky and Trotskyism. Of course, the definition of Trotskyism is somewhat blurred; too many people have used the concept subjectively, either with positive or negative connotations, for it to signify anything unambiguous. The Lubitzes have done their utmost to remedy this state of affairs by disregarding sectarian restraints and by choosing a broad approach to the subject; they have even gone to the extreme of including some anti-Trotskyist effusions of no real scholarly or current political value.

This, the third edition, has been enlarged considerably in comparison with the first edition: from 3,227 entries to 9,534, including an annex of texts, most of which date from 1998. It could probably grow even further since Latin America in particular seems to be sparsely covered, especially considering the relatively strong Trotskyist groups that have had a presence in several Latin American countries, something that is not reflected by the bibliography. This does not, however, detract from the value of the material registered; we have been provided with an extensive and useful tool.

The bibliography strives to cover all aspects of Trotsky’s biography, his theoretical oeuvres, and political endeavours and assessments, including Trotsky’s legacy, which is what Trotskyism largely represents. Trotskyism originated as a line of thought within the SUCP and the Comintern, later growing into an independent grouping which, even before the founding of the Fourth International in 1938, had split into several mutually antagonistic organizations. The bibliography includes entries in twenty-five European languages, many of which are, of course, also spoken outside Europe. Approximately forty percent of the entries are in English, though most of the non-English language titles have been translated into English in a note. Russian, German, and French represent seventeen, fifteen, and fourteen percent respectively. In terms of geographical distribution, the United States leads the field with twenty-one percent of the en-
tries, followed by the Soviet Union, Great Britain, France, Germany, and Italy. Other countries account for about one percent or less.

There is a clear time factor involved; the period between 1920–29 covers ten percent of all entries, whereas each of the three decades from 1970 to 1998 cover twenty-three, twenty-one, and twenty-four percent respectively. A few Trotskyist organisations have, in fact, achieved a degree of influence in recent years, most notably in France, but this will not suffice to explain the renewed surge in interest. In the introduction the compilers point to a possible explanation: Trotsky and Trotskyism have become suitable subjects for academic theses (p.x).

It is essential that a bibliography have a sound structure and good indexes that enable users to find the articles they are looking for. Here these requirements are amply fulfilled. There are nine main chapters and over one hundred sub-chapters and references to titles found under other headings. The six indexes cover authors, titles, sources (periodicals, anthologies, etc.), series, dissertations, and conferences; there are many ways of finding the information one is looking for. Finally, there is a list of abbreviations used in the bibliography. Each entry contains all the requisite bibliographical information. In some cases an additional note provides a list of contents, the original title, references to any translations, other publications of the same text, and finally, in chapter eight, a reference to reviews.

Chapters eight and nine deserve special mention. Chapter eight registers reviews of individual publications of the many different essays by Trotsky, on Trotskyism, and the writings of individual authors, so that it is, for instance, possible to compare the different assessments of Robert J. Alexander’s International Trotskyism (Durham, NC, 1991) or Isaac Deutscher’s Trotsky biography. In addition to allowing interesting publications to be found, it is fair to say that this chapter demonstrably digs deep to include relevant reviews, despite the fact that not all of them have been included.

Chapter nine contains biographical material, often obituaries, on approximately one hundred deceased Trotskyists, some of whom were no longer Trotskyists at the time of their death. C.L.R. James and Ernest Mandel take up a great deal of space, although others may for good reasons be more interesting. Hal Draper, for example, whose scholarly work and political analysis deserve a degree of attention beyond what is devoted to him as yet, is one of these. What we do get is, therefore, all the more important. Again, it is fair to say that the bibliography does not impose upon itself any inappropriate restraints.

The editors deserve considerable recognition for having prepared this work, in a similar fashion to the recognition they received for their formidable editorial survey of the Trotskyist press (Trotskyist Serials Bibliography, 1927–1991 [Munich, 1993]). Recriminations are sure to be voiced by some of the Trotskyist sects, which might seem only fair from a narrow, sectarian position, but in this case the point of the exercise as far as the editors are concerned has been precisely that of transgressing sectarianism.

Gerd Callesen

Arbejderbevaegelsens Bibliotek og Arkiv, Copenhagen

This study of urban labor in Pernambuco draws on the author’s experience in the 1980s and early 1990s as a trade union lawyer and legal advisor to the leftist trade union confederation *Central Única dos Trabalhadores* (CUT) (161). Formed in 1983, the CUT is the institutional expression of the New Unionism identified with Luis Inácio Lula da Silva, founder of a new Workers’ Party (PT) in 1979.

After describing the corporatist legal framework for industrial relations, chapter two introduces the reader to the salient characteristics of the CUT Model with its rejection of state tutelage and advocacy of a radical and militant rank-and-file oriented unionism. Unions in the poorer Northeastern states, the author admits, were not among the pioneering sectors of the labor movement most concerned with surmounting the corporatist framework and establishing alternative conceptions of industrial relations. Such “New Unions” were more common in Brazil’s most industrialized state, São Paulo, in the late 1970s (162, 253). Despite these geographical limitations, the New Unionism’s predominant strategy of “boring from within” the existing corporatist union structures would produce an explosive expansion of the CUT, whose affiliates, by 1995, would represent seventeen million workers, including much of organized labor in Pernambuco.

Chapter four provides a sketch of local labor struggle since 1978, a review of the implantation of the CUT and its rivals, and background data on the seven trade unions that are the focus of his study. The book’s most important research findings derive from a 1994 questionnaire to 211 members of seven unions affiliated to CUT and non-CUT labor confederations. It was designed to test a claim put forward by new unionism activists that the alternative model of unionism practiced by the CUT unions contributed to greater active citizenship among its members than that of unions affiliated to traditional (non-CUT) unions (162, 191). Unfortunately, the author’s either/or classification, which assumes only two possible types of union models, obscures the fact that his own descriptions have shown the latter group to be not uniformly traditional, nor the former so radically innovative. The CUT metalworkers, for example, actively used the labor courts and did not abolish medical and dental assistance to members, supposed hallmarks of the CUT model (140, 196).

Conceptual problems of research design go unresolved, as the author makes no effort to gauge the implications of his admission that even different CUT unions “display distinctive levels of adherence to the alternative model,” or that existing corporatist structures have also marked CUT’s “leadership attitudes, cultural environment, internal practices, and theoretical conceptions.” His “difficulty in constructing scales to measure degrees of adoption” led him to a “dichotomic strategy. That is, we assume that the differences between the CUT model and the traditional ones are real, it being justifiable to compare their different impacts on membership attitudes” (163).

The author does not fully resolve questions of causality that are central to
his claim that members’ active citizenship attitudes are fostered by a union’s adoption of the CUT model. As he notes, a union’s affiliation with the CUT may have developed precisely because of pre-existing characteristics of that groups of workers (those with “a tradition of mobilization, [or] whose members were prone to participate.”) Admitting this, Barros simply claims that the model may still have helped to “improve workers’ consciousness” (166). In addition, he recognizes that one cannot “assume that the model of industrial relations espoused by a given union is the only factor to influence their members active citizenship” but feels comfortable proceeding as long as it is a factor (158). And finally, he does not consider the possibility that questionnaire responses may simply reflect a greater familiarity with a certain New Unionist rhetoric by members of a CUT union. If they were true, his findings, though significant, would still fall short of his larger claim that “an alternative model of unionism and labour relations . . . [has] shaped distinctive workers’ attitudes towards citizenship” and created a distinct political culture of active citizenship (1).

The processing and analysis of the questionnaire data is also problematic. Barros takes the individual’s responses to the survey’s seventy-five questions, grouped into what he calls modules, and gives each respondent a final score, which in turn becomes the basis for the aggregate average scores for each union (the measure that carries the analytical weight of his argument). This approach, as he emphasizes, is intended “to depict differences of intensity or degree” rather than reporting “data on percentages of a population espousing certain opinions, as usually done in the so-called public opinion polls” (290). Yet this procedure gives little sense of the dispersion of answers within each surveyed group and no sense at all of any shared tendencies within or between groups (i.e., is there a modal non-mobilized worker within all or some of these unions?). The resulting weakness is suggested when an average appears that does not fit his desired thesis. For example, when he addresses the high cynicism regarding politics in all groups (201), or a situation in which a non-CUT union does “better” than a CUT union (199), he merely notes the anomaly in order to discount or discard it.

More surprisingly, Barros’s book does not probe for similarities and differences between member responses within differing subsets of the seven occupations. For example, it would have been useful to probe responses from the members of two predominantly manual industrial categories, for example, the CUT metalworkers and the non-CUT textile union whose respondents were eighty-five percent blue-collar. This group might then be contrasted with the two most highly educated categories of white-collar employees: telecommunications workers and bank employees, both CUT affiliates. Thirty-two to thirty-three percent of these respondents earned more than ten times the minimum wage while seventy-six percent of the non-CUT commercial employee respondents earn less than two times the minimum wage (265).

And finally, Barros’s data suggests the need for a more detailed consideration of the impact of levels of education, especially in a society with high degrees of absolute and functional illiteracy. The results for three of his four CUT af-
filiates: telecommunications, data processing, and bank employees, show that twenty-nine, thirty-one, and forty-four percent, respectively, had fifteen or more years of education, while only one of the non-CUT union samples, pharmaceutical workers, had respondents with that level of education, only thirteen percent (264). What is being measured when three of his four chosen CUT unions are composed of relatively well paid employees? This is particularly problematic since interest in politics and feelings of political efficacy are among his prime indicators of active citizenship and thus of the effectiveness of the CUT union model (174). This problem is further compounded by the fact that his chosen indicators of active citizenship encompass only four union-related responses and six political-electoral ones (192), though he does not discuss the political action programs of CUT unions.

In the conclusion, the author provides a table of attendance at union general assemblies (242). There is no doubt that the CUT unions stand out for the frequency of their meetings, twenty to forty a year versus two a year for non-CUT unions, and the existence of an activist core of regular attendees. Yet this favorable impression shifts if you measure attendance as a percentage of total union membership provided earlier. In such a measurement, the union that apparently mobilizes the largest share of its members is the non-CUT pharmaceutical workers union, with sixty-two percent, while the CUT metal and non-CUT textile workers unions come in next with nine and thirteen percent respectively. The two other CUT unions turn out five to seven percent of their members, but the largest single CUT union, the 16,000 strong union of bank employees, attracts on average less than one percent of its membership to its meetings, as does the heavily criticized non-CUT commercial workers union with 8,000 members.

The overall impression of a hastily-researched book is confirmed by his unfamiliarity with the sophisticated investigations of the New Unionism in Bahia, the Northeast’s other large state, carried out by Nadya Castro, Sérgio Guimarães, and their many students, collaborators, and associates. It is also distressing that Barros fails to draw on the most important social scientific monographs on Pernambuco’s workers, their unions, and their struggles. Research done by Lygia Sigaud (1979, 1980) and Anthony Pereira (1997) on rural workers, Sergio Leite Lopes (1988), and Maria Rosilene Barbosa Alvim (1995) on textile workers, and a 1990 survey of textile and metalworkers by Jacob Carlos Lima (1996) should be taken into account. Lima, for example, emphasizes the continuity of the Pernambuco’s worker struggles, stemming from a long-existing worker culture with its own traditions of organization and mobilization. Lima does recognize that the period since the late 1970s has been marked by the occurrence of novel events throughout the country, which lead him to conclude that, given such events, we can speak of a new Pernambucan unionism. Yet unlike Barros, Lima sees such newness as “not necessarily linked to specific trade union centrals, but to all of them” (Jacob Carlos Lima, Trabalho, Mercado e Formação de Classe: Estudo sobre Operários Fabris em Pernambuco [João Pessoa, 1996] 194). The use of this and the previously mentioned monographs would not
only have enriched Barros’s cultural analysis but would have challenged his emphasis on newness and CUT distinctiveness.

John D. French  
*Duke University*


The agrarian reform launched by Peruvian President Juan Velasco Alvarado in 1968 yielded unexpected rewards for historians. As the estates of landed oligarches came under the control of the agrarian reform administration enterprising scholars collected surviving hacienda records and transported them to Lima. The documents were deposited in a new agrarian archive, El Archivo del Fuero Agrario, located in a dilapidated former school house in the working class neighborhood of El Rímac and kept going on a shoe-string by a dedicated director, Humberto Rodríguez Pastor. The centrality of agrarian history to Latin American Studies and Third World History as well as the seeming incongruity of a left-wing military government attracted visits by J. Eric Hobsbawm and Juan Martínez-Alier. Hobsbawm later published “Peasant Land Occupations,” (*Past and Present* 62, 1974) and Martínez-Alier wrote *Los huacchilleros del Perú* (Lima, 1973), which was the first monograph based primarily on agrarian archive materials.

By late 1973, when I first passed through the archive’s doors, several Peruvian scholars were engaged in research projects in the largely open air facility. Humberto Rodríguez Pastor put us all to work organizing documents, writing inventories, and attempting minor construction projects (which he called *mingsas*, after Andean communal labor). The archive could only survive if we worked together and kept the building from falling down. The unsettled political climate also added a sense of urgency to our work. I shall never forget my wife and I navigating our way on foot through the streets of Lima during the bloody riot of February, 1974, and the prolonged arrest-on-sight evening curfew that followed.

During the 1970s, several foreign scholars, mostly younger historians from the United States and Britain, arrived to begin research in the Archivo del Fuero Agrario, and their subsequent publications changed the way we viewed Peruvian agrarian and social history. Among the first to arrive was Vincent Peloso, whose monograph under review here revisits important themes in Peruvian plantation history through an innovative lens.

Peloso’s book is a study of the small (385 hectares) cotton plantation “Palto,” located in the Pisco River Valley south of Lima and owned by the influential Aspillaga family. The book begins in the 1880s, following the devastation of coastal agriculture during the War of the Pacific (1879–1884), and ends with the cotton boom of the 1930s. Peloso places peasants at the center of the action. He
argues that peasants willingly entered into tenancy contracts in the late nineteenth century to gain access to land and credit, and effectively resisted managers’ attempts to erode their social and economic position. In the process, peasants decisively shaped plantation society and culture. By the 1920s, however, peasant resistance finally succumbed to planter hegemony, as fixed-rent tenancy, which afforded peasants greater control over production, gave way to sharecropping and rationalization.

Peloso’s study begins in the wake of the Chilean occupation of Peru after the disastrous War of the Pacific. The coastal economy lay in ruins and the Aspillagas scrambled to maintain production on Palto and on their large sugar cane plantation Cayaltí, located on the northern coast. In the midst of the turmoil, planters all along the coast relied on the same Chinese laborers who had originally come to Peru as indentured servants decades earlier, and who now worked as wage and contracted laborers under conditions resembling slavery. As the number of able-bodied Chinese declined, however, plantations suffered from severe labor shortages that threatened their survival.

In the Pisco Valley, local peasants, mostly of African and Afro-mestizo heritage, took advantage of the crisis and gained access to plantation land as fixed-rent tenants. The rental contract granted villagers stewardship over the land and access to credit. If planters violated their agreements with peasants, moreover, renters effectively resisted the outrage by fleeing the estate and thus undermining production.

After the turn of the century, Palto’s managers exerted more control over production by phasing out fixed-rent contracts in favor of sharecropping. Sharecroppers received seed, credit, and equipment from the estate, which increased their dependence on management and further divided the plantation social order. Renters and sharecroppers fought with the estate administrator over labor obligations, land and water rights, and outstanding loans. In 1907 a major flood damaged the estate, reduced production, and caused many peasants to default. Management’s insistence that tenants and sharecroppers help with repairs increased tensions and Palto’s renters protested, in a politely worded letter, to the Aspillagas in 1908.

During the commodities boom of the First World War the Aspillagas asserted their authority and undermined tenant autonomy. Managers completed the switch to sharecropping, limited production to cotton, and forbade the grazing of cattle. Renters’ complaints to managers and owners fell on deaf ears, which demonstrated the fragility of patron-client relations. A protest rally in the provincial capital attended by tenants from around the valley was easily suppressed by authorities.

During and after the war, planters benefited from rising cotton prices and increases in labor supply, as a steady stream of migrants descended from the nearby Andes in search of seasonal employment all along the coast. Most highlanders (serranos) had signed contracts with labor contractors (enganchadores), who sometimes received the right to operate stores on the plantations. Contractors advanced money to peasants against future wages and sold them goods
on credit, and laborers could accumulate substantial debts. Although debt peonage existed on Peruvian plantations, studies of north coast sugar estates have shown that worker resistance and planter inefficiency limited its effectiveness. Peloso’s research uncovers little evidence of debt peonage at Palto until the 1930s, which suggests that similar conditions prevailed there.

Rationalization of production quickened during the 1920s. The Aspíllagas reduced production costs by investing in tractors, contracting with major cotton processors, and increasing sharecroppers’ labor obligations to the estate. Increasing numbers of migrants worked directly for the estate as wage laborers, which created an increasingly heterogeneous plantation social order. Sharecroppers unhappy with their situation resisted by fleeing the estate.

Rising cotton prices on the international market in the 1930s encouraged further managerial scrutiny. Planters squeezed more labor from sharecroppers and their families, fertilized fields more extensively, and enjoyed the profits. Several sugar growers, impressed with the results, dug up their fields and planted cotton. Peru’s “golden age” of cotton came largely at the expense of plantation laborers. Planters profited by tightening credit, raising prices at company stores, and increasing rents and labor requirements. Debt peonage became widespread. By the end of the decade soil exhaustion, plant disease, and rising costs limited production and profits for sharecroppers and planters alike.

This book is a welcome addition to the literature in this area. Peloso succeeds in teasing new information about Palto’s peasants from plantation records, and he enriches our understanding of plantation society and culture. His work is theoretically informed by subaltern studies, without resorting to dense paradigms, and is distinguished by a readable style and handsome photographs from the period.

That said, I have general criticisms of this book. Peloso’s focus on peasants sometimes obscures the importance of managers and the marketplace in the formation of plantation society. Peloso recognizes the inherent inequality of peasant-landlord relations, but planters’ role in the formation of plantation society is sometimes muted. For example, following the War of the Pacific, Peloso does not mention that the Aspíllagas exacerbated acute labor shortages by shipping the majority of Palto’s Chinese laborers to their large sugar cane plantation Cayaltí. This action hastened the transition to cotton tenant farming.

Peloso makes clear what peasants gained from fixed-rent tenancy, but he does not discuss the benefits that planters derived. From the Aspillagas’ perspective, tenant farming solved their labor shortages and passed onto peasants most of the risks of production during a period of economic and political crisis. Rental contracts were the nexus of peasant access to land and credit, but they also guaranteed planters scarce labor and the bulk of the cotton crop. When disputes arose over tenant contracts, peasants took flight and left planters, in Peloso’s words, “to bellow helplessly about the inconstancy of labor” (159). Nevertheless, Palto’s records show that growers retaliated against fleeing tenants by confiscating crops, claiming improvements to the property, and suing for breach of contract.
The period of most effective peasant resistance occurred during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Peasants deserve credit for whatever advantages they managed to squeeze from planters through whatever means. Still, some of the credit for their success should go the Aspillagas’ managerial neglect, which created an environment favorable to peasant resistance. For example, the owners rarely visited the estate, invested modestly in its operations, and left its daily administration to marginally competent estate managers. Production and profits remained modest. Bad management created opportunities for peasants to avoid payment of loans, cheat the estate, and take advantage of frazzled administrators.

When the Aspillagas improved estate administration peasant resistance faltered. The First World War commodities boom gave the Aspillagas the capital and incentive they needed to firm up their control. They hired a competent estate administrator and had their local cotton broker (and cousin) inspect the estate twice a month and oversee tenant loans. The owners also increased their control over production by ending fixed-rent tenancy, which provoked bitterness and outrage from renters, some of whom had been on the estate for years. Renters’ public pleas and protests changed nothing.

Despite Peloso’s focus on peasants, he does not present a systematic discussion of relations between peasants of different races and cultures. In the late nineteenth century, animosity between Afro-Peruvians and Chinese was commonplace on coastal plantations. In 1881, in an infamous event well known to historians, Afro-Peruvians massacred over 1,000 Chinese in the Cañete Valley. It seems implausible that tensions between the two cultures would have disappeared within a generation. Did racial conflict undermine peasant unity and resistance?

In addition, after the turn of the century thousands of Indian villagers descended from the nearby Andes into the Pisco Valley to work on cotton estates. These were Quechua speaking peasants unaccustomed to wage labor, the coastal climate, and local culture; their transition to plantation life must have been difficult. The presence of these emigrant laborers created an exploited sub-class with distinctive linguistic, racial, and cultural characteristics. Planters considered Indians racially inferior, and Afro-Peruvians and Chinese undoubtedly recognized natives’ distinctive features and culture. Were Indian migrants integrated into peasant communities on the plantations or did they form their own communities on the fringes of the estates?

These questions serve as suggestions for future research. More insights into plantation society and culture can be discovered in the plantation records collected by enterprising scholars twenty-five years ago and now housed in the Archivo General de la Nación in Lima.

Michael J. Gonzales

Northern Illinois University

Covington Hall was a lifelong labor activist and a member of the Industrial Workers of the World. Hall edited labor newspapers and was a contributor to socialist and labor movement publications including the *Industrial Worker*, the *One Big Union Monthly*, and the original *International Socialist Review*. For years, his unpublished manuscript on Southern labor, a work that is both history and memoir, has been a resource for historians of labor in and near Louisiana. Now it is widely available, with an introduction by David Roediger. Hall tells a lively story about key movements in Louisiana labor history from the 1880s to 1914, but he is not always able to capture or explain the broad sweep of events. And the introduction by David Roediger does less than it should, offering little analysis of the unions Hall will describe or of the social settings in which they operated. Oddly, Roediger does not take the opportunity to apply his theories on “the wages of whiteness” to Hall’s text; perhaps this is because New Orleans white workers don’t seem to be receiving them. Hall himself deals with issues of race and unionism as they arise in particular situations, but not as themes in southern or American labor history.

The strengths and weaknesses of Hall’s approach are visible in his treatment of the New Orleans general strike of 1892, a struggle that followed more than a decade of gains by city unions. The strike was declared by the Workingmen’s Amalgamated Council of the American Federation of Labor (AFL), drawing together skilled and unskilled workers who were outside of the well-organized, biracial cotton trade unions. The strike began with a walkout by a group of unions representing workers in the sugar and molasses trade. Between 20,000 and 30,000 workers ultimately joined the strike, but the threat of intervention by 5,000 state soldiers forced the unions to settle. They won wage increases, but did not win the union shop, and at some workplaces strikers were not rehired. Hall captures the excitement of the strike with a running narrative of the back-and-forth negotiations but does not evaluate its consequences.

Eric Arnesen, the leading historian of New Orleans’ waterfront unions, concludes that the failure of the strike to extend the boundaries of union organization was an important cause of the growth of corporate power and deepening of racial divisions throughout the depression-ridden 1890’s. The collapse of the Amalgamated Council soon after the strike destroyed an important arena of racial cooperation. After the depression began in 1893, the rising tide of white supremacist ideas eroded traditions of class solidarity for some white workers, who attempted to force black workers from the docks, long a bastion of interracialism. Hall recognizes that the strike ended in compromise, but says nothing about what happened to the labor movement through the rest of the decade.

Hall’s narrative returns to New Orleans thirteen years later, in 1905, when efforts by the Teamsters to displace the industrially-organized United Brewery Workers consumed the attention of the New Orleans labor movement. The Teamsters were backed by a national AFL-ruling declaring their union’s craft ju-
risdiction over drivers at New Orleans breweries. In the fight that followed, the Brewery Workers and 24 other unions launched a new assembly, the United Labor Council, as an alternative to the AFL-dominated council. Support for the new organization revealed widespread opposition to the AFL's interference and frustration with its organizing strategies.

Yet here again, Hall's story seems incomplete. He claims that the new council “quickly became the center of working class power in New Orleans.” Yet although the council was initially widely backed and enjoyed support from the powerful Dock and Cotton Council and the black Central Labor Union, it was short-lived. The Brewery Workers themselves reconciled with the AFL in 1908, something Hall does not mention. And while Hall writes that the Brewery Workers ultimately retained the right to represent brewery drivers, Eric Arneson has shown that the Teamsters successfully completed their raids by 1909.

The jurisdictional battle was quickly followed by a massive waterfront strike in late 1907, which confronted employers determined to gain greater control over dock labor. The key issues were not wages, but work rules. Steamship agents won an increased workload, but failed to significantly reduce the day-to-day authority of the dock unions. Hall sees the strike's settlement as a union defeat. Yet not only did work rules continue to favor the unions, but the interracial alliance of waterfront unions held strong, laying the basis for solid years of wage gains and stable conditions. The strength of such an alliance is particularly significant given the racial strife of the 1890s and the triumph of Jim Crow politics in the first decade of the twentieth century. New Orleans workers resisted the dominant ideas of their age out of hard-won experience of the costs of racism and the potency of divide and conquer strategies. Hall's silence on these issues is puzzling and Roediger could have attempted to explain them in his introduction.

The ability of black and white workers to build relatively stable long-term alliances in New Orleans stands in sharp contrast to the experiences of workers elsewhere in the state. Politics mattered in New Orleans. The city’s Democratic Party machine, despite its enormous faults, was beholden to white working class votes. In 1892, New Orleans’ elite had to turn to the Louisiana State militia, not to local police, for the show of force that ended the strike. The city’s failure to satisfy business demands drove three decades of attempts at political and civil service “reform.”

But while troops intimidated unions in New Orleans, they killed with impunity in rural areas. Hall recounts the struggles of sugar workers who rallied behind the Knights of Labor in the 1880s. Of the 10,000 workers who struck the sugar plantations, 1,000 were white, showing that interracial solidarity was not limited to New Orleans. But the 1887 strike was brutally crushed by state authorities and planters who massacred workers and imported thousands of strikebreakers from Mississippi.

Like the sugar workers, those working in lumber also discovered that interracial organization in the era of Jim Crow met armed resistance. From 1910 through U.S. entry into World War I, Hall supported efforts to organize the in-
dustry, serving as a publicist for the Brotherhood of Timber Workers. The Brotherhood existed from 1910 to 1913 and affiliated with the IWW in 1912. At its 1912 convention Hall and Wobbly leader William “Big Bill” Haywood convinced union members to hold integrated assemblies, in defiance of segregationist norms. Remarkably, the union also gave voting rights to the wives of lumber workers. The Brotherhood grew quickly and survived a broad lockout by timber mill owners, but was drained by legal fees resulting from a shoot-out when company gunmen ambushed union supporters. Soon after, the union was defeated in a major strike in Merryville, Louisiana.

David Roediger’s introduction to the book provides useful information about Hall’s life and about the use of his manuscript by historians. The text would have been strengthened, however, by a greater effort to compare Hall’s account with studies by historians. The thinness of such comparison makes it difficult for readers to evaluate the accuracy of Hall’s assertions. At key points he draws conclusions that are at odds with judgments of historians. Introducing a primary source, Roediger should have assessed the differences more rigorously. Roediger does include references that offer broader perspectives on the labor struggles Hall describes. But he should have provided more of the context, structure, and historiography surrounding these events, which address important issues in southern and labor history.

David Thurston
City University of New York


Howell J. Harris has written an important book that should spark much discussion among historians of labor, who in their rush from institutional history have all but abandoned the history of labor relations. He is one of only a handful of scholars who have studied the history of modern labor relations systems. And a careful reading of *Bloodless Victories* shows what labor historians have been missing.

We know a great deal about the management practices and labor relations policies of large firms. We have studied Taylorism and welfare capitalism. However, we know surprisingly little about the small and mid-sized businesses, which make up the vast majority of American workplaces, employ the bulk of American workers, and are the most antiunion of businesses. Harris’s book is an attempt to partially remedy this through the telling history of the Metal Manufacturers’ Association of Philadelphia from 1890–1940 and their struggles for a union-free industry. One must be impressed with the sheer level of research needed to rebuild this world. The MMA was a regional manufacturers’ association with a core of mid-sized firms. Through this book, we get a glimpse into their world.

Harris’s book tells of three stages of “bloodless victories” of management
over labor: the ascendency of the Open Shop (1904–1915), the partial accommodation with labor during the New Deal, and the postwar partial return of the old labor system, dealt with in an afterword. Taken as a whole, Harris suggests that America’s century was clearly business’ century. Harris’s claim, that for all labor historians’ talk about the “the turbulent years” of the New Deal the real gains for workers were few and short-lived, is sure to raise a chorus of objections.

Philadelphia was one of the centers of metal manufacturing. The mid-sized shops Harris focuses on were family, single-owner or limited partnerships. They were “proprietary capitalist” in orientation. These owners/managers ran their shops directly and depended on a well-paid skilled workforce. Yet, their world was changing rapidly in the early twentieth century.

One of the changes that most concerned the owners of metal shops was the rise of labor unions. These men were fiercely antiunion and ardent open shop supporters. The MMA, founded in 1903, had roots in local business clubs. As the city’s workers started organizing, these shops found themselves ill equipped to fight the unions alone and therefore banded together. Harris has reconstructed the social world of these businessmen to explain why such individualistic manufacturers would band together collectively so quickly and easily. The MMA became central to their business world because it provided several important services.

One of the most important activities of the new MMA was supplying scab labor to member shops during strikes. It quickly established a Labor Bureau where replacement workers were recruited and registered. The MMA cooperated with national manufacturing and industry groups to screen out unionists and establish a core body of nonunion workers. In the early years, this was easy due to high unemployment in an industry without a tradition of labor activism. Union discipline was initially weak in the city, but when it strengthened, the Labor Bureau simply recruited from outside the city. The MMA’s ability to supply replacement workers enabled its members to defeat all unionization drives in their industry. By 1915 the MMA was victorious and the Philadelphia metal trades were union free.

In addition to providing scab labor the MMA also provided important data to its members. The MMA worked with a team of social scientists at the Wharton School. These reports presented detailed labor statistics to member firms who used this data to keep to an “industry standard” of wages so as not to drive up wages. They could also use the information to force low-wage firms to conform to industry norms, eliminating what was an important union complaint. The MMA also offered information and training in personnel management to help their members modernize hiring practices. In addition, in the 1920s the MMA worked with the city’s public schools to establish a vocational educational system. All of this was in the name of providing union free skilled workers to their membership. Harris flatly rejects Harry Braverman’s thesis about the de-skilling nature of industrial capitalism.

Labor activism returned to the industry in 1933 as a result of Section 7(A) of the NIRA. After regaining control over their labor in the 1920s after a brief troubled period during WW I, the 1930s brought change in the form of more mil-
itant workers, more aggressive unions and the New Deal state. The August 1933
strike settlement of the non-MMA member Philco changed the playing field.
Philco’s “strategic mistake,” according to Harris who seems throughout to be
rooting for the MMA, was that it paid too high a price for labor peace: union
recognition. Starting in 1934, MMA member firms fought labor drives with some
success. But they soon realized that while they could win, the price they paid was
too high: money for legal fees to fight NLRB decisions cut into revenue. Final-
ly and “without drama,” writes Harris, “three decades of open shop policy were
discarded in an instant . . .” as the MMA sought accommodation with the new
industrial order of the New Deal. (412)

Bloodless Victories is an important book because it offers us a glimpse into
the managerial world of mid-level industrial America. It offers us an alternative to
the “corporate liberal” school of interpretation. The one weakness I find with this
work, and I do truly admire this book, is that it ignores workers. Because of its sole
focus on the MMA, its leaders, and the managers of its member firms, workers are
completely absent. And, while one cannot honestly ask that this book be some-
ting it is not, I think it would have been a more compelling story (if not different)
had Harris looked more closely at workers. Harris provides no agency for the in-
dustry’s workers. We know nothing about them. What happened on the shop floor
in these open shops? We know workers made “accommodations” with welfare
capitalism; is this also true of the open shop? Harris suggests that the MMA’s ef-
forts at vocational training were partly caused by the “turnover” problem. Were
workers voting with their feet? What of the workers in the Communist metal
trades unions? More centrally, industrial relations is a dialogue (unequal as it is)
between workers and managers. In the mid-20th century, it is a dialogue involving
the state as well. By not paying attention to labor, Harris’s is an incomplete tale.

I also found Harris’s introduction strange for its outright rejection of race
and gender as important categories of historical inquiry. Written surely to be
provocative, it seems misplaced. He is correct that this is after all a book about
WASP businessmen and their world. But neither these men nor their workers
lived such isolated lives. During the wars women entered these firms, a subject
that is not discussed. I am sure that African-Americans did too. While their so-
journ might have been temporary, their impact surely could not have been. The
sheer absence of race and gender is important and clearly shaped the cultural
world of these shops. The absence of race and gender, as scholars such as Joan
Scott and David Roediger suggest, is important and needs to be explored. I be-
lieve his book would have been stronger had he looked into this.

Such criticism aside, Harris’s book will inform a generation of business and
labor historians and will no doubt be a spark for new research. Harris has raised
many important issues and has explored the history of business associations in
such detail that anyone writing about industry during this period will be well ad-
vised to read his book.

Richard A. Greenwald
United States Merchant Marine Academy

Kimberley Phillips adds a fine study of African-Americans’ northward migration, community development, and working-class formation to a series of similar works published in the 1980s and 1990s. *Alabama North* opens new reaches of African-Americans’ early twentieth century experience in both North and South, but especially in Cleveland, a major industrial city and significant destination for Southern black migrants. We have known most about the city’s African-American community at this time from the landmark study of ghetto development by Ken Kusmer, published in 1976. Like the more recent field of research which has examined black migration and migrants in Northern industrial cities, Phillips focuses her study not on the spatial and social aspects of African-Americans’ increasingly segregated community but on the racial, class, and gender dynamics that produced a particular form of community in Cleveland.

*Alabama North* enriches the new field of African-American migration studies through its sophisticated treatment of the role of Southern origins in the migrants’ Cleveland experiences, through a vigorous investigation of black women migrants’ part in the formation of a new black community, and through a fascinating examination of the Future Outlook League, a black community organization with a Southern migrant and working-class base. Kim Phillips’s portrayal of migrants in Cleveland yields a clearer picture than we have previously had of a black working-class population.

Like other Northern industrial cities at the opening of the twentieth century, Cleveland was home to a small black population. Beginning with the outbreak of World War One in Europe and continuing at varying levels through mid-century, African-Americans in the South mobilized themselves to move north for work opportunities in expanding industries and to improve their own and their families’ living conditions generally. While many contemporary observers and later analysts have told the story of their city-ward movement, Phillips does an especially fine rendition of the migrants’ journeys to Cleveland. She emphasizes the migrants’ diverse backgrounds of work, Southern places of origin, gender, and family status. She also includes in her description of the northward movement the complex layers of migrants’ motivations, hopes, and perspectives that lead them toward Cleveland. In some respects, the story is a familiar one of people reaching for better employment and rejecting limited economic opportunity and restrictive social barriers, using family contacts in Cleveland to help with long trips to unfamiliar destinations. In other ways, Phillips gives us a deeper, more varied description of how and why Southern African-Americans came to Cleveland. Above all, she argues convincingly that when they arrived in Cleveland, the migrants had already organized and directed a difficult, long-distance move for a better life. Their agency in leaving former homes for Northern work and community shaped their experiences in Cleveland in later decades.
Alabama North follows the lives of Southern blacks who moved to Cleveland through their employment, relationship to organized labor, home and family life, and community associations. Through all phases of her treatment of the migrants’ lives Phillips avoids simple generalizations that would render African-Americans’ experiences in favor of contradictory cross currents and ambiguities. Cleveland’s newcomers broke through previously impervious occupational barriers in industry, transportation, construction, and some types of domestic service, but seldom found work that was not menial, dangerous, subject to early layoffs, or lower-paid than similar work for whites. They often understood and sought the advantages of collective bargaining but seldom overcame the hostility of anti-union employers and discriminatory unions. A large proportion of Southern African-Americans in Cleveland committed themselves to permanent homes in the city without breaking ties to their Southern places of origin or to the particular Southern culture in which they had been raised.

Phillips does a particularly fine job throughout Alabama North with the lives of African-American women in Cleveland. Correctly claiming that previous studies have given too little attention to women’s experiences, she carefully traces the distinct lines of gender in the development of Cleveland’s new African-American community. Aided by the newer historical literature on black women’s work, leisure time pursuits, and home lives, Phillips succeeds admirably in bringing female migrants’ experiences to the foreground of her study. Her outstanding treatment of African-American women in Cleveland contributes greatly to the richly textured analysis in Alabama North overall, compared to other studies of Southern blacks’ migration.

Perhaps a greater contribution in Phillips’ book is the story of the Future Outlook League, which was Cleveland’s militant African-American organization that started in the 1930s. She brings together several of her other major themes in analyzing the rise of the League. Lead by the Alabama migrant John O. Holly, the FOL enjoyed its first success in “Don’t Buy Where You Can’t Work” campaigns against white merchants in Cleveland’s black ghetto. In some respects, it used the organizing methods and the style of aggressive street demonstrations tested by radicals and militant labor organizations in the early 1930s. African-American radicals with previous experience in the Communist party and in unions allied with the FOL. Opening jobs for African Americans in the depths of the Depression gave the FOL a broad following among working-class blacks in Cleveland, many of them Southern-born like Holly and relatively recent arrivals in the city. The FOL’s membership base and its militant tactics dismayed Cleveland’s black elite, which preferred painstaking negotiations with white business and political leaders in the city. FOL’s leadership, membership, and militancy during the Depression brought to the fore the new world of African-American urban communities.

Phillips weaves gender and class into her analysis of the Future Outlook League. Black women played important roles in all aspects of the FOL’s work, from recruiters, to picketers, to negotiators with employers and with black ministers and other leaders of Cleveland’s African-American community. Phillips
convincingly shows that black women workers, suffering the greatest job insecurity and discrimination of all black employees, responded warmly to the FOL’s appeal. They were also most often the primary consumers in African-American households, directly bearing the struggle to make ends meet. Phillips shows that the African-American women used their community social and political organizations to reinforce the FOL, just as they drew strength from their traditional roles in black churches to help the campaigns for economic justice.

Phillips’s book ends with a description of the World War II years. Cleveland blacks’ great difficulty in achieving fair consideration for industrial employment in the booming job market of the early 1940s attenuated the steps toward class solidarity. Phillips recounts the harrowing experiences for African-American workers who sought jobs in Cleveland factories as production rapidly expanded during World War II. Men and women alike met stiff and unremitting barriers from employers who flouted the fair employment policies of the federal government. Unions were not consistently supportive of blacks’ efforts to get jobs and to advance occupationally. The war concluded with African American employees in Cleveland on the outer, insecure margins of the industrial economy. Despite the increasing power of industrial unions open to black workers, Cleveland’s African-American migrants in 1945 faced many of the same economic battles they had fought since first reaching the city in the World War One era.

The strength of Alabama North comes from the depth and complexity of Phillips’s presentation of blacks’ experiences in Cleveland. But this achievement comes at a price. It is difficult for the reader to grasp the outcomes of migration, urban work, class formation, and the development of new community relations. With the significant exception of the FOL story, Phillips does not outline clear patterns nor provide concise summaries to help us grasp the general tenor of blacks’ experiences in Cleveland. When she ventures generalizations in her conclusion, some seem overly broad. For example, she asserts that African-Americans in Cleveland could perceive their similarities with the city’s white ethnic workers (258). In the later chapters of her book, Phillips describes very well migrants’ complex attitudes toward AFL and CIO unions and their very mixed experience in gaining entry to or equal benefits from union membership.

Phillips ends her study where it begins—with an affirmation of the migrants’ agency in their journeys and social transformation. This almost seems not to say enough, after all the rich evidence on the cross-currents of race, class and gender. Alabama North shows us in fine detail African-Americans’ self-activity and struggle for self-determination. But it also gives us much more that is valuable for a deeper understanding of the parallel processes of migration and class formation.

Peter Gottlieb
State Historical Society of Wisconsin

At one time, historians wrote of a Civil Rights Movement that appeared with the Brown vs. Board of Education decision in 1954, picked up steam around 1960 only to implode by mid-decade, the victim of riots, white backlash, and black power. Recently, historians have begun to question this narrative, recognizing the continuity of black protest before and after the celebrated “heroic phase” of freedom rides, marches, and sit-ins. In his latest book, Timothy Minchin addresses this growing body of literature by examining the post 1964 integration of the traditional symbol of white job privilege—the southern textile industry. Using oral interviews and trial transcripts from anti-discrimination suits, Minchin chronicles the efforts of the government, Civil Rights activists, and ordinary black workers to break into an industry whose size and opportunities for unskilled laborers had the potential to make good on the promises of the Civil Rights movement. Here it seems that activists had a lot to be happy about. Black gains in the industry were impressive, going from just over three percent of the workforce in 1960 to over eighteen percent by 1978. The question is, why?

Surprisingly, few scholars have addressed this change, and the ones who do have argued that an industry-wide labor shortage was responsible for black employment gains. Minchin argues that the labor shortage was certainly a factor, but not the most important. Instead, he points to the role of the federal government, especially the Equal Economic Opportunity Commission, which enforced affirmative action goals and encouraged African Americans to bring discrimination lawsuits under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Minchin begins his analysis with a chapter on the structure of the textile industry before 1964. The typical mill was lily white, with a few black men working the dirtiest and heaviest jobs. In rare instances, black women worked as janitors. Although there were some attempts during World War II to bring black workers into production jobs, most owners backed off of full-scale integration, claiming that their white labor force would revolt. All this changed after the passage of Title VII. Eager to relieve black unemployment in the Piedmont industrial section of the South, Civil Rights activists and the EEOC launched an aggressive campaign to force the industry to hire and promote black workers. The Office of Federal Contract Compliance pressured the industry to implement affirmative action programs by threatening to withhold federal contracts. In 1968, six federal agencies and civil rights groups founded TEAM (Textiles: Employment and Advancement for Minorities) charged with coordinating the integration of the industry. The EEOC also encouraged African-American workers to file discrimination suits against recalcitrant employers.

Federal action was necessary, Minchin notes, because textile firms were so intransigent. Owners argued that white workers would not accept blacks, the community was not ready, or that there were simply not enough qualified black applicants. Interestingly, Minchin points out that managers who initially resist-
ed integration accommodated themselves to the change, and even made it work to their advantage by using the introduction of black labor as an excuse to increase workloads in production jobs. If white employees complained, they could always blame integration on the government.

Minchin is on solid ground here, and his case is generally persuasive, but his real contribution comes in the chapters that focus on the men and women who pioneered these changes. He finds that in most cases early hires were overqualified, well liked, and less likely, management hoped, to be seen as threatening by white workers. Black men were usually promoted from non-production jobs within the plant; black women had usually performed domestic work in the homes of management.

The experience of these pioneers contained some important differences, however. In both oral interviews and lawsuits, black men frequently complained of pay disparities and slow promotions. Black women, on the other hand, had trouble just getting hired. Lawsuits reveal that they were hired at a much lower rate than white women and waited a longer time between filling out applications and being hired. Both men and women complained about low level supervisors who practiced overt discrimination or favoritism (management generally conceded this point but argued that there was little they could do about it). The experience of integration seems to have radicalized black workers. Minchin found that African-Americans were avid supporters of unions that were slow to take up their grievances. In fact, black workers were so consistently supporters of unionization that management used this fact to convince white employees that unions were black organizations.

There is a lot to like about this book. Minchin's focus on the experience of the black workers is especially revealing of both community and shop-floor politics. His use of employment statistics gathered by plaintiffs in discrimination lawsuits illustrates the pay differentials between black and white workers over time. He also makes good use of internal company documents to examine how mill owners tried to use integration to speed up the work process, divide the employees along racial lines, and hinder unionization. In short, Hiring the Black Worker is empirically solid, carefully argued, and generally persuasive. It makes an important contribution to what we know about southern industry and the Civil Rights movement.

The book’s virtues make its weaknesses all the more frustrating. First of all, Minchin frames his argument too narrowly. By casting his study as a challenge to the “labor market did it” thesis, he is able to prove his case too easily. The government and Civil Rights activists were involved in every step of the integration of the textile industry. They also faced persistent opposition from management and white workers. Market fundamentalists are really only left with a counterfactual argument (the labor market would have integrated the industry if given enough time). By framing his argument this way, Minchin misses out on a chance to emphasize another part of his story: how affirmative action did not just benefit the black middle class but also the most economically distressed workers in the South. Moreover, efforts to integrate the industry involved (and
eventually radicalized) many rank and file black employees. In a way, it brought the Civil Rights movement to the Piedmont. Also missing, are efforts to place his story in a larger regional or national context. Indeed, Minchin fails to make a sustained engagement with the historiography on changes in the racial and gender composition of other industries, both before and after the Civil Rights movement. This sort of comparison could allow him to draw more finely the outlines of the enforcement phase of the Civil Rights movement, asking questions like: how did the integration of the textile industry compare with efforts to integrate other industries like paper, steel, or the building trades? If these experiences were radically different, why? A comparison of this sort could also help Minchin answer a final objection, to what extent was integration a form of workplace white-flight in which white southerners abandoned mill work in favor of higher paying jobs in other sectors of the economically expanding sunbelt?

These objections should not detract from the book’s achievement. In many ways it is on the cutting edge of a new scholarship that is rewriting the history of the past few decades to include the experiences of those who did not participate in high profile demonstrations, marches, or sit-ins, but played a part in the black freedom struggle nonetheless. Minchin’s study helps provide a solid base for this ongoing project. It deserves to be widely read.

Carl Burkart
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