

Giving pride of place to the role of cottage industry, Gutmann devotes a substantial proportion of his book to describing how and why cottage industry developed, and how its forms varied in time and place. He demonstrates how its appearance in specific localities had the important effect of lowering the average age of marriage (by breaking the customary wait for inheritance of land as a preliminary condition for peasant weddings) and thus increasing the fertility rate in these areas — which in turn, in the longer run, enhanced both the labor supply and the number of consumers requisite for the growth of industrial society.

Gutmann explains both the strengths and weaknesses of the system of cottage industry. The system spread because it offered low fixed capital costs and low labour costs, and because it provided more flexible ways of responding to both market and other forces than were available to traditional urban industries tightly controlled by both guild and municipal regulations. But cottage industry was not very efficient (since moving materials around the countryside was expensive and time consuming), and it was difficult to control (embezzlement of materials and lack of discipline over workers were constant problems). But as cottage industries matured in the eighteenth century, conditions were created in which concentration and large scale production could take place. Early industry had prepared the ground for mechanization by creating a group of industrial leaders with the means and experience to experiment with new methods of production, including more rationalized production under the control and eye of the merchant-manufacturer. Gutmann shows clearly how the logic of industrial production led from large scale cottage industry to early factories to mechanization.

Like other volumes in Knopf's series on "New Perspectives on European History" of which it is a part, Gutmann's contribution is addressed to several audiences (undergraduates, professional historians, and a more general readership). Readable, clearly organized, nicely supplemented with easily comprehensible maps, tables and graphs, and well documented with extensive notes and a bibliographical essay, the book should serve all these readers equally well.

Richard A. Lebrun
University of Manitoba

* * *

Richard Harris — *Democracy in Kingston: A Social Movement in Urban Politics, 1965-1970*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1988. Pp. 203.

Scholarly attention is increasingly being paid to the 1960's and interpretations are beginning to emerge on the significance of the period. Was it more, or less, than we thought at the time — was it a revolution or merely the same old thing, perhaps slightly disguised?

Richard Harris' study of Kingston falls very clearly into this category of reinterpretations of the 1960's. Harris' basic argument is double; that class plays a more important role in political action than most Canadian scholars are prepared to admit and that one cannot understand local social movements without considering the broad societal context. For Harris, analysis of class is fundamental to understanding the social movement that took place in Kingston in the late 60's. However, class alone does not explain the forms and outcomes of political activity — Harris argues that three related but distinct factors must be considered — class, housing tenure and place of residence.

Kingston is looked at as one example of the reform movements of the 1960's. Kingston is a particular case, as is any urban centre, but the reason for choosing it is not that its specific characteristics are particularly interesting, but rather that a relatively small-size centre permits one to get a real sense of the way in which different factors interrelate with one another.

Harris tells the story of the rise and fall of social reform in Kingston in the latter part of the 1960's. The active elements came in part from the University, in part from disaffected working-class adolescents and in part from full-time community organizers. A variety of organizing strategies were

tried, including setting up a coffee-house, but the most effective organizing took place around the issue of housing. There was a translation of movement politics into electoral politics and, in 1968, one of the leading community organizers was elected to municipal council. This led to a major debate in council around rent control, but despite important organizational battles, the debate was lost and the social reform movement began to come to an end.

Harris concludes that despite initial appearances that very little or nothing was achieved, important consequences have resulted from the social movement of the 1960's. He considers it to have been at the origin of other social movements — including the women's movement, ecology groups, the peace movement. As well, it changed our view of politics and of the nature of participation in political action. And, finally, in terms of concrete policy changes, the 1960's has had some impact — notably in the area of citizen involvement in local planning procedures. He, therefore, comes down on the side of the interpretation of the 1960's as having made a difference, perhaps not as much as was thought at the time, but certainly more than some revisionist interpretations are now arguing.

What I most enjoyed about this study, and what I feel the author should be particularly commended for, is the varied and imaginative use of data sources. The study relies heavily on interviews and personal information from ex-participants in the social struggles, but it also brings into play a wide range of statistical and documentary evidence. An election is mentioned and the text goes on to describe the strategies of those involved and this is, then, followed by a table giving the voting turnout in different wards. Material reality and human agency complement each other, and one does get a sense of the way in which the influence of structural factors interrelates with that of choice, strategy and coincidence.

What I found less satisfactory was the articulation of the links between the theoretical elements and the description. Harris states that his study shows the importance of the interrelated but distinct influences of class, housing tenure and place of residence, but the story, as told in the book, does not, to my mind, necessarily lead to this conclusion. One is very struck by the importance of Queens' professors and students and by the importance of full-time community organizers, but it is not clear how these relate to the three factors. Students are tenants, they have a very minimal sense of place and they are certainly not working-class — what does this tell us about the interrelations between the three factors?

It is not that I disagree with Harris' view of the saliency of class, but rather that his discussion of class is not well linked to his case study. One has, on the one hand, a very vivid and well-told story and, on the other, some interesting although brief comments on the role of class in urban politics (and even briefer comments on the theorization of tenure and place), but the two parts are not really tied together.

Another example of the loose links between theory and case study can be seen from Harris' treatment of gender. The study treats this question seriously — connections to the emerging women's movement are consistently developed — but it remains largely external to the theoretical discussion. There is, for instance, no discussion of the problem posed for the class identification of particular geographical areas by the fact that this identification is based only on the employment status of the male within the household. Women are visible in the description of the case study but not in the theory.

Despite these reservations, there is much to recommend in *Democracy in Kingston*. Harris does succeed in making one think about the relationship between different manifestations of the reform movement — between swings to the Liberal Party and the mobilizations of the New Left, between setting up a coffee-house and running for election. The study amply justifies the author's reasons for having chosen Kingston — we do get a sense of a full description of the overall movement and of the multiplicity and interconnectedness of the parts.

Caroline Andrew
University of Ottawa