

vacances payées et la prise en compte de l'ancienneté. Bien que la grève ait tenu pendant plus de deux mois, l'auteure montre que les défections furent nombreuses durant les deux premières semaines du conflit. Il semblerait que la solidarité ouvrière n'ait pas été aussi solide que ce à quoi les historiens nous avaient habitué par le passé. D'ailleurs les fiches de service de la Lake Shore Gold Mine montrent que de nombreux travailleurs qualifiés de surface auraient quitté prématurément les piquets de grève pour chercher de l'emploi dans d'autres régions. En fait, les grévistes solidaires se retrouveraient surtout parmi les ouvriers travaillant sous terre, notamment parmi les foreurs. L'originalité du propos de madame Blais est de nous montrer que si cette grève a duré aussi longtemps, c'est surtout à cause des femmes qui, par leur action dans les comités auxiliaires, ont insufflé une énergie nouvelle au conflit. Gestionnaires du budget familial, les femmes d'ouvriers auraient un sens aigu des conjonctures et sauraient distinguer mieux que quiconque les combats qui méritent d'être livrés dans l'arène sociale. Le seul reproche que l'on peut adresser à l'auteure, c'est de n'avoir pas assez insisté sur le rôle du patronat minier durant la grève. Qui sont ses représentants ? Se sont-ils regroupés dans une quelconque chambre de commerce locale pour faire front commun devant la grève ? Quels étaient leurs liens avec les milieux politiques et financiers de Toronto ? Quels arguments ont-ils utilisés pour légitimer leurs actions auprès de la société civile ? Voilà peut-être un terrain à explorer dans le cadre d'un futur article.

Disons enfin qu'il m'est apparu pour le moins surprenant de la part de Guy Gaudreau de s'attaquer en conclusion à un courant de l'histoire sociale qui, selon lui, chercherait à occulter les divisions entre travailleurs et à promouvoir l'idée d'une solidarité prolétarienne allant de soi, au nom « de la noblesse de la cause ouvrière et de l'inévitable affrontement avec le patronat soucieux de ses avoirs et de son autorité » (p. 267). L'auteur fonde son raisonnement sur des ouvrages et des articles vieux de 30 à 40 ans. Or plus personne ne défend aujourd'hui une telle vision triomphaliste en histoire ouvrière.

Robert Tremblay
chercheur indépendant

HARDY, René – *Charivari et justice populaire au Québec*. Quebec City : Septentrion, 2015. Pp. 288.

René Hardy has produced a stimulating and readable social history of charivari in Quebec from its European beginnings to its eventual disappearance in the mid-twentieth century. Drawing especially on the rich archives of the criminal courts, he explores the range of the custom's forms and meanings to examine what "les classes populaires ont utilisé comme moyens de se faire justice en marge des pouvoirs constitués" (p. 8). His volume is a welcome addition to the literature on popular justice and ably balances broad appeal with scholarly rigour.

Chapters 1 and 2 trace the French and British origins of charivari and related practices and follow their selective transplantation into North America. Certain forms, such as the French *azouade*, seem not to have reached Quebec at all; others, such as riding on a rail, were British practices, sometimes coming to Quebec via the United States; still others, notably the political charivari, took on forms peculiar to their new environments. Chapter 3 surveys varieties of popular justice in Quebec, situating charivari within the broader context of informal responses to social threats and deviance, including insulting and humiliating songs, hanging and burning of effigies, cutting the mane and tail of horses, and destruction of homes. A quibble: the inclusion of vexatious complaints before the courts fits awkwardly with the extra-judicial recourses on which the chapter focuses.

Chapters 4 and 5 introduce the Quebec charivari itself, drawing on Hardy's database of some 160 charivaris mainly from the archives of the criminal courts, supplemented by newspapers, oral histories, and other sources. Hardy's research covers most of Quebec (Gatineau is an unexplained omission) and turns up incidents (called 'charivaris' by contemporaries) ranging from playful to cruel (a taxonomy suggested by E.P. Thompson and Natalie Zemon Davis). As Hardy admits, however, his focus on criminal proceedings over-represents the cruel charivaris, with frequent examples of property damage, physical assault, even the death of participants or their targets. The criminal archives are a restrictive filter: only when the actions of the *charivaristes* went beyond accepted norms—particularly through actual violence or its threat—were criminal charges likely. Matrimonial charivaris, for example, are under-represented as a result, since they more often remained outside the institutions of formal justice. The filter of the archives also constricts the range of the custom's functions: reconciliation, such as demanding a "fine" to use to buy food and drink for participants, often took a back seat to driving offenders from the community.

Chapter 6 introduces the political charivari, which emerged during the Lower Canada Rebellion of 1837, was frequently used during clashes protesting school taxation during the 1840s and 1850s, and arose sporadically later during contested elections. Hardy's definition of politics—"la manifestation des rapports de pouvoir au sein d'une société" (p. 188)—is so broad as to make almost any charivari political. Power was indeed central to the practice: even the merriest matrimonial charivaris, as much about partying as censure, still asserted the values of the community's dominant groups and made clear to the target who was in charge.

Finally, in Chapter 7 and a substantial Epilogue, Hardy traces the custom's gradual disappearance, from the 1890s to its last recorded examples in the 1960s. He links this decline to a move away from popular violence (echoing Norbert Elias's civilizing process), to increasingly effective social control by both church and state, as well as to a slow erosion of the community cohesion that upheld the normative homogeneity on which the charivari depended.

A key theme throughout is the charivari's elusiveness and ambiguity. Hardy avoids a restrictive definition or application of a rigid typology based on European models. The charivari, he points out, was always flexible enough to reflect the

culture in which it operated. This leads to some blurring between the categories in the book's title: when does a charivari become a riot? how can historians distinguish between individual grievance or revenge and collective chastisement? Hardy adopts a sensibly nominalist approach: an incident makes it into his database because contemporaries called it a charivari, regardless of how many markers of the traditional (European) charivari were present (such as masks, discordant music, taunting, demands for ransom).

The ambiguity of charivari extends also to the motivations behind particular incidents, about which we can often only guess. Motives varied and overlapped, and untangling political rivalries, disapproval of lifestyle or sexual mores, individual grievances, commercial competition, and the like is impossible at this remove. Even when a clear reason is apparent—targeting age disparity in marriage, for example, or attacks on reputed bawdy houses—the nature of judicial sources must give us pause. Witness testimony reflects prosecution or defence strategies and so may or may not accurately express motivations. Even if we can guess with some confidence at an incident's reasons, this still does not fully clarify the social norms involved. Why this particular target, and not others? Why at this particular time, and not earlier or later? Why this particular level of censure, rather than less or more? The reader might also wish for more information about the outcomes of the cases, to shed further light on the relationship between popular and formal justice.

Hardy implies throughout the book that charivari both exemplified and challenged the idea of community and its power dynamics, a point that deserved more explicit development. Charivari was a form of collective, popular justice, asserting norms and their boundaries, but that collective was never unitary or homogeneous, and charivaris exposed a community's in- and out-groups. Criminal prosecutions and newspaper reports of incidents make charivaris appear to be one individual or family against all the rest. But despite social pressure to take part, degrees of commitment—both to the charivari itself and, one could argue, to the norms behind it—varied from the enthusiastic through the merely curious to the silently opposed. All charivaris, from the most playful to the cruellest, were about power. The rather merry group in the only known illustration of a Quebec charivari, Edmond-Joseph Massicotte's 1928 drawing, reprinted in the book (p. 148) and on its cover, captures the party atmosphere that no doubt characterized certain charivaris. But the boisterous nocturnal antics and forced reconciliation afterwards made clear that the in-group disapproved of the target and was demanding, not requesting, compliance with its judgment.

If after all the charivari inevitably keeps some of its secrets, Hardy's careful research has helped reveal its complexity and social power.

Eric H. Reiter
Concordia University