for" (138). My sense is that here, more is less. It should be remarked that four chapters of this book were first delivered in the form of lectures at Stanford University in 1983. *Works and Lives* has thus been in the air for at least five years. In that time, there has been precious little theory construction in anthropology in America, although American ethnographers have displayed an unprecedented degree of literary inventiveness. Literary style has taken the place of theorizing, "the way of saying" has swallowed up "the what of saying". Geertz may be said to have laid the groundwork for this displacement as long ago as 1973, when he wrote in *The Interpretation of Cultures*: "What does the ethnographer do? — he writes". This functional definition is, of course, only partly true. The tragedy is that if one accepts the premise on which *Works and Lives* is written, namely, that ethnography (like just about everything else these days) is "a kind of writing" (1), one is divested of any alternative theoretical space from which to call this presumption into question.

David Howes
Concordia University

* * *

Myron P. Gutmann — *Toward the Modern Economy: Early Industry in Europe, 1500-1800*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1988. Pp. xxi, 257.

This slim volume provides an extremely valuable synthesis of recent research and writing on the long-term background to the Industrial Revolution. Combining a detailed account of the economic and social evolution of the area around Verviers in what is now eastern Belgium (which is the area of the author's greatest expertise) with a broader overview of developments elsewhere on the continent and in England, the study emphasizes continuities in the history of European industry, highlights the integration of social structures with demographic growth and economic change, and stresses the role of cottage industry in the eighteenth century in the forging of a new society and economy.

Myron Gutmann organizes the long study of industrialization around three turning points. In the "first crisis of urban industry" in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, new centers favoured by shifting trade routes and relative freedom from the disruption of war and religious persecution challenged the traditional medieval, regulated, guild-organized textile industry centered in Flanders. A "second crisis of urban industry" in the seventeenth century was charaterized by the rise of large-scale cottage industry in the countryside (in metal goods as well as textiles). As this cottage industry matured in the eighteenth century, bringing new forms of production, businessmen perceived a need to concentrate and control manufacturing. The next logical step was the turn to mechanization, which constitutes the third turning point. Shifting the focus from technological innovation as an explanation for industrial change, this interpretive essay emphasizes configurations of societies and markets — and the attitudes and behaviours of the people involved.

Unhappy with the use of the term "preindustrial" to describe the era that ended in the late eighteenth century, Gutmann distinguishes between *early industry*, the large scale (but not mechanized) industry that developed in Europe up to this third turning point, and *mechanized industry*, the stage of industrial development in which machines became widespread. While not denying the significance of this last development, which has long been characterized as *the* "industrial revolution", Gutmann believes that traditional accounts have overemphasized the "revolutionary" nature and scale of changes associated with mechanization, precisely because they overlooked the importance of early industry and the way it evolved to the point that mechanization became the inevitable next stage in European economic development. This perspective on the process of industrialization shifts the focus backward in time and stresses the extent to which industrial growth and change were affected by interacting forces associated with shifting market opportunities, demographic changes and government intervention. Finally, while acknowledging the rapid mechanization of the textile industry by about 1830, Gutmann points out that a large part of European industrial production remained artisanal until the end of the nineteenth century.

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 strenghts 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 eitghteenth 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