

cognitive. For the historian, the important task is to make something concrete out of this shift, and not merely exploit it for critique mongering in the Foucault mode.

Graff works on one of these shifts: that from insider/outsider into literacy/illiteracy. He takes his material mainly from *who* the literates/illiterates were, and from *what* historians and other polemicists have said about that shift. He tells us what illiterates could achieve. He suggests, mainly in his copious, informative footnotes, the wealth of problems that remain to be explored, on those boundaries where different cognitive modes combine to form complex styles. Historians of electoral politics have come to recognize that they should either unearth individual data, or make aggregate data serve the ends of individual analysis. Likewise the cognitive historian, especially the one who aims to rehabilitate some popular mode, should search out examples of popular cognition, or should contrive to make high culture serve as indicator to the popular. With such materials, the historian can then analyse concrete examples of how the hierarchical and the qualitative interact in daily thought. Only then will it become possible to see some way out from the fragmented strategies of popular coping, into comprehensive schemata of popular understanding.

Daniel CALHOUN,  
*University of California at Davis.*

\* \* \*

GREGORY S. KEALEY. — *Toronto Workers Respond to Industrial Capitalism, 1867-1892.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1980. Pp. xvii, 433.

Gregory S. Kealey has written a courageous book, which attempts to chart a direction for Canadian labour history in keeping with E. P. Thompson's focus upon class as an emergent phenomenon. In its application to Toronto (chosen as a case study), Kealey's programme constitutes an interpretation of craft-based trades unionism, Knights of Labor producer consciousness, ethnic organization, elements of Tory electoral politics, and a variety of particularistic political controversies under the aegis of "class struggle". This is not a linear, progressive development, however, but — in the period discussed — one in which pre-industrial concepts and behaviours continued in varying degree to characterize Toronto workers. As Kealey puts it neatly, in summary:

Much of the [labour] movement's strength lay in the workers' knowledge of a past that was totally different from their present. They knew that industrial capitalism was a social system with a history. ... This realization injected their struggles with a precocious vigour. (p. 295)

This vigour, however, inevitably was sapped by the failure to envision an alternative future for the industrial life of the city.

I find myself in considerable sympathy with Kealey's programme. At the same time, I cannot report that Kealey succeeds in either establishing his thesis or demonstrating that Toronto materials can sustain his analytic framework. Out of respect for the seriousness of Kealey's enterprise, the balance of the review will concentrate upon what I think is a substantial shortfall between ambition and realization, leaving generally unsaid the respect I feel for the author as pioneer and as assiduous researcher.

In part, *Toronto Workers* fails to meet its author's ambitions because of the inevitable paucity of documentation other than of planned, concerted action; but in part, even where material exists, Kealey seems to lack the will to deal with it. For instance, the book contains some thirty-seven pages of statistical tables, seven pages of workers' poetry, and three of workers' graphics. These are in almost every case used only illustratively; they are virtually never analysed as such. Thus, an intriguing table on typographical union membership turnover is summarized as illustrating the point that "the power of the Toronto printers continued to grow throughout the late nineteenth century" (p. 95). But even a glance at the table reveals that nearly every year more members were "withdrawn by card" than "admitted by card", that substantial members annually were "suspended" or "expelled", and that only new initiates balanced the total in favour of the union's growth. Might this table yield clues to the nature of working-class self-identification?

Similarly, in keeping with the Thompsonian emphasis, Kealey reports frequently upon ritual. Most often, however, he invokes the ritual ritualistically: it proves that worker culture exists. When he ventures into interpreting the rituals, he comes up short. The Orange Order, for example, expressed elaborate hierarchy in their oaths, orders, parades: "the function ... was undoubtedly to provide additional interest and incentive to persevere and to obey Orange structures" (p. 105). Even when, as with the Knights of Labor, the analysis of ritual is a little less statically Durkheimian, little attention is paid to the circumstances under which the rituals took place, or of structured participatory roles.

Historians, of course, are properly eclectics, and it follows inevitably that our demography and anthropology will sometimes fall short. But here — maybe because of the book's ambitions — I can't help hearing *ought*: Kealey *ought* to have gotten much more out of his 1871 manufacturing census manuscripts (and he surely ought to have known what "value added" conventionally means); he *ought* to have given some systematic consideration to the relationship of leadership statements and followers' beliefs; he *ought* to have carried out voting analysis of the critical electoral issues he discusses.

Most of all, Kealey *ought* to have worked more systematically on the notion of class, for this is surely the crux of the book. Class has both objective and subjective components, but neither is very adequately treated here. (Instead we read a welter of discrete narratives, and an admonition that "the reader should constantly keep in mind that these political struggles were dialectically intertwined with the economic activities and workplace struggles" (p. 216) of organized labour, and, presumably, with the evolving self-consciousness of the working people.) Kealey quite foregoes analysis of the occupational structure of Toronto, apart from a meandering account of industrial concentration. He eschews treatment of the family life of even those organized male workers upon whom he concentrates. We learn next to nothing of the literacy, formal education, and recreation (ritual and riotous assembly excepted) of these people. Class is not a category emergent from Kealey's account. Class here is a category externally imposed, sometimes a near synonym for organized workingmen, sometimes rhetorical.

In a disturbing way, Kealey's account lacks a sense of the dialectical. Abstractly considered, he has a powerful point: "Discontinuities of organization are vastly overrated in labour history: most Knights' locals reorganized under other banners in the 1890s and the total experience lived on in working-class memory" (p. 215). Kealey, however, cannot seem to organize his materials dialectically at the middle level between such abstractions and the disconnected detail. So, instead,

he describes the Knights as “a unique blend of tradition and innovation, an amalgam particularly suited to the transitional stage of capitalist development” (pp. 176-77). That is, the abstraction, “capitalist development”, explains the workers’ response. Does it?

John MODEL, *University of Minnesota.*

\* \* \*

CECIL J. HOUSTON and WILLIAM J. SMYTH. — *The Sash Canada Wore: A Historical Geography of the Orange Order in Canada.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1980. Pp. xxi, 215.

The authors of *The Sash Canada Wore* attempt to combine the techniques of “cultural geographers and folklorists interested in transatlantic diffusions” with the “methods of analysis most commonly ascribed to social historians” (p. vii). Unfortunately the two disciplines are not integrated, but sit side by side in uneasy partnership.

The point of departure from the geographers’ perspective is the work on the transfer and diffusion of material culture pioneered in the United States by Fred Kniffen. The notable Canadian application of this approach is John Mannion’s comparative study of the differential transfer and survival of elements of Irish physical culture in three very different *Irish Settlements in Eastern Canada*. Although they confine the remark to a footnote, Houston and Smyth state the important qualification to Mannion’s book: “much remains of a group’s culture in the aftermath of technological conformity” (p. 183). They therefore set out to trace the diffusion of an ideology and an institution rather than to undertake the investigation of physical elements, like house types and field patterns, that leaves the central mental aspects of culture — *mentalité*, if you will — unexplored. In the end, they succeed only in mapping the distribution of Orange lodges (they say that their locations are almost a surrogate for Protestant settlement) and in characterizing the membership (a lot of Protestant males from most walks of life, excluding the top and bottom rungs of the social ladder).

The problem lies partly in the selection of an all-pervasive institution like the Orange Order as the subject of such a study. This book does not delineate cultural regions as do the American studies of the spread of architectural and folkloric elements. The effect is to colour the map Orange: the few contrasting patches are exactly where we would imagine them to be. Nor is *The Sash* a study of the relative degrees of survival of imported cultural elements in differing New World environments. The authors do suggest that the significance of the pattern lies in what it tells us about Canadian regionalism (p. viii), but they do not follow up this suggestion sufficiently.

Having dealt with the geographical element of diffusion, Smyth and Houston go on to discuss the historical one, function. Their conclusion that the Order’s role in the lives of its members was predominantly social is not new. Hereward Senior, author of the standard history of the Order, is more than “aware” of the social dimension (p. 182); his thesis is that the early Canadian Orange lodge was primarily a social institution which eased the adaptation of immigrants to a new country. Senior’s book is very concise, so it is useful to have a chapter on the