The Winnipeg General Strike:
Class, Ethnicity and Class Formation in Canada

Donald Molnar
Department of Political Science
McGill University, Montreal
August, 1987

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and
Research in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master's of Arts

The labourer has a right to his maintenance.
Matthew x,10.

The rights of men are in a sort of *middle* incapable of definition, but not impossible to be discerned.

Edmund Burke.

If a man is rich, gifts will be made to him, and his riches will abound; if he is poor, even the little he has will be taken from him.

Matthew xii,12.

The workmen desire to get as much, the masters to give as little as possible. The former are disposed to combine in order to raise, the latter in order to lower, the wages of labour.

Adam Smith.

Abstract

This thesis is about the relationship between class and ethnicity within a cultural process of class formation in Canada. It adopts some methodological and epistemological insights from the interpretive sciences to explain the class solidarity amongst the Winnipeg strikers in 1919, despite their ethnic and ideological cleavages. So this thesis has import for three issues. First, it projects an alternative explanation for the Winnipeg general strike. Second, it addresses the broader concern for the formation of Canadian class politics. Third, it makes some theoretical remarks about Canadian social inquiry. These three facets are all interrelated since, following the logic of the interpretive sciences, theory and practice are always mutually engaged.

Résumé

Cette thèse concerne le lien entre la classe et l'ethnicité dans le contexte culturel de la formation de classe au Canada. Elle adopte les sciences hermeuneutiques pour expliquer la solidarité parmi les grèvistes à Winnipeg en 1919, malgré leurs differences ethniques et ideologiques. Cette thèse s'attarde, donc, sur trois thèmes considerés interdependantes selon l'optique des sciences hermeuneutiques sur la relation étroite entre la theorié et la pratique. Premièrement, cette thèse offre une explicatioin alternative pour la grève générale à Winnipeg. Deuxièment, elle s'interesse plus généralement au question de la formation de la politique de class au Canada. Troisièment, elle ajoute quelques remarques theoriques concernant l'enquête social au Canada.

Acknowledgements

Most everything I have learned here, at McGill, has been in some sort of dialogue with other students, in seminars and libraries, in coffee houses and living rooms. It was here that the long hours of reading and writing came alive. Conversation flashed, ideas thickened the air; it was exciting, if you can imagine that. So, indeed, I am much in debt to my friends and peers, especially those particularly close to me, for "friendliness is considered to be justice in the fullest sense. It is not only a necessary thing but a splendid one," and indeed, "friendship is based on community." (**Ethics** pp. 259, 273). University-life is a process where individuals grow and bond with others, who shared similar experiences. These bonds last. I especially want to thank Laura McFadgen for reading this thesis with a careful eye, and Darius Rejali for his helpful assistance untangling this most ungenerous computing system here at McGill.

I appreciate the help of my thesis supervisor very much. He gave me extensive liberty to explore my own ideas, then provided wise counsel and criticism. Indeed, he was always there when I needed him. Thank you professor Taylor for your patience.

The flaws in this thesis are mine, mais ils "sont de traits de caratère qui ajoutent à la vérité de la peinture." (Molière)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction: The Interpretive Sciences and the Study of Class and Ethnicity in Canada

Heave! It was hot and the trolley car was heavy. Men, crushed upon one another, sweating, straining, still couldn't push the street car off its track. But it was disconnected from the overhead wire, so, at least, it wouldn't move. "Kill the dirty scabs," she screamed. Those hard words formed flecks of spittle on her lips.[1] "Scab!" The word fell amongst the broken glass all around Hugh Chambers; one word from a hundred lips, shards of hate, scattered about the ruined trolley car's interior. He was scared; he had to leave the car sometime. Feet smashed through the door, hands dragged him into the street, fists thrashed his neck and breast.[2] He was fortunate, though, because someone noticed his G.W.V.A.[3] badge. So some striking veterans pushed a big man aside so that this scab could go free.[4]

Hooves clattered toward the trolley. Astride their horses, the mounties and yellow hats[5] trotted briskly along Main Street which was thickened with demonstrators. Pressed against human flesh, the horses slowed to a strained walk. Horses have powerful muscles, so the crowd, sea-like, curled around the beasts. The mounties swung their clubs and got through. The strikers picked up stones, shards of brick, and bottles, because, soon, the the mounties would come back.

A deep sense of calm slipped into the moment. Anyone who has had a fist fight in the school yard recognizes it. It's somewhere between the anxious squeeze in one's stomach and the flash of violent conflict. Time slows as concentration thickens. Here is the time to wonder why I am here. This is Winnipeg in 1919 and everyone is on strike for trade union rights. They jailed trade union leaders, and now, the army wants to prevent veterans from assembling into peaceful demonstrations. Then there was that trolley car, rolling proudly down the street,

clickity-clack, some symbol of the strike's now lost cause. The reasons for the strike evaporate with this calm reflective moment, and then, condense into droplets of jumbled, passionate impulses. The mounties reformed ranks down the street. They're coming.

The street swirled in flying debris, running men and long-skirted women. The confused horses were lucky since they had bridle bits in their mouths and firm pressure from khaki clad knees to tell them where to go. Constable Bell caught a brick just above the ear; the crowd turned to a confused colourful image: it was warm and beautiful.[6] Over here, a mountie turned. Mike Sokolowski stepped squarely toward him, drew back his arm loaded with a brick; "he was a real fanatic - fifteen feet in front of a Mountie ...."[7] With calmness or panic, I suppose no one knows, the mountie shot the bohunk straight through the breast, who then collapsed upon his already folding legs. The death-like twist their "silent parade"[8] took on became the crowd's common knowledge. A young woman knelt before the oncoming mounties and begged them to stop.[9]

Everyone ran somewhere. With wooden wheel spokes and bats in hand, the extra-specials[10] formed their ranks at each end of main street, around city hall, and later, some regular army troops appeared, in trucks, with mounted Lewis guns.[11] With a deliberate pace, the specials marched toward the rioters; night sticks flashed and the crowd broke. Inspector McDonald reached for the man then broke his baton over that head. With a roguish bravado, he blustered that he missed that baton since he used it in the last riot, back in 1910.[12] Still in the crowd-thick froth of running feet, the mounties fired at flashing legs. Bullets spat upon the pavement, wined through the little spaces between people, and disappeared somewhere far-off. Drunk-like, Hugh Johnson staggered; *this* bullet flicked his head.[13] Someone else fell at the curb, awkwardly askew the sidewalk and street.[14] Again the mounties

reeled 'round, "twirling their reeking tubes high in the air in orthodox Deadwood Dick style."[15] It was scary.

Mike and his friend heaved themselves over a fence. Here, too, a back-alley, hand-to-hand battle raged against Specials.[16] The mounties had main street but that was all. Both men, however, knew if they were caught that was it, because, everyone knew the mounties and army didn't like aliens.[17] Down the next alley, over another fence, and into a stable. Safety. No; the Specials found them there, huddled in a corner. For them Bloody Saturday[18] ended in a shed.[19]

* * *

James Winning[20] called it another Peterloo.[21] The Winnipeg General Strike collapsed beneath the weight of Bloody Saturday, in a violent huff. For trade union leaders, these violent methods were completely unjustified since the strike was about collective bargaining and a living wage: trade union rights. Against this interpretation the Federal government and the Citizens' Committee of 1000[22] argued that the violence of Bloody Saturday was indeed necessary: Bolshevik revolution threatened Winnipeg. What ever the strike was, it was clearly class conflict: class social phenomenon.

The general strike was a benchmark in Canadian labour history. Its size, its intensity, its confluence of contradictory social forces, indeed, project a standard by which Canadian class conflict, generally, may be measured. In a community of 175,000 people, almost 35 thousand workers struck to support a small group of skilled machine operators, who tried to gain trade union rights.[23] Since so many struck for so few, since so many issues converged within one strike, no one factor

explains clearly this working class solidarity. Indeed, political worldviews and ethnic differences bitterly divided both socialist and trade union movements. Against the grain of these differences, the strikers nevertheless found some common ground upon which to stand.

Some accounts of the strike attempt to explain its cause. Professor Bercuson's authoritative explanation is a case in point. His argument goes like this: a web of economic forces - such as inflation and depressed wages, fears of post-war depression and unemploymentmixed with a twenty year tradition of bitter industrial relations disputes between trade unions, and Contract shop employers. These caused the general strike. The rest, namely, radical socialist leadership, and well organized ethnic communities, did not reflect the real socio-economic forces *déclenchée*. Wages, not socialism, motivated workers to strike. So the strike's significance, like its cause, shaped industrial relations in Canada, so that, students ought to study the "ongoing struggle for economic power" as a means to understand *all* of labour history.[24]

This interpretation is flawed. It does not adequately explain why the entire trade union movement of roughly 12,000, as well as 25,000 non-union workers, would support a small group of highly skilled tradesmen who wanted a union shop and wage increases. It does not explain why east European immigrants, mostly unskilled labour, would support Anglo-Saxon trade unionists. The English workers were better off economically, and indeed, intensely disliked aliens. Most of all, this interpretation lacks a satisfactory explanation for the sense of class solidarity, that which bonded the strikers together.

This thesis is about the relationship between class and ethnicity within a process of class formation in Canada. Class formation, here, following E.P. Thompson, means a cultural process within which human beings acquire class

consciousness, through a common experience of conflict, within a capitalist system. It is a cultural process because workers already had traditions, social practices, and institutions, from which, new patterns of social protest projected alternative means to protect a common *class* interest.[25] This means that the collective action of workers is based upon a shared sense of community most everyone, within it, can recognize. Since Canada is an immigrant nation, one is less convinced that shared class values trump ethnic differences. Thus, class does not necessarily explain collective action. Indeed, if class formation is a cultural process, then ethnic differences may retard the development of a Canadian class movement. Most of the literature upon Canadian class politics takes this view so that the weakness of Canadian socialism, lack of working class consciousness, and so forth, are attributed to the country's ethnic diversity. This may be so, but clearly, class consciousness amongst ethnic groups also explains certain class solidarity in political, and industrial conflict from which workers chose *between* alternative class social practices and institutions to build upon.

Here, the general purpose of this thesis and the Winnipeg general strike cross. Since the broad flow of historical forces pass through particular moments, both set the determinate identity of the community. So the general strike defined what these ethnic groups had in common in a class-way, from which class community solidarity was possible, and this, despite dramatic political, and ethnic cleavages. Those commonalities, and those differences, become reference points from which Canadian class politics will make sense. From these fragments of class solidarity at Winnipeg, perhaps, we shall find the other end of the piece of string, some determinate shape to Canadian class consciousness.

An interpretive analysis, which focuses upon the cultural context of human action, will be used, below, to explain the strikers' class solidarity. Instead of

asking what *caused* the strike, we shall query what range of alternatives were projected into the conflict, what they *meant*, and for *whom*. This is not to say that meaning and causal social explanation are incompatible. It is just that causal explanations make no sense without meaning and context. It is the community's understanding of social practices, institutions, and general manner of conceiving the nature of one's social order that makes sense of a cause, and assigns it a meaning. So, an interpretive analysis relates the meaning of social phenomenon to the social context, from which causation can then be better understood.

Interpretive analysis is commonly associated with the study of culture. Many Canadian Labour historians such as Bryan Palmer (a Marxist), and David Bercuson (a Pluralist)[26], use culture, in some way, to explain working class behaviour. Thus, in part, this author will attempt to illustrate the differences and the commonalities between the two in order to justify an alternative method. This thesis will differ insofar as the epistemological, and methodological issues that inhere to social inquiry will be addressed. The hermeneutic philosophy, of H.G. Gadamer and Charles Taylor, among others, which puts into question the relationship between the individual and the intersubjective beliefs, values, and social practices of the community, mark this alternative perspective. These authors set culture within the hermeneutical context for which historical phenomenon is analyzed in order to understand its meaning. This means that social inquiry is similar to textual exegesis. Epistemology and methodology, then, come together since theory and practice are founded within the human life-world - the text. Indeed, theory and practice imbue the way the trade unionist and the radical political activist, English or Ukrainian, act. So hermeneutical science in class and ethnic studies is warranted. This strong claim means hermeneutical studies must be both theoretical, and empirical.

Recently, the culture approach to Labour historiography surfaced in the swell

of methodological debate amongst historians. A small group of Marxist social historians aggressively applied cultural analysis to Canadian class relationships. Though their definition of culture is confused, it is still clear that *method* directs their work. Culture is both an interpretive device, and a real social force. As an interpretive device, culture defines subjective and objective working class features so that individual impressions, toward the social order, cross quantified sociological indices such as income, housing, and membership in class-like institutions. Culture, then, describes a real social force which, claimed E.P. Thompson, interacts with 'not-culture'.[27] Here, the Marxist social historians became conceptually confused since, ultimately, 'not-culture' also originates from a materialist base, meaning the evolution of economic forces. So it is never really clear what these historians want to explain, class consciousness, or its causal import. A brief citation, here, illustrates the muddle:

> Culture is not, therefore, the last instance of analysis, but part of an interpretive framework that builds upon recognition of the limitations imposed upon experience by economic constraints, places the movement of self-affirmation of the class within the context of particular stages of development and levels of conflict and struggle, and, finally attempts to bridge the gulf between culture and the forces that are both a part of it and work upon it.[28]

Whatever it is, culture is clearly being forced, with a crowbar and much academic sweat, into an economic model.

David Bercuson argues the Marxist historians developed a concept that categorizes, but does not explain, historical phenomenon. After all, the object of historical analysis, for Bercuson, is to thread together manifold causes, and effects to present an explanation of an historical event.[29] Bercuson recognizes the fact that authors such as Palmer try to demonstrate the existence of a working class culture so that some causal explanation could be, afterward, deduced. Yet he remains skeptical for two reasons: that Palmer's definition of culture can not incorporate ethnic differences; that a social history of individual attitudes , beliefs, and values of

ordinary people ought to be the primary source of historical evidence. Given these reservations, Bercuson believes a more complete explanation must include the logic of political economy, industrial relations dynamics, and institutions, as well as, cultural forces. So indeed, here, too, culture must have a 'not-culture'.

The fundamental difference between Palmer and Bercuson is that the former enlarges the notion of culture into a method *imposed* upon labour history, whereas, the latter so narrows culture to specific qualities that it obscures subtle relationships between class, ethnicity, religion, and so on. Do not, however, let these differences obscure the significant common ground between the two. For each, culture is one variable that interacts with another - mode of production, institutions, and so on - which can be described in culture invariant terms. Both Bercuson and Palmer describe some culture invariant phenomena in functional terms, which means that, similar social practices or institutions must fulfill similar functions in different societies: a general strike or collective bargaining, monopoly capitalism or trade unionism. This means that social structures, economic systems, and so forth, have a logic that can be described independent of culture, and their relationships with cultural patterns evaluated with some degree of precision. In practice, culture becomes the wisps of colour which the historian uses to flush out economic or structural explanations of reality. In fact, though, all these authors form their methodological perspective from their own general understanding of the ordering of social forces, and then structure the cultural variables into the specific context of study.

Indeed, culture drops from view. When Palmer describes the impact upon workers of various phases of "Capital's" economic domination, in historically "generalized periods", cultural analysis disappears. How culture greased the motor-like transition from one generalized period to another is left a mystery. Bercuson is

more interested in the incompatibility of threading collective bargaining practices and general strikes together, and can not, therefore, explain why so many people could sustain such unity for the economic well-being of a small minority of workers. The analyses, of both Palmer and Bercuson, miss the common principle, the common interest, the common grudge against the boss, and his system. This grinding of social and economic structures, especially Palmer, presents a static image of historical forces, so their historical explanation, indeed, obscures social change; since the grease is thin, the motor clatters.

A more anthropological approach to Labour studies is necessary. Culture must not be conceived as one variable among others, but as a context, within which, social phenomenon acquires significance. Culture pervades, envelops - thickens - social phenomenon. Only in the context of a given cultural setting can other variables, a depression, inflation, or craft union institutions, make sense. Variables like these can not be abstracted from their context. Nor can they be factored into it to explicate "real" forces that cause social phenomenon since an understanding of them is presupposed within that context. To speak of market forces causing slumps in the economy and reduction in trade union memberships, for example, would make no sense what so ever to an eighth century monk. For all this to make sense, one must live within a capitalist system for which certain property relations are common knowledge.

This context must indeed be learned. E.J. Hobsbawm's study of skilled labour in the early 19th century describes this process. Many skilled craftsmen were on the cusp of being a wage earner and a small independent producer. When bargaining for wages, or aspiring to self autonomy through one's craft, many demanded customary rates of pay or eschewed the expansion of their capital base rather than demand wages they thought the market would bear or strive for profit when the

opportunities arose. They followed their social patterns of the day, defined a fair wage, and valued the life-style of the small independent producer. The logic of the capitalist system, its exploitive relationships, and what to do about it, all had to be *learned.*[30]

So here, social inquiry is idiographic. But does this contextual focus reduce the explanatory power of culture? In fact it is reinforced because culture is conceived as a context of meaning. Following Clifford Geertz, man is conceived as an animal spinning "webs of significance" from which determinate meaning shapes human behaviour; meaning is a human process.[31] Significance does not inhere to the *eidos* but is derived from the complex relationships that underscore symbols. To analyze the logic of these forms apart from their context, then, is to confuse, not explain, social phenomenon.

Man not only makes culture, through determinate meanings, he is constituted by an existing cultural context. One simply does not have a radical choice between *weltanschauungen* which, through informed rational judgment, a particular set of values, institutions, and so on, can be chosen to suit one's individual taste. At birth, one's social environment, and patterns of custom are already chosen and mark our "tastes" beforehand. Our sense of self-understanding, therefore, has a preconscious and preunderstood element meaning that, culture is neither the property of an individual, nor a society. It falls into the public space; between individuals in community. Common sense is an example of this since it is an understanding of meanings in a common reference-world that is available to all who share the same "common sense", that which everyone knows. Culture, then, not only imbues the world with significance in intersubjective meanings for man, but partly determines his place within it.

This ontological foundation for man's relationship to culture has import for

method in social inquiry. As an object of study, man is radically different from phenomena in the natural world because understanding our own being is itself a definite characteristic of man.[32] Man interprets himself; a rock does not. For this reason, the social sciences are hermeneutical because, properly speaking, there is no raw, unformed material to study, but rather, only interpretations of pre-interpreted data. As a science, hermeneutical inquiry searches for coherence in second order interpretations, which emerge from our pre-understood being-in-the-world. The object of hermeneutical inquiry, then, is to define meaning which inheres to human action.

If the object of inquiry is to relate the meaning of an act or social event to the larger webs of signifficance, the hermeneutic task - our method - is by nature holistic, and the interpreter is drawn into the hermeneutic circle. Individual motives and acts must be related to the deeper meanings shared by the community for which action is significant. Yet, a general context of meaning can not exist without a subject, some historical reference point. Therefore, in social inquiry, our starting point is never exactly clear because the interpreter must move from general, to particular, in order to achieve a greater clarity of meaning in context. This is what is meant when we say social inquiry is hermeneutically circular.

Aristotelian practical knowledge strongly influences hermeneutical inquiry. It is a rhythm of human consciousness. Man is always in a situation for which action is required. Since man is a reasoning being, who acts upon purpose toward that which is good for man, reason imbues his action. So practical knowledge, here, is the application of reason to a specific situation where some human being strives for that which he has judged as good. This is also a self-formative act since man learns from his experience, meaning that, he continually reflects upon his experience from which he projects further purposeful activity, with increasing clarity. It is a human

process of consciousness that relates the understanding, interpreting and applying of knowledge to a particular situation which further defines the context.[33] Reason, knowledge, and consciousness always strive, develop into a fixed attitude, and strive again, as the situation always changes, and always projects different initial conditions.[34] The revolutionary activist provides an example of this. History does not end once the revolution succeeds. The revolutionary must act, implement policies, apply economic and political theories, and refine them. Historical change is indeed a cruel mid-wife since this action only beget different, though increasingly sophisticated, problems.

So far, this hermeneutical alternative hardly seems to be a method at all because one is not told explicitly *where* to start an analysis, or what to *look* for. Yet both the object of hermeneutic study, and the nature of human action, are the same - choice. If culture provides webs of significance - determinate meanings - to human beings, it also presents a resource from which alternatives to social problems can be projected. Indeed, many points of view, though clearly not limitless, present alternative analyses to explain the nature of social forces, what problems they engender, and possibilities toward their solution. The success, or failure, of any one point of view depends upon a correct reading of the situation, weaving together of appropriate common understandings, and, of course, the experience of success or failure. This range of alternatives, then, concerns hermeneutical inquiry.

Luddism and trade unionism make good examples to explain choice between possibilities. If, say, the problem is the destruction of the cloth making crafts in 18th century Britain, due to technical innovation, how can those facing the destruction of their way of life respond? Luddism, mob violence, and labour combinations, not yet understood as trade unions, were all 18th century social practices.[35] The first answered the problem through violent machine wrecking and

prompted oppressive retaliation from the employer and the local militia. This brutal response is justified by property rights, something all right thinking Englishmen defend, even, most probably, luddites. The second draws upon notions such as freedom of association in order to justify an organization which restrains trade. Though still vehemently opposed by employers, this trade union option has a certain force of argument. It is coherent, has a penchant for organization, and relates to notions of freedom an Englishman thinks is right. It is a reasonable choice. And so, a bitter political conflict begins since one right, stands against, another.

The cultural basis from which choices form is never completely understood by man. It is not necessary for an individual who *lives* a culture to know, and identify precisely, the various traditions that make it up, in order to understand it. Culture, indeed, permeates his knowledge and actions at both preconscious and conscious levels. The average trade unionist, for example, may not know how industrial unionism developed under the leadership of the Knights of Labour, and the International Workers of the World, or, how these principles were refined by the Congress of Industrial Organizations. But they most certainly understand the impact of the closed shop and industrial unionism on their lives, and how to use them to achieve their goals. Since culture imbues language too, the preconscious traditions are disguised in everyday speech. The modern British Columbian trade unionist, for example, may 'wobble', meaning a wild cat strike. The slang term, wobble, comes from the nickname given the revolutionary syndicalists, in the early 1900's, who called themselves Wobblies. So culture is indeed ambiguous, which, consequently, makes interpretation of human behaviour inexact because the object of study is inexact. And, we can not demand from an object of study more than that which its nature can give.

The object of hermeneutical inquiry, then, is to make sense of this body of

cultural meanings, in its context, from which a more complete explanation of human action may be possible. The nuances of the cultural context will be drawn into the following discussion of the Winnipeg general strike to explain the strikers broad class solidarity despite ethnic, and ideological differences. It is the logic of the hermeneutic circle, here, that concerns us. The particular situation, remember, is crucial to any understanding of the limits from which broader historical traditions could shape the range of choices for working class collective action.

The relationship between ethnicity and class in Canada is particularly suited to hermeneutical inquiry since Canada is a nation of immigrants. This means that different immigrant groups came to Canada with their own culture from which they projected a vision of Canada's future, and their role in it. The Canadian West provided opportunity to create a new society from nature's raw material, once the native people were corralled into reserves. Businessmen defined the most powerful vision of the West's future. They strove to develop a modern capitalist economy, and so, too, acquired the natural conflict of interest between businessman and labourer that marks modern capitalism. Many immigrants resisted this vision. Some came from cultures from which working class social practices, politics, and philosophy developed precise meanings, some alternative ethical interpretation of capitalism's excesses. Other immigrants, from traditional agrarian societies, worked for wages in the new country. Even so, their cultures had working class alternatives since their own socialist leaders spliced together social theories and peasant traditions, and so, fastened class protest to traditional peasant collective action. Since these immigrants understood the logic of social forces differently, even if they suffered within the same capitalist system, they interpreted capitalism's significance differently. These immigrants, then, protested against the social order, but not in quite the same way.

Trade unions, socialist parties, and so on, were concerned with education, so hermeneutical inquiry is even more relevant to the study of class movements. These people sought to acquire knowledge for a reason: to understand, interpret, and apply their knowledge to their situation. Through class institutions one learned about existing social relationships: who had like interests, who did not, and which political and economic social practices enhanced, or hampered the welfare of one's community. Trade unionists and socialists acquired a strong dialogical tradition in their institutions through which they learned, discussed and criticized the social theories, and ethical worldviews which made up their community's knowledge. This was no sterile academic quest for knowledge *qua* knowledge since their purpose was to better their station in life. It is indeed for this reason that working class education had a practical element within the general process of consciousness raising.

Throughout the strike, labour leaders claimed the issues were collective bargaining and the living wage, not political revolution. Our task will be to relate these issues to the broader context of English and Ukrainian class political traditions, Canadian working class experience during the Great War, and the events at Winnipeg in May, June 1919. What makes the Winnipeg general strike something extra-ordinary? It placed into question trade union rights. So the general strike was about principles, more so than precise negotiations for pay scales and working conditions. These trade union principles are related to traditions that define certain civil, and democratic rights to which English, and Ukrainian workers became accustomed. Indeed, the strike does not make sense without those traditions. The chapter which follows next will discuss the national political, and class traditions that English and Ukrainian workers brought with them to Canada. This will illustrate the meaning of democracy, civil rights, and class political action for these two ethnic groups. The reason Anglo-Saxon class traditions are important to

Canadian Labour is indeed self-evident. But why those of Ukrainians? Because in Winnipeg, Ukrainians represented the largest Slavic community at 5.3 per cent of the city's population.[36] Also, Ukrainians were very well organized into social and political organizations, some of which participated vigorously in class politics.[37] Chapter three will argue both Ukrainian, and English Canadian workers feared the Canadian government threatened their ways of life during the Great War. With their traditions in jeopardy, the Canadian Labour movement projected certain options to found a more coherent class movement with both political, and economic purposes. Chapter four will focus upon the general strike to illustrate the unity between class and ethnic forces, within the context of unfolding alternatives for Labour in Winnipeg. Without this aspiration for a better world, based upon democratic freedoms, and civil liberties, the intensity of the strike, and its class solidarity, would lack full comprehensibility. The general strike may not have been about political revolution, but it did concern political change. Why? Because the nature of a Canadian class movement was placed into question.

The structure of this thesis attempts to present the rhythm of time and tradition, so that, increasingly compressed contexts of meaning fall upon the impressionistic account of Bloody Saturday with which we began. First, broad political traditions evolve into English and Ukrainian class movements over the course of two centuries. Second, Canada's class conflict, *circa* the Great War, takes place within a time span of about a quarter century. Last, the weight of these contexts fall upon the few months that bracket the general strike. The logic of English and Ukrainian class movements connect each period.

At Winnipeg, several interpretations of class collective action converged with a singularity of purpose both English, and Ukrainian workers could identify with; all shared the same concern for certain fundamental working class rights. These ethnic

groups could not, however, find their feet with one another which means that, they could not completely understand, accept, or synthesize each others class social practices. The meaning of collective bargaining, in this situation, however, shook loose. It was not precisely defined by the strikers in the customary way; so many interpretations of class social practices could relate collective bargaining to their own understanding of their class movement's logic. Thus, the strikers' solidarity could indeed stretch over the entire working class community. Consequently, ethnicity and class overlapped in social practices, institutions, and ways of life, in a situation for which the determinate nature of a unified class movement was at stake.

Since this is a political science thesis, some account for the verification of knowledge is necessary. Indeed, the science of politics, since the 1950's, aspired to discover certain laws of human behaviour, and so, deduce general theories through an experimental science. These laws would guide and verify empirical research through scientific method. Indeed, if this science could be value-free, it was thought, the nature of political phenomenon, that common human element that defines all political behaviour, could be discovered.[38] Some hermeneutic philosophers, especially Taylor, deny the possibility of such a science because language and history, which expresses this desire, is culturally determined, and thus, hardly value-free.[39] As such, social inquiry can not be falsified, or corroborated through method because method attempts to stand outside the subject of study, man, yet is fundamentally man's own creation.[40]

How, then, can this author be certain his argument is correct? In hermeneutic philosophy there tends to be a strain of intellectual arrogance. Verification can mean understanding one's opponent and one's own position, but not the reverse;[41] one can repeat his argument again hoping it will be better understood; or last, one can pose some rhetorical question such as, "if my account is wrong, what else

explains this phenomenon better." Despite all this, there is a more meaningful strain in hermeneutical philosophy which verifies an argument's correctness, and is true to its own traditions. The most important undercurrent in hermeneutic philosophy is its dialogical tradition. Questions are posed to historical texts and answers attempted. Though hermeneutical inquiry may have an elitist twinge, it is the subjection of one's interpretation to the public space of debate that is its levelling characteristic. Everyone can reject, accept, or build upon someone else's interpretation.

So an author responds to questions posed by the historical situation - a body of second order interpretations that lacks, to some degree, coherence. That there is a question means that another's interpretation is in someway flawed. For this author, professor Bercuson's insights into the strike do not capture the full extent of class solidarity at Winnipeg, which is so necessary to make sense of the strike. Since Bercuson fused the strike's cause and its significance, this justifies an alternative method to grasp the logic of social change. The significance of the strike was by no means settled before the conflict began, all bunched up in a seed-like cause. Since this class solidarity drew workers together, workers divided by political worldviews and ethnic differences, new categories are necessary to explain this solidarity. So this author turned to interpretive social science to explain the relationship between class, and ethnicity within a process of class formation.

FOOTNOTES: CHAPTER ONE

[1]"Hundred Arrests Following Riots," **Winnipeg Free Press**, June 23, 1919, p. 2.

[2]"Veteran Conductor Tells of Treatment," **Winnipeg Free Press**, June 23, 1919, p. 5.

[3]Great War Veterans Association.

[4]"Veteran Conductor," p. 5.

[5]Military Police.

[6]"Riot Casualties Taken to Hospital," **Winnipeg Free Press**, June 23, 1919, p. 1.

[7]Norman Penner, **Winnipeg 1919**, (Toronto: James Lewis and Samuel, 1973), p. 196.

[8]The strikers called this protest march the 'silent parade' since it was a mass peaceful demonstration to pressure the government to bargain with the trade unions.

[9] **Winnipeg Free Press**, June 23, 1919, p. 4.

[10]The Extra-Specials replaced the unionized city police force of 240 officers with a hastily recruited special police force of 1,800. They were widely perceived as strike breakers, criminals, and so forth, by the strikers. David Bercuson, **Confrontation at Winnipeg**, (Montreal: McGill-Queens University press, 1974), pp. 153-4.

[11]Lewis guns are machine guns. Penner, **Winnipeg**, pp. 200-1.

[12]"Hundred Arrests," p. 2.

[13]"Riot Casualties," p. 1.

[14]Penner, **Winnipeg**, p. 196.

[15]Ibid.

[16]Ibid., p. 197.

[17]"Alien" was a pejorative term for east European immigrants used by the Press, Canadian government, and indeed Anglo-Saxon labour.

[18]The **Western Labour News** christened the riot Bloody Saturday. "Bloody Saturday," **Western Labour News**, Special Strike Edition No. 32, June 23, 1919, p. 1.

[19]"British Justice on Trial," **Western Labour News**, July 5, 1919, p. 3. Since the Winnipeg business elite argued the strikers were predominantly revolutionary aliens, the **Western Labour News** tried to downplay the participation of eastern

European immigrants. It claimed many immigrants, such as 'Poor Mike', were innocent bystanders who just stumbled across the parade by accident. In other words, they did not know about the demonstration in advance. And indeed many east European immigrants told this sort of story to the police.

Common sense tells us to question this. Since east Europeans were persecuted by government, police, and public during the war one can hardly expect those east European immigrants arrested during the riot to say anything less. They knew about internment camps, possibilities of deportation and so forth. Indeed, they knew Canadian law may not protect them. But Canadian judges, policemen and so forth had a genuine weakness east Europeans could exploit. Anglo-Saxon prejudice. The English Canadian believed the average east European was indeed quite stupid. And this stupidity did inspire leniency in some cases. 'Poor Mike's' account of his presence at the demonstration may of course be true; but, clearly, other Slavic immigrants, such as Solokowski, actively participated.

[20]James Winning was president of the Winnipeg Trade and Labour Council during the strike.

[21]Peterloo symbolized the British working-class fight for universal sufferage, trade union rights and general aspirations for liberal democracy and civil rights. A mass demonstration marched near Manchester where it was attacked by the local militia; many died and many more were wounded. It took place almost exactly 100 years previously, in August of 1819.

[22]The Citizens' Committee of 1000 formed to oppose the strike and provide essential services. Its membership included mostly businessmen and professionals from organizations such as the Board of Trade, the Manufacturers Association and the Bar Association. Indeed, one H.B. Lyall was also an official for the Manitoba Bridge Company, one of the firms principally involved in the collective bargaining negotiations. Bercuson, **Confrontation**, p. 121.

[23]Penner, **Winnipeg**, p. x.

[24]David Bercuson and Kenneth McNaught, **The Winnipeg General Strike: 1919**, (Don Mills: Longman, 1974,) p. 123.

[25]E.P. Thompson, **The Making of the English Working Class**, (Markham: Penguin Books, 1982,), pp. 8-9.

[26]Professor Bercuson probably would not call himself a pluralist. Even so the pluralist current in Bercuson's work runs deep. Pluralism, remember, is a model that describes the behaviour of social groups in competition for power and access to government, ideally upon equal terms, in a liberal democracy. Some, like Theodore Lowi, who wrote **The End of Liberalism**, argue this model had become an ideology expressing how the world ought to appear. The following quotation illustrates how Bercuson confused his conceptual print with the aspirations of Winnipeg trade unionists.

> To combat ... conditions workers turned increasingly to trade unionism. In the days before the closed or union shop and automatic check off this very process further increased his awareness of himself as a member of a group with a special interest in society and very particular desires and ambitions. Union members began to believe that they were a special group, should be

> recognized. and accepted as such and should be given a share and responsibility with other groups. (Bercuson, **Confrontation**, p. 190.)

And,

> But for the most part the belief that a union victory would set society on its head and place workers in a position where they would sit as equals with management ... spurred them on. (Ibid., p. 184.)

Trade unions, here, are portrayed as a special interest group which sought to share power with other groups. Indeed, they wanted *equality* with management. But Bercuson provides no evidence that trade unionists thought this way. This claim that trade unionists had pluralist-like values must be measured against the socialist and liberal strains within the trade union movement. It is just not clear that workers and trade unions wanted *equality*. The strike was not about, say, equal access to the firms decision-making process - investment, production, products and so on. It certainly could not be about equal access to the political process, and still remain a simple industrial relations dispute. Indeed, it would be a strange conceptual context which would define exactly that which would make the two equal, if not pluralism.

[27]Bryan Palmer, "Classifying Culture," **Labour/Le Travailleur** vols. 8/9 (Autumn/Spring 1981/82): 178.

[28]Ibid., p. 183.

[29]David Bercuson, "Through the Looking Glass of Culture," **Labour/Le Travailleur** vol. 7 (Spring 1981): 109.

[30]See "The Machine Breakers" in E.J. Hobsbawn, **Labouring Men: Studies in the History of Labour.** New York: Basic Books, 1964.

[31]Clifford Geertz, **Interpretaion of Cultures: Selected Essays by Clifford Geertz**, (New York: Basic Books, 1974), p. 5.

[32]Martin Hiedegger, trans. John Macquarrie and Edward Ro.binson **Being and Time,** (New York: Harper and Row, 1962), p. 32.

[33]H.G. Gadamer, **Truth and Method,** (New York: Crossroad, 1975), p. 274, and Paul Rabinow and William Sullivan, eds., **Interpretive Social Science: a reader,** (Berkley: University of California press, 1979), p. 17.

[34]Gadamer, **Truth and Method,** p. 278.

[35]See E.P. Thompson, "The Moral Economy of the English Crowd in the Eighteenth Century," **Past and Present** No. 5 (February 1971): 76-136.

[36]Alan Artitibise, **Winnipeg: A Social History of Urban Growth-1914,** (Montreal: McGill-Queens University press), p. 142.

[37]See Donald Avery. **Dangerous Foreigners: European immigrant workers and labour radicalism in Canada 1896 - 1933.** Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1979; and Manoly Lupul, ed. **A Heritage in Transition.** Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1982.

[38]See David Easton. **The Political System.** New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1966.

[39]Charles Taylor, "Neutrality in Political Science," in Alan Ryan, ed., **The Philosophy of Social Explanation,** (Oxford: Oxford University press, 1973), pp. 169-70.

[40]Charles Taylor, "Interpretation and the Sciences of Man," in **Philosophy and the Human Sciences: Philosophical Papers 2,** (New York: Cambridge University press, 1985), pp. 52-3.

[41]Ibid., p. 53.

Chapter Two

Politics, Community and Class for Ukrainians and Englishmen

In both Ukrainian and English historical experience class movements existed. They mixed national political traditions with enlightenment social inquiry for the purpose of human emancipation. Consequently, democracy and civil rights were always a cherished concern which influenced class social practices, and institutions, as well as aspirations for social and political change. Englishmen and Ukrainians both participated in movements to establish liberal democracies within the shell of ancient empires, led by kings and queens, nobles and lords. That which gave class movements a "class" determinate meaning was an aspiration for economic justice, as well as political liberation. The reality of this class experience lay in the way in which social, economic, and political relations imposed a certain worldview upon a community of people by virtue of their functional status in the social order. Through a common experience of exploitation, the class community acquired a certain consciousness and solidarity from which it faced the world. So class movements developed. They defined their communities, projected certain ideas for social change, and created new social practices and institutions. Their goal was to educate the community about social change, and challenge the established social order, namely, its relationships of political and economic power. These class movements also had to justify that challenge, so activists had to illustrate how a class movement could capture the best of national political traditions, such as democracy and civil rights, better than the established order.

This chapter is about the similarities and differences between Ukrainian and English class movements. It will describe how national political traditions mixed economic and political protest, and consequently, fixed social practices and institutions within Ukrainian and English working class communities. Since both English and Ukrainian immigrants brought their class culture to Canada, each re-established their class social practices and institutions in the new land. Their cultures provided a resource from which these immigrants adapted to Canadian life, and when necessary, protested against Canadian social, economic and political relationships. These movements, however, differed in fundamental ways since each ethnic group accented different elements of a class movement, namely, trade unionism and socialism. For Englishmen, trade unions formed their core class institution; but for Ukrainians, it was a Marxist social democratic political party. Despite these differences, political traditions which incorporated notions of democracy and civil rights imbued both ethnic working class cultures so that some fundamental common understandings between the two existed. Since both had working class cultures, this is why, as we shall see in the next chapter, Englishmen and Ukrainians could recognize the significance of the Great war, and the general strike for their movements.

One caveat must be added before we embark on this chapter's project. Not only do the ethnic groups differ but so does the scholarship about them. Indeed, English political traditions, class movements, and so on, are exhaustively documented. But English Canadian historiography understands little about Ukrainian political and class traditions, or their influence on Canadian labour traditions. Concerning the Slavic involvement during the general strike David Bercuson claims "the eastern Europeans stuck to their traditional silence...."[1] Traditional silence. This chapter must describe the resonant tones of this silence because English Canadian historiography is uncertain Ukrainian political and class

traditions exist. The traditional silence is indeed that of historians.[2]

II

Ukrainians had traditions of nationhood, not statehood. The distinction is important since Ukrainians did not acquire their political traditions through any identification with uniquely Ukrainian political institutions. Ukrainians, rather, had an inclination to nationhood for which national identity was fixed by a common language, culture, and geography. So their political traditions were partly myth defined by a legendary golden age. Without political institutions, the responsibility for Ukrainian traditions fell upon the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church which protected the Ukrainian language and cultural identity within religious social practices. Only when part of the Ukrainian nation (Galicia) was incorporated into the Austrian empire did Ukrainians gain practical experience with formalistic institutions, and legal systems where they acquired modern political concepts such as rule of law, civil rights, and democracy. This lack of a state tradition, perhaps, explains why radical Ukrainian intellectuals had an affinity toward the ethical socialist's vision of freely associating communities, or the Marxist's utopic, stateless communism. Radical political theories were indeed attractive to some Ukrainians since they argued society, not the state, was the causal force behind political change; an attractive idea to a nation without a state. It gave hope because the "real" power lay in the people and not the abstract logic of state sovereignty. Nevertheless, Ukrainian social movements always sought some reconciliation between national identity and political institutions, so statehood was always a goal.

Ukrainians were a conquered people. Since the Tartar invasion of 1240, the

Ukrainian lands were divided amongst many different emperors - Polish, Ottoman, Russian, Austrian - until 1917, when for four brief years, Ukrainians had their own nation-state. Consequently, Ukrainian political traditions were truncated. Their masters neither cared about Ukrainian welfare, nor included them in political life. Even more, the Ukrainian people never had just one master at any one time, so the texture of domination was never really the same. This, however, does not pose as much of a problem to our study, here, since almost all Ukrainian immigrants to Canada came from two Austro-Hungarian provinces, Galicia and Bukovina.[3] Yet despite this fragmentation, the Ukrainian people still had vague commonly held political traditions from medieval history - Kievan Rus - and the 15th to 17th centuries - free Kozaks.

During the Kievan Rus epoque *circa* 900 - 1240, the Ukraine was united under one monarch (until 1054), one church, and enjoyed a golden age of commerce and prosperity, learning and culture, under Yaroslav the Wise (d. 1054).[4] The monarch himself was the *apogée* of the united church and state. He ruled by divine right. He symbolized all that which was Ukrainian. In the popular mind the monarch delivered the people from evil. He was wise, just but stern. He was also remote from daily life. The peasant believed that if the czar could only see their suffering, especially at the hands of local nobles and Jews, he would deliver them while meting out his severe justice.[5] A swift religious current flows underneath these political beliefs: suffering, deliverance, justice; suffering by people, deliverance by a remote abstract force, justice from a superior wise-being, all beyond the control, and ken of the common folk. Perhaps it is here, too, where we find the origin of 19th century man's faith in other worldly "natural laws" of society, defined by the economic sciences, which would deliver the bourgeois from his aristocratic oppressor - the hidden hand of market forces - or, the proletariat from his bourgeois oppressor - the natural contradictions within those market forces - with or without

anyone's co-operation. Through the mist of time this Golden age engraved powerful images upon Ukrainian historical consciousness; first, a united Ukraine, and second, political traditions incorporating concepts of other worldly forces which hold the polity together.

The second political tradition was a legacy form the Khmelnytsky state (1654), which was situated in the central Ukraine, and developed during the 15th through 17th centuries. It was a military society which eventually broke away from the Russian czar, though no monarch really did control the Kozaks until the late 17th century.[6] There was a simple social division of labour between farming and military classes. The officers were elected, including the Hetman who was the national leader.[7] The basic social unit was the *sich*, meaning community, in which its members had some self-autonomy. Indeed, some kozak *sichs* such as the Zaporizhic,

> Built on democratic principles, constantly recruiting new members from the discontented elements in the Ukraine, and relying for support on the broad masses of the rank and file kozaks...(it) demanded maximum social and economic security for the common people.[8]

The legacy of this political tradition left some notions of democratic practices and participation in the community's affairs. This image, however, cannot be stressed too much since democracy and community were shadowed by the hardy virtues of military life.

These traditions are somewhat incompatible; clearly an elected national leader contradicts divine monarchy. Neither, however, left lasting political institutions from which a Ukrainian state could develop, nor unify all Ukrainian people. The contradictions within these visions, then, never needed resolution. These traditions did, however, have some elements in common. As visions, the political traditions were romanticized, and thus, left a sort of Ukrainian spirit. Also, these visions concerned freedom, mediated through community - all Ukrainians could be free if

only another Kievan Rus or Zaporizhic *sich* could be resurrected. Ukrainian poetry describes passionately the collective suffering of the Ukrainian nation, and its hope that freedom could be resurrected. "Come living soul", wrote Schevchenko,

> Come dwell in Ukraine;
> Fly across the banks with the cossacks, stand guard
> By the robbed mounds of heros, and wait in the plain,
> Sharing the tears that Cossacks are weeping
> Until I escape from this slavery and pain.[9]

These were only visions of a lost era. The realities of Ukrainian social structure occluded political maturity and confined Ukrainians to the village commune. Since 1386, when incorporated into the kingdom of Poland, the Galician political and economic structure was ethnically split. In the next three hundred years of Polish domination, the Ukrainian nobility became Polonized, and thus, left the lower classes without their traditional political leadership. (The Tartars beforehand left the political units of conquered territory intact, and only demanded duties.) Under Cashmir the Great (1434), Ukrainian law was abolished and replaced by the Polish legal system.[10] Under Polish law, Ukrainian artisans were not given rights which customarily regulated and protected craft guilds.[11] Since Ukrainians were denied rudimentary civil and economic liberties, they could not learn them. This exclusion from law also effectively restricted Ukrainians to peasant life in village communes since migration to larger cities stopped. Most Ukrainians, then, were of peasant class, ruled by Polish lords, yet beyond the protection of Polish law and institutions. So they clung to their customs, those which regulated interpersonal relationships within their rural communities.

Until the 19th and 20th centuries Ukrainians remained a rural people with little variation in social class. Without a noble class to provide political leadership, the Ukrainian Greek Catholic church became the community's principal social institution. And so goes the Polish expression, "there is no Ruthenia, just priests

and peasants."[12] Against their Polish political masters, the church tenaciously fought to protect religious rituals, rights, and education, all of which preserved the Ukrainian language. Politics was that of culture. It was well understood that, without language, the Ukrainian people would have no sense of identity distinct from their masters who shared different ethnic origins. This concern for language is why the Romantic poets, such as Schevchenko, were so politically explosive. Language and education became politics when poetry gave the peasant his consciousness of self; and, an identity is the first crucial ingredient for any social movement's broth.

Ukrainian political practices and concepts became more concrete when the Austrian Empire acquired Galicia, after the first partition of Poland, in 1772. The Austrians extended their systematic government, the rights and duties of citizens, to cover Galician Ukrainians. Influenced by the German *Aufklarung*, the Empress Maria-Theresa (1740-1780) and later Joseph II (1780-1790) built a centralized Austrian state that was quintessentially utilitarian. Under the policy of enlightened autocracy, political authority radiated from one man who managed the state efficiently. This form of government established a rationalized legal system, tax, and economic policies. Notions of equality under the law, and the *Toleranzpatent* (1781), which defined religious freedom, and separated church and state, related the individual to the political institutions in a more direct way. The individual had some rights apart from his ethnic or religious group. Only once inside a modern state, could the Ukrainian internalize modern political concepts.[13]

For the Ukrainians, the impact of enlightened absolutism was immediate; law protected them. Austrian law lessened the burden of Polish domination. The *panshchyna* (corvée) was reduced from six days to three, and abolished in 1848; real estate holdings were recorded by the impartial state, and so, secured peasant

property from thieving landlords.[14] A legal system created a process by which feudal grievances against the lord might be pursued, through various levels of local, provincial, and national administrative units. A wronged peasant could appeal first to the lord, then to the regional government, and last to the monarch himself.[15] Moreover, the village communes became administered by elected officials, though almost always controlled by a wealthy elite.[16] Also, the *Toleranzpatent* also liberated the Greek Catholic church from Polish domination which meant that, the only authentic Ukrainian social institution, at this time, could now freely communicate amongst different communities and create national organizations. So Austrian law instilled notions of right and legitimate authority amongst the Ukrainian communes, where before, law only meant Polish arbitrary rule.

After the 1848-9 revolution, Austrian enlightened absolutism fell to the liberal pressures for constitutional monarchy. In 1861, a permanent national parliament was established[17], as well as a provincial Galician Diet.[18] Certain rights, such as freedom of speech and association, were guaranteed, and thus legitimized the existence of political parties, clubs, and to some degree, political dissent.[19] Along with civil rights, Constitutional law, in 1867, guaranteed equality between ethnic groups and linguistic rights, so that education, political institutions and law courts, were now more accessible to different ethnic communities.[20] The reforms of the 1860's, civil liberties and limited democracy, made Ukrainian cultural, social, and political growth possible. So much was this the case that this Ukrainian in Russia could claim,

> Galicia was for us a model in the struggle for our nations rebirth: it strengthened our faith for a better future. Galicia was a true Piedmont of the Ukraine because prior to 1906 a Ukrainian press, scholarship and national life could develop only there.[21]

If constitutional histories are often sad chronologies of bright promises, which

political realities tarnish, then they also create an image of legitimate political behaviour, a standard against which governments are measured, and resistance justified. Life for the peasant after the Josephinian reforms was still harsh. Polish nobles either ruthlessly disobeyed reforms, or manipulated legal interpretations to ensure their own advantage. With the *panachyna*, for example, one day's labour could mean twenty-four hours, not necessarily consecutive.[22] These reforms also did little to relieve the harsh forms of corporal punishment which the lords used to discipline serfs who disobeyed feudal obligations. And legal procedures were obviously unfair; a peasant had to express his grievance in *written* German, otherwise it would not be processed. It often took years. The lord however, had the militia as a ready and immediate instrument to coerce peasant compliance to law. Hard labour, violence, and harsh laws were still part of the Ukrainian way of life.

Yet despite the horrible conditions of servitude, the Ukrainian peasant still acquired a sense of political legitimacy. Peasants made great efforts to use the appeal process, and so, a Ukrainian secular intelligentsia, called corner-scribes, developed. These disenchanted intellectuals, discriminated against by the Austrian bureaucracy and thus excluded from legal careers, made their living by processing grievances.[23] In other cases, the authority of the monarch was used to legitimize the withdrawal of services to the lord. This peasant remarked, in 1819, when the Kamarno community refused to give fodder, chickens and capons to the lord, that, only when, "...the emperor writes to us in response to our petition then we will do and give what he tells us."[24] And sometimes, the Polish lords reaped what they sowed when, in rebellion against the Austrian Empire, in 1846, they were legitimately slaughtered by the Ukrainian peasantry.[25] Indeed, once rules were established, Ukrainians learned how to follow a rule, and so, they acquired concepts of political legitimacy, however rudimentary.

To insulate themselves as best as they could from oppressive feudal social relationships, Ukrainian peasants fostered strong community bonds. They found identity in their shared suffering. Ukrainians stood apart from the nation because they were a relatively undifferentiated economic class, their rulers were ethnically distinct, spoke a different language, and practiced a different religion. Since they were so weak, they had to stand together. This meant the community enforced discipline upon its members. Often, peasants used fearsome religious rituals to bind members of the community to a course of action. A ceremony might look like this; on knees, with bible over head, candles all 'round, a superstitious peasant would swear fealty to the commune.[26] This frighteningly powerful image braided together superstition and religious ritual, community protest and solidarity. And that compact was enforced "If you do not stand up for the commune and do not join with the commune," threatened this peasant from Perchinsko Stryi in 1817,

> the commune will hang you The commune is a higher authority than the lord [27]

Indeed, the commune could not exist unless "one would stand up for the other completely."[28]

The strike was the foremost means of protest. Ukrainian peasant strikes illustrate the intensity of their community solidarity, as well as their own comprehension of their social system's logic. When, in 1847, twenty peasants were flogged to force the rest of the Turie commune to pay rents, "the stubbornness of those punished grew to fanaticism ... They considered themselves martyrs for the happiness of the community...."[29] Only in this sort of stubbornness could the peasant recoup that last line of human dignity, and gather the courage to say "no more". Here, as in other incidents, peasant strikes transcended economic discontent: life, death, martyrdom, commune's existence. The logic of the strike, however, was related to protest against feudal relations. Strikes could be against the

unfairness of the lords demands, given the lord's obligations, or, more rarely, as in the case of 1848, against the system itself. Indeed, it took some political *savoir-faire* to distinguish between a strike and a revolt, economic versus political grievances. Revolts challenged the social order in a fundamental way and were put down quickly, with brutal force, by the militia. Strikes concerned feudal obligations and did not provoke *as* swift a response from the militia. In the 1880's and 90's peasant understanding of strikes was enriched by students who taught peasants the relationship between political economy, combination for the purposes of wage increases, and the logic of the modern strike. And indeed, strikes did increase during this time, especially in the 1900's.[30] Much later in Canada, the communes fierce solidarity, combined with more systematic understandings of industrial strikes, indeed, sharpened class conflict since,

> The industrial conflicts were not a mere disagreement between capital and labour, they were life and death struggles and any deviation from the group action was branded as traitorous When quiet persuasion failed, the property of scabs was dynamited and they were assaulted by mobs composed not only of workers themselves but wives and children too [31]

Again, the commune was a higher authority than the lord.

Community solidarity was also the commune's foremost weakness. Peasants trusted no one outside the commune. Peasant self-identity was isolated from the hostile outside. The conception of self and world, for the peasant, was related to the community and local region, and built upon the suspicion of outsiders.[32] Indeed, the ignorant peasant, for whom witchcraft, evil omens, and so forth, were as real as their poverty, reasoned skeptically the merit of any new ideas. Galician social movements, at first, could only slowly penetrate the *bornée* peasant worldview.

The Galician intelligentsia and clergy faced the peasant's ignorance and brought the *Prosvita* (Enlightenment) to the peasant commune with clear cultural,

and political purposes. Indeed, culture and politics formed a well ordered *projet*. The immediate political purpose was to create an independent Ukrainian province within the Austro-Hungarian empire. How could this be done? Ukrainian leaders assumed political self-determination, in a constitutional system, depended upon mass support. But the problem was that,

> our peasant, who barely comprehends the business of the commune let alone the crownland (Galicia) or - what is more - the state, might understand the connection which exists between his own well being and what transpires in the District Council, Diet or Parliament.[33]

So education was the key; the growth of a political force depended upon a literate, politically conscious peasantry. Culture, then, was a first order step to secure political ends that, ultimately, depended upon awakening the Ukrainian peasant, who only vaguely knew his own traditions. Through poetry, where culture promised knowledge of oneself, Ukrainian leaders achieved access into the dark communes. They offered clarity of purpose in place of vague ancient customs. Poetry, here, symbolized Enlightenment because it asked questions. "Our history", Shevchenko spoke clearly and rhythmically in verse,

> Explains to us and preaches.
> Search out the meaning of it all, then ask
> yourself the question! Who are we?[34]

First Ukrainians had to know who they were, before they could define their needs and goals.

The early Ukrainian activists who pursued these cultural and political purposes called themselves *navodovtsi* - National Populists. Conservatives, clergymen, radicals and social democrats shared similar goals. This unity soon broke apart as radicals and social democrats connected cultural liberation with socio-economic emancipation.[35] During the 1860's and 70's, the socialists were quite manipulative. Since they could not penetrate the villages without the church, they temporarily deferred to the church's worldview until secure enough to continue alone.[36] The

new leaders were secular; students and intellectuals "only one or two generations from the peasant or parsonage", or descendant from those troublesome corner-scribes.[37] The clergymen distrusted this intelligentsia since their socialist *projet* was radical, and quite clearly, anti-clerical. And clergymen had good reasons for their suspicions. The Radicals and Social Democrats believed the clergy was a class which dominated peasants; and indeed the church did increase taxes and reinforce ignorance of modern political concepts. Furthermore, many clergymen were unsympathetic to the peasants poverty, which, so some believed, was caused by "their sloth, prodigality and drunkenness", rather than oppressive social forces.[38] As the century progressed, the Radicals gained more support because they taught the peasant that his poverty was not entirely his fault.

The Radicals and Social Democrats represent the common goals activists shared, and the extreme poles between which they differed. Both Radicals and Social Democrats agreed that the economic and political system had to change, root and branch. They adopted the tenets of scientific socialism, and fashioned their political program to expedite the *real* economic forces which, eventually, would cause the capitalist social order to come crashing down.[39] So the Social Democrats attempted to organize the Ukrainian industrial proletariat, which hardly existed, save a few craftsmen and peasants, who worked in the Boroslav oilfields.[40] The Radicals drew their philosophical worldview from the ethical socialism of Mykhailo Drahomanov, a University of Kiev professor, whose postulates were rationalism, realism, and communal autonomy.[41] For Drahomanov, the precondition for socialism was not the destructive logic of Marxist economics, but an enlightened peasantry, shed of its irrational superstitions, who lived in autonomous voluntary associations for economic and cultural purposes.[42] Therefore the Radical *projet* would "elevate the sense of national consciousness by means of literature, meetings, congresses, associations, demonstrations, lectures, the press, etc.."[43] Though each

differed in their perspective, each group also accented the political party as the institution through which change could be forced. While the scientific socialist hurried the capitalist collapse, the Radical built a new order within the old. One can not make too much of this distinction between the parties, especially in the early years, since their separate philosophical impulses beat in both parties, so that, when, in 1899, the Social Democrats did finally separate from the Radicals, they retained traces of the Radical's ethical socialism.

Ukrainian political parties created the *chytalni* (reading circles) in order to shape the political consciousness of the peasantry. From their first appearance, in the late 1860's to 1910, their numbers increased from a handful to thousands.[44] The mechanics of the *chytalni* were brilliantly simple; a literate peasant would read popular journals printed by one of the many political parties. The issues ranged from technical procedures, such as agricultural production methods, to national politics. Also, during their summer vacations, students taught peasants Ukrainian literature, history and politics.[45] Then peasants discussed the topics.

> Anyone who has ever been present at an assembly of Ruthenian Radicals has seen peasants in their sheep skin jackets with their hair plastered down with grease, making notes on scraps of paper supported on their knees in order to participate in the discussion ... has been filled with wonder and respect for this nation's intelligence and its capacity to develop.[46]

So the *chytalni* became an educational institution through which political parties presented scientific-technological production methods, social and economic theories, and in the process, defined the community's unique ethnic identity through literature, history, politics.

The *chytalni* did not just broaden the individual peasant's horizons, as the old cliché goes. Its impact was more extensive. Peasants learned how to learn and acquired political and economic experience. Since many political parties were represented in the *chytalni*, it was a forum for political debate and critical analysis

which meant that, peasants in the action of learning, talked, thought, criticized; all skills in themselves.

This was, then, the first steps toward a dialogical tradition from which peasants learned politics. In village politics peasants often used the *chytalni* to initiate opposition against the village leaders, who were wealthy peasants and priests. With peasants being political in their communities, the national political parties could present more forceful arguments for mass political participation for national purposes. Why? Because peasants had some political experience.

Last the *chytalni* was a medium through which economic collective action was learned. The intelligentsia provided technical advice upon how to establish mutual associations to insure against illness, and co-operatives for land and food distribution, as well as banking services. Intellectuals taught peasants the logic of political economic laws, and how to manipulate them to suit their own needs. Here the community's traditional solidarity and aspirations for communal self-reliance met modern 19th century sociology and economics. Even more, without that sense of community, where all acted as one, these associations could not work unless *everyone* became involved. Once established, these mutual associations and co-operatives acquired a distinct identity of their own. They in turn, became the medium through which the individual peasant learned economics, politics, co-operation, and so forth.

The success of the Galician-Ukrainian *Prosvita* was evident in the growth of community associations, complex political activity, and class protest. "As a result of political struggle and self-organization efforts and work," exclaimed Rudnytsky,

> The Galician Ukrainians had before World War I over 3000 elementary schools, six state gymnasia and fifteen private schools, 2,444 local branches of the Society for Enlightenment (reading circles) a network of gymnastic associations...local circles of the agricultural associations, and more than 500 co-operatives and mutual credit associations.[47]

Such intense organization was indeed made possible through political activity. Part of this activity included the Radical and Social Democratic parties which had a firm position in the Galician legislature with 5 of 27 seats.[48] Moreover those parties ascribed to the assumption that more democratization of Galician institutions would be a catalyst for more social change. So Radicals and Social Democrats participated in the successful campaign for constitutional reform, *viz.* universal sufferage.[49] Thus, by the turn of the century, democratic practices were not foreign to Ukrainian political parties, leaders, and consequentiy, the peasants they organized.

The Social Democrats cultivated a working class movement. The party organized trade unions, supported strikes, and established workers mutual associations. After forty years of political organizing, a clearly class conscious workers movement developed in Boroslav. In a series of strikes, from 1901 to 1904, these workers expressed class discontent.[50] The zenith of Radical involvement in social protest was, perhaps, the agricultural strike of 1902. Two hundred thousand agricultural labourers, in 400 communities, struck against the large manors.[51] Although the strikes started spontaneously, Ukrainian political parties organized, directed, then spread them, soon after they began.[52] This strike protested against Galicia's rapid social change which proletarianized the peasant, who, now, became a wage labourer on large farms. Political party activists provided a political economic perspective which made sense of the problem. With a clear perspective, the scattered impulses of discontent focused sharply on the political and economic problems, and so, directed precise protest methods.

Clearly Ukrainians had complex political practices and traditions. Since Ukrainians never had a state for many centuries, and consequently little political life, the preservation of a Ukrainian national identity became a fundamental

concern. Communities and the church stressed language, culture and later education. So, during these dark times, Ukrainian political concepts, were imbued with national aspirations for unity and freedom. They mythologized Kievan Rus and the wild Kozaks. With the spread of Ukrainian social movements, in the mid to late 19th centuries, Ukrainians mixed modern political practices and institutions with ancient aspirations for national and community autonomy. Through these movements, Ukrainians acquired knowledge and practical experience concerning politics, democracy and socio-economic empancipation. And by the late 19th century, a distinctly class movement existed which integrated political and economic emancipation.

The political party was the dominant political institution through which Ukrainians learned politics: political concepts, organization, and so on. Through the *chytalni* political parties brought literature and philosophy, social and economic sciences, to the peasantry. It was through the party that one learned how to organize co-operatives and worker benefit associations. Regarding class conflict, party activists, such as the Social Democrats, organized Boroslav workers into trade unions, directed strikes and built mutual societies. So for the Ukrainian, the political party deeply influenced the evolution of class social, economic, and political practices.

Through historical experience Ukrainians learned two forms of political critique. After the first partition of Poland, when they lived within clear political structures, Ukrainians learned how to measure political behaviour by the standards of the existing political order. Consequently, Ukrainians acquired notions of acceptable political behaviour *qua* political legitimacy. The second form of critique put into question the fundamental assumptions of the body politic, and inspired movements such as that of the Radicals and Social Democrats. These movements

sought to reorganize social, economic, and political relationships upon different assumptions. Since Ukrainians never had a tradition of statehood, the edges of each level of critique could blur. A protest or strike against a particular law could lead to more critical situations because the laws Ukrainians obeyed were never really their own.

III

The English had the sort of cohesive cultural unity only an island nation can inbreed. Within this culture, the English acquired and institutionalized political traditions such as democracy, civil and political rights, which, then, became part of English common knowledge. We need not, however, start with the Magna Carta to understand working class political traditions. Indeed, the economic change from traditional to capitalist society, national political traditions, and enlightenment philosophy mark the origins of the English working-class, in the late 18th century. Many authors catalogue the industrial revolution's changes; the evolution of factory system, institutionalization of laissez-faire economic practices, and the liberation of market forces which all stunned and staggered traditional society. This economic change was indeed imposed upon an unwilling lower class. Our concern, here, is the way in which the English working class resisted these changes and projected alternatives to the encroaching system, from their own understanding of an Englishman's rights, and the logic of social forces.

By the late 18th century, notions of political concepts, rights, and practices were part of English custom, thus a part of English common knowledge. Three strains within English political traditions converged to define the lower class

Englishmen's sense of right: Libertarian, Dissenting and Jacobin traditions. Though most Englishmen had no right to participate in politics, all were still protected by law under which all were equal. Since the Glorious Revolution, the rule of law and Parliament restrained the arbitrary authority of the monarch. The judicial system, especially the right to Jury trials, protected the individual Englishman's rights against government. And indeed, many examples exist where Juries protected commoners from overly zealous governments. Juries freed men such as Hardy, Horne, Tooke and Thelwal, for example, after Jacobin societies were repressed in the early 1790's.[53] Englishmen had the right to equal protection under the law, freedom from arbitrary laws, and the right to a jury trial before one's impartial peers. Even an inkling of rights which protected expression of opinion existed such as freedom of conscience, speech, and press. These claims to a right found their origin in the English limited religious tolerance of the 17th century, as well as literature and political philosophy, Milton and Locke. An Englishman's rights also defined personal freedoms: travel, trade, and the right to sell one's own labour. Last the most powerful sense of right was the sanctity of an Englishman's home because,

> if iver that bullwark is broke down of every english mans hous being his Castil than that strong barrer is for iver broke that so many of our ancesters have bled for and in vain.[54]

These rights clearly defined the determinate social space in which the Englishman was free, for which much blood spilled. These rights also fashioned a sort of line the government dare not cross, without reflection, for fear of civil violence.[55]

This libertarian tradition did not include the right to participate in the democratic political process, so only the wealthy and/or aristocracy could be full citizens. Yet self-government and freedom of conscience were still familiar to ordinary Englishmen. The swinish multitude acquired their civics education from practical experience in religious movements, in particular, Dissent, and later

Methodism, which practiced self-government. Through Dissenting traditions, common Englishmen learned to organize and discipline themselves for other purposes, so that, in 1820, Southey could say,

> Perhaps the manner in which Methodism has familiarized the lower classes to the work of combining in associations, making rules for their own governance, raising funds, and communicating from one part of the kingdom to another may be reckoned among the incidental evils which have resulted from it.[56]

Indeed, there was a certain wildness about Dissent since, "the very anarchy of Old Dissent with its self-governing churches and its schisms, meant that the most unexpected and unorthodox ideas might suddenly appear - in a Lincolnshire village, a Midlands market-town, a Yorkshire pit."[57] This acquaintance with self-government, mixed with traditions of free conscience, made Dissenting sects possible forcing beds for Radicalism.[58] But their most lasting impact was upon early trade unions where Methodist forms of organization, and internal democracy, became models for a rather different sort of movement.[59]

The French Revolution and Enlightenment political philosophy sharpened a new edge to English political traditions. The rationalism of Tom Paine, expressed vividly in the pamphlet style, generated radical ideas amongst lower class Englishmen; for this reason many English historians credit Paine as the father of working class radicalism.[60] Paine attacked English society for equating political authority with tradition since, inevitably, all history failed to justify inequality. Some aristocratic ancestor was usually an usurper of some sort. If history can not be trusted, society ought to be organized upon ahistorical principles; those which defined human nature, but which the human faculty of reason could observe; and from which, principles could be deduced to organize social, economic, and political life. For Paine, legitimate government derived its authority from human reason based upon an understanding of fundamental natural and civil rights. "Natural rights," he said,

> are those which appertain to man in right of his existence. Of this kind are all intellectual rights or rights of mind, and also all those rights of acting as an individual for his own comfort and happiness, which are not injurious to the natural rights of others. Civil rights are those which appertain to man in right of his being a member of society. Every civil right has for its foundation some natural right pre-existing in the individual, but to the enjoyment of which his individual power is not, in all cases, sufficiently competent.[61]

Paine provided a simple *a priori* alternative to define legitimate government as well as principles from which social institutions and practices could be built. Ironically, Enlightenment met tradition since it was only because a sense of rights already existed that Paine's influence could spread so quickly. Another irony of Paine's ahistorical account of politics is that it, too, became tradition. Here was an alternative means to define, protect, and expand existing cherished values, in a more radical way.

Paine, himself, participated in republican revolutionary movements in the United States, England, and France, so, in part, his legacy was a revolutionary one. The object of revolution was to create political institutions which could best represent the common interest, something most social contract thinkers assumed to exist, in all communities, just by virtue of being a community. Through representative formalism, political conflict could be resolved through rational debate and deliberation: democracy. These institutions could only stand above conflict when the community agreed on the rules of the game. Clearly this sort of change would have required revolution, something England never had. Yet many revolutionary societies were spawned throughout the century, such as the Jacobins, the syndicalists, and the communists, which, furthermore, influenced other social institutions, and social change in general, if only to make the authorities recognize their threat. Concerning trade unions, for example, Aspinal arguesthat

> The working class movement for social and political reform, which was inspired by the 'Ideas' of 1789'... was, perhaps a more important factor in bringing the existence of trade unions to the notice of authorities than the rapid progress of industry and the factory system of production.[62]

And perhaps this fear was realistic. Thompson and Hobsbawn argue Jacobins were involved in revolutionary activity during the Luddite era, Peterloo, the Cato Street conspiracy, as well as the peaceful petitioning for sufferage rights.[63] Like the modern communist, the Jacobin attempted to infiltrate and influence many social organizations such as trade unions, friendly societies, and corresponding societies.[64]

English working class movements related English political traditions to economic demands. Indeed, they were more than willing to appeal to politics to influence the economic forces which made life miserable. A series of movements, in the 1820's to 1840's, lobbied and petitioned parliament to regulate working conditions in factories, limit the hours of work to ten per day for children, and to change the poor law system. These movements were well organized middle and working class coalitions, from factory towns, which sought to influence the democratic process. Not only did they seek change through democratic methods, they organized themselves upon democratic principles. During the factory movement, for example, Yorkshire operatives organized short time committees through out the factory districts, and campaigned by means of pamphlets, petitions, public meetings and newspapers.[65] What makes all this political? These movements believed the rule of law could assuage economic laws.

If we can separate our notion of politics from being related, foremost, to political processes and systems, a richer expression of the political edge in English working class discontent, and protest, becomes clear. The factories and mines dehumanized men, women, and children. This English Jacobin explained the industrial revolution as a process wherein

> a large portion of the people were converted into mere machines, ignorant, debauched and brutal.[66]

Whole families worked upwards to 16 and 17 hours a day so that, indeed, people *became* machines, ignorant, debauched, and brutal. The effect was "the separation

of families, breaking up of households, the disruption of all those ties which link man's heart to the better portion of his nature - *viz.* his instincts and social affection."[67] If Aristotle is a legitimate authority, to whom one can turn to define what is political, then this economic development was a political problem; it cut community bonds. And, after all, Man is a social being.[68]

So, much working class economic discontent demanded the protection of a vague notion of "the quality of life" which, once linked to wage demands, became known as a living wage. Perhaps the Webbs described this sentiment best.

> Deep down in their hearts the organized workmen, even whilst holding the Doctrine of vested interests (that a trade was one's property bought by certain years of servitude which gives a vested right. p. 564) or acquiescing in that of Supply and Demand, have always cherished a feeling that one condition is paramount over all, namely, that wages must be so fixed that the existing generation of operatives should at any rate be able to live by their trade.[69]

This living wage notion is not easily quantifiable by pay rates since it is related to *living*, a social term which incorporates such intangible things as leisure, family life, education, and so on. Though this notion relates "vested interests", and concepts such as "supply and demand", which, now, set wages, it is also reminiscent of the Speenhamland system, where the price of bread was related to wages and set by Justices of the peace.[70] Another, even deeper, historical political tradition underscores this concept living wage since Parliament-made law regulated wages through the Statute of Artificers (1534), in the 16th century. Again, more modern expressions of this tradition would be policies such as minimum wage legislation. So through custom such practices, whose concern was the tradesman's standard of living, became rights, protected by Parliament and the Judiciary. Indeed, we may push the living wage deeper, into religious traditions, since, "the labourer has a right to expect his maintenance."[71] Here, then, categories of what was political, and what was economic, folded in upon one another since the worker was concerned with his way of life.

Economic demands and political traditions came together in the community and fashioned a distinct working class worldview. Workers in their own communities organized friendly societies and trade unions, political clubs and parties, to influence economic and political systems, as well as their own self-consciousness. Though friendly societies and later trade unions were organized for primarily economic purposes, their social practices and self-organization, were democratic. In existence since the 17th century, friendly societies elected their officers, formed committees, published their rules, and deliberated about society affairs.[72] Thus, by the time trade unions were legal, an understanding of self-government was second nature. Indeed, the most fundamental democratic axiom of early trade unionists was, "the most child like faith not only that 'all men are equal' but that 'what concerns all should be decided by all.'"[73] And over the years, trade unions used many models of democracy, from direct to representative, and many forms of executive, legislative, and judicial systems of decision-making, direct and delegated.[74] Almost one hundred years later, the Webbs in *Industrial Democracy*, would suggest that the state ought to learn from trade union democratic experience, and alter the country's institutions so that industrial production and self-autonomy could be compatible. "If the democratic state is to attain its fullest and finest development", speculated the Webbs,

> it is essential that the actual needs and desires of the human agents concerned should be the main consideration in determining the conditions of employment.[75]

So in the trade union, a model existed which could reconcile democracy and economic need. Indeed, some labour radicals wanted to go so far as to actually turn the country into a trade union, since a community of producers did not need an aristocracy or a bourgeois elite.

Political clubs and parties had a more tenuous existence. Like trade unions they governed themselves democratically, and were part of the fabric of local

communities, yet their goal was clearly political change. Unlike trade unions, political clubs could not provide economic security, and were often suppressed by the government. They did, however, project a vision of political rights, practices and institutions from which more economic security could be possible. Paine, for example, led the Jacobin claim that a republican polity could provide limited social welfare programs for the elderly, mothers, the unemployed, and rights for workers to bargain collectively.[76] Later, the Chartists related universal sufferage to "the means to secure every working man's 'right' to a good coat on his back, a good roof over his head and a good dinner on his table"[77], as well as a means to generate the political will to regulate the industrial revolution.

In these political clubs and parties, the grand designs of Painites, Chartists and later, socialists all penetrated communities. Through painstaking organization dedicated political activists tried to create a new political force in each community. These activists wrote pamphlets, distributed propaganda, organized petitions and marches, and burrowed into other community institutions such as co-operatives, trade unions, friendly societies and chapels. From the corresponding societies of 1790's, to the Chartist leagues of the 1830's, 40's, to the Yorkshire Socialist Leagers of the 1870's and 80's, these small political unions spread the word. Most of all they provided a *choice* for political action within local communities. Indeed, their *projet* shaped their communities' social thought, social action, and social instinct.

Political choice and action did indeed succeed when conditions made a radical choice rational. Thompson, for example, argues Jacobins helped organize luddite activity in in order to train a revolutionary force. Luddism peaked at the end of the Napoleonic wars when trade was depressed, and machines reduced the living standards of weavers and stockingers. Luddism also occurred in Yorkshire, Nottinghamshire, Lancashire, and so on, which were all industrial communities with

long Jacobin and illegal trade union traditions.[78] Clearly, some Jacobin influence was present, as one Luddite promised,

> and we will be governed by a just Republic and may the almighty hasten those happy times is the wish and Prayer of Millions in this land.[79]

In a very different case, some 70 years later, similar local organization efforts produced political fruit. In "Homage to Tom Macguire", Thompson attributes the successful rise of the Independent Labour Party to long term political organizingby Labourite socialists, who were able to take advantage of a local strike, and the stupidity with which Liberals and Conservatives responded to working class grievances. That which made political action possible was that independent labour had political expression in sub-political impulses within organizations such as co-operatives, trade unions, friendly societies chapels, and so on. Political possibilities lay enmeshed in community life.

From their well organized community life, workers acquired a sense of self-identity. The core concept, around which working class communities found this identity, was, of course, work; some labour theory of value. The labour theory of value was so fundamental because it defined how man relates to nature and provides for his needs, be they for self-preservation, or self-expression as a human being. For Englishmen, labour also had religious import. The religious value put upon human labour is clear, especially for the working class. Christ was a carpenter. The craftsman's labour was also related to English notions of property rights since his skill was indeed private property; he had a vested interest from which he claimed the protection of British law.[80] Eighteenth century political economy, from Adam Smith on, used labour to ascribe value to commodities. So, from classical political economy, workers deduced different conclusions as to how goods ought be produced, and profits shared. Interpreting Ricardo's theory of value, in which all value comes from labour, some workers attempted to establish co-operatives so as

to set a just price on labour.[81] With Marx, the labour theory of value was linked to a political economy that promised the destruction of capitalism, after which, the workers would inherit the industrial earth. Justice, and the iron laws of political economy, would deliver humanity. Most of all, however, the value placed upon labour, whatever the conceptual network, was an ethical concept which defined rightful human action, and the good and just life. Postulating the Rights of Nature, in the 1790's, Thelwal described a working class sense of right due labour:

> I affirm that every man and every woman, and every child, ought to obtain something more, in the general distribution of the fruits of labour, than food and rags and a wretched hammock with a poor rug to cover it; and that without working twelve to fourteen hours a day ... from six to six-thirty - they have a claim, a sacred and inviolable claim to some means of or some information as may lead to an understanding of their rights.[82]

From labour, one not only had ethical notions of justice, and the good life, but the potential power to grasp it.

> The real strength and all the resources of a country ever have sprung and ever must spring, from the labour of its people. The people were those who had built towns who had made England what she is.[83]

Clearly, the working class conceptual net cast 'round labour had many interrelated meanings: religious traditions, English property rights, classical political economy and ethical rightness, all of which justified a working class claim to participate in the larger national community.

For workers to collect their due, and attain some individual freedoms, they had to rely upon the community. Working class institutions, therefore, were concerned with self-help; social welfare policies and education. Friendly societies were the first institutions which provided its members any social welfare, and so, protected their contributors against sickness, accidents and temporary unemployment, since the 17th century.[84] Later, trade unions became the principal institution through which these benefits were organized and distributed. Through co-operatives, which had always only limited success, some workers attempted to

provide cheaper food and housing, or indeed, establish productive businesses.[85] The concerns, which became identified with trade unions, were expanded to include the national community by the early 20th century when the Liberal government created health and workman's compensation policies, unemployment insurance and labour exchanges.[86] Education was also a crucial element in working class self-autonomy because it "awakens within the worker higher cultural desires; it always awakens a feeling of self-respect."[87] Trade unions, Corresponding Societies, socialist parties all emphasized knowledge and learning as one means to better individual workers, mobilize trade union and political activity, and inspire change. For this task, trade unions and political organizations created libraries and printing presses, to make books available, and organized reading societies, to disseminate knowledge. This activity was essentially that of a university, for working class people, to teach them political economy, educate them about their political rights, and in some cases, encourage revolutionary thought. In the early Jacobin corresponding societies, for example, discussion groups mulled over political events, ideas, and literature including Paine's collected works, *Common Sense*, *The Rights of Man* and *The Age of Reason* as well as other tracts such as *King Killing*, *The Reign of the English Robspierre* and *The Happy Reign of George the Last*.[88] Through these educational institutions, many working class men became sophisticated and erudite thinkers such as Paine himself, and later, Kier Hardie, as well as British immigrants to Canada, such as William Pritchard. Perhaps Paine represents best the relationship between education and a working class movement since, before becoming a pamphleteer, he was an artisan, then a teacher. So, in a way, his success as a self-taught thinker, from humble origins, who stood up to tradition and authority, did express the ideals of his age.

Trade unions represented the aggressive element in working class self-help since workers combined to stand up to the employer, enforce wage rates, and

control working conditions. Thus, trade unions were the most visible institution in English class conflict. It is not clear when modern trade unions came into existence, though they have historical origins in mutual benefit societies, various trades clubs and guilds.[89] Trade unions came into existence through resistance against a process of liberalization of production, meaning they organized to protect rights formerly defined by Parliament.[90] From the 1790's to the early 1820's, trade unions got their definition from legislation, mostly the Combinations act of 1799, which made combination of workmen, for the restraint of trade, a criminal offense. This, in combination with Common law, and the Master and Servant acts, which both defined any breach of contract by the worker a crime, made the legal status of trade unions uncertain, until as late as 1875. Even after the repeal of the Combinations act (1824-5), combination for the restraint of trade became so narrowly defined, by the Judiciary, that it, *de facto*, remained a criminal offence. In 1871, the Criminal Law Amendment act finally freed unions from criminal conspiracy trials due to restraint of trade. Yet it was not until 1875 when breach of contract, by a worker, was not considered a criminal offense under the Master and Servant act. So, until the 1870's, workers could only join trade unions which did not restrain trade and break contracts, persuade other workers to do so, or intimidate workers who do not join.[91] Since 1824, then, workers could only negotiate wage and working conditions; they could not legally enforce their demands.

The origin of trade unions lay in crime. Since trade unions were illegal, the men who organized them depended upon loyalty to the community of workers, and more, could not exist without some sympathy from the rest of the community. Trade unionists met in places where they could not be eavesdropped upon; the moors or pubs. Why pubs? Because: In local communities a stranger was readily identifiable. They took dramatic precautions; they elected their officers by secret

ballot, yet did not announce the victor, save the Secretary or Treasurer of the union, so that if one was caught, the organization would not collapse as easily. Members were forced to take oaths with strong religious undertones which expressed the seriousness of their conspiracy, and also, marked their collective suffering, their appeal for justice, and their community bond. And these oaths were brutally enforced.[92] In luddism, some understanding of the community's solidarity and sympathy with illegal trade unionism is possible. Luddites were rarely caught in their communities; and when someone did inform authorities about luddite activity, they were excluded from community life. Indeed, communities supported captured luddites at trials or in street demonstrations; and when luddites were executed, funerals became public gatherings where the victims were almost canonized.[93] So trade unions grew in an "illegal world in which secrecy and hostility to the authorities were intrinsic to their very existence."[94]

Trade unions were intimately related to English political traditions. Trade unionists always felt their right to organize trade unions was legitimate, and the government's repression was not, by virtue of their understanding English political tradition. For trade unionists, the Combinations act unjustly took away rights entrenched in the Constitution since the Statute of Artificers.[95] Following the logic of Painite Natural rights, trade unionists had civil rights to freely associate. Indeed, these were also constitutional rights and justified the existence of friendly societies already protected by statute since 1793.[96] Moreover, the right to resist government, a right established in the aftermath of the Civil war, a right intellectually fashioned by Locke, allowed the trade unionist to justify breaking wrongly fashioned laws. His way of life was indeed English.

Inextricably related to trade unionism and working class self-help was collective bargaining. It was always a sensitive process while trade unions were

illegal, so trade unionists fashioned elaborate mechanisms to communicate demands and enforce them. Craftsmen, one by one, would quit an obdurate employer, seemingly without any collective demand; no one in the community would be available to take the craftsman's place. Nothing said, no wage demands made, no visible community dissent. Yet everyone involved understood. There was a logic to the web of meaning englobing proper, and improper master servant relations.[97] Other systems of collective bargaining may have been that of the tramping artisan. In order to force a labour shortage, some artisans would leave the district, ostensibly to find work elsewhere. They had special cards to identify their real purpose and passed on information concerning the local dispute.[98] Obviously these sorts of systems broke down when the gravity of depressions became regional or national in scope, so, often, violence against the employer, his property, and black legs occurred to make employers bargain.

From the mid to late 19th century, collective bargaining became popular amongst trade unionists and some employers.[99] It rationalized relations between employer and employee; it managed conflict and production. For trade unionists this brought obvious advantages since employer approval of collective bargaining presupposed the legitimacy of the trade union's existence, and reduced industrial conflict by preventing strikes which, often, strained the trade union's resources, and consequently, threatened its existence.[100] Employers had less to gain, but they did benefit somewhat. They soon found trade unions had a stake in their companies' survival. Most of all, some employers could exchange wage concessions for control over their production processes.[101] The general acceptance of collective bargaining, then, projected possibilities that could cut two ways; it could reinforce the existing system, or project a new system of industrial relations. In the first case workers would accept their status as a unit of production, and through collective bargaining simply get more wages. In this way the individual greed principle - more - brought

the worker into the mainstream laissez-faire system.[102] Collective bargaining, however, could also project society into a new direction by bringing trade union democracy to the management of industry: the democratic control of industry.[103] The republicanism of Rousseau was stretched over the modern factory since,

> It is only when the resources of the nation are deliberately organized and dealt with for the benefit, not of the particular individuals or classes, but of the entire community; when the administration of industry, as in every other branch of human affairs, becomes the function of specialized experts, working through deliberately adjusted common rules; and when the ultimate decision on policy rests in no other hands, those of the citizens themselves, that the maximum aggregate development of the individual intellect and individual character in the community as a whole can be attained.[104]

So collective bargaining was one means through which some thinkers and labour activists believed larger social, economic, and political change could occur.

Through trade unions and radical associations workers organized mass protest movements for economic and political purposes. Since these movements placed their faith in the power of people, they depended upon democratic participation to define both ends and means of social protest. So radicals organized mass political demonstrations to pressure Parliament for political, social, and economic reform. They sought political solutions to social problems. Indeed, the early struggle for trade union rights and manhood sufferage expressed the nature of English working class movements.

The repeal of the Combination laws is the most important historical moment for the trade union movement since Parliament, for the first time, recognized the labourer's right to combine. It is also a masterful illustration of politics; radical and trade union political pressure combined many features of British political forces in order to achieve a social right. There were two acts which repealed the Combination laws, one in 1824, followed by another act one year later. The main difference between the 1824 and 1825 acts is that, in the former, trade unionists only reluctantly supported the Parliamentary coalition for the repeal, whereas, in the

latter, a mass movement to protect the gains of 1824 burst forth in 1825. Why did trade unionists not support fully the first repeal? First, trade unionists believed the framers of the repeal bill, Place and Hume, were dogmatic in their laissez-faire philosophy. Indeed this was so since Place argued the repression of combinations caused combinations, and that freedom of labour to negotiate wages would make combinations unnecessary, due to the nature of the forces influencing supply and demand for labour.[105] Second, Place and Hume had just sabotaged a bill, presented to Parliament by Gravener Henson, which proposed not only repeal but a complicated machinery for regulating piece work and settling industrial disputes.[106] Both Henson and the bill's substance had the broad support of trade unionists, so trade unionists distrusted the motives of Place and Hume. Last, trade unionists feared that the laissez-faire kernel within the Place bill may project further destruction of trade union practices.[107] Once the acts were repealed, trade unions came in to full public view; they organized workers, struck against employers, and violently coerced other workers to join trade unions and support strikes.[108] So, in the following year, the employers demanded an industrial policy. Faced with this threat, trade unions stormed Parliament with protests and petitions, organized marches and meetings. "'Vigilant and intelligent men' came down to watch the parliamentary proceedings from Lancashire, Glascow, Yorkshire and Tyneside."[109] The possibility of revolution hung in the air, like humidity anticipates rain. Writing to Place, Doherty, the Lancashire cotton spinner leader, warned any attempt at a re-enactment of the combination laws would result in a wide spread revolutionary movement.[110] A compromise bill, then, was passed which re-established the general common law prohibition against combinations, but exempted those whose purpose was to regulate hours and wages.[111] This meant that trade unionists could not picket, force workers to join unions or strikes, or, force employers to change his business.[112] All these events illustrate the sophisticated political consciousness of

the early English working-class. The trade unionists knew which bill to support, and why. Once they had achieved trade union rights, and then faced a political set-back, they retaliated with a complexly organized mass protest which, indeed, featured English democratic social practices in it-self; they met, marched, petitioned, and formed their own parliament of workers. So indeed, trade unionist won their freedom to associate through complexly fashioned political action.

Working class institutions also had political purposes. Many small working class societies, friendly societies and trade unions, political clubs and corresponding societies, participated in broader movements for political reform, especially those concerned with civil rights and universal manhood sufferage. Though these movements were never uniquely working class, some incidents have specifically working class meaning in the struggle for democracy in England. One such incident is the massacre on Saint Peter's field at Manchester, in 1819, where eleven people were killed and 421 wounded. Some 300,000 people protested against the Combination laws which allowed the government to repress political clubs, especially their press, as well as trade unions; so the protest was about freedom of the press and association, and manhood suffrage.[113] The march was meticulously organized by Radical societies and trade unions; indeed, the protesters practiced their march by drilling in the fields around Manchester in order to ensure discipline and order.[114] The Manchester yeomanry, meaning local militia, savagely attacked the demonstrators. For Thompson, this was a "class war" because the demonstrators were tradesmen, labourers and their families, while the Yeomanry were merchants and manufacturers.[115] The barbarity of the attack turned Saint Peters field into Peterloo, a symbol of working class suffering and martyrdom, for a just cause: civil rights and democracy.

The Reform acts finally split the combined middle and working class pressure

for suffrage reform. Though the sufferage movement was primarily led by the middle class, even from the first days of the London Corresponding Society (1792), English artisans and tradesmen participated in the mass movement for universal sufferage. By the late 1820's, and early 1830's, working class societies created political organizations such as the National Union of the Working Classes, the London Workingmen's Association, or joined organizations such as the Birmingham Political Union "of the lower and middle classes of the people".[116] Debates within the NUWC concerned how the government could be forced to reform. Throughout 1831 and 1832, leaders such as Lovette, Gast, and Watson pressed for a Grand National holiday, a one month general strike, which would allow the "productive classes to assume control of the nation's government and resources."[117] Though representative of intellectuals and artisans, these leaders gathered influence rapidly, so that, by October of 1831, they were organizing demonstrations upward to 70,000 strong.[118] This sort of working class participation allowed the middle class leadership to pressure the government by threatening working class insurrection.[119]

The government divided middle and lower classes when it expanded sufferage rights. The franchise requirements, based upon property qualifications, excluded most of the working class so that in a city such as Leeds, with a population of 124,000, only 355 workmen were now able to vote of whom 143, "are clerks, warehousemen, overlookers etc.."[120] When the bill passed, Edward Baines voiced the enthusiasm of middle class aspirations for social change,

> The fruits of Reform are to gathered. Vast commercial and agricultural monopolies are to be abolished. The Church is to be reformed ... Close corporations are to be thrown open. Retrench and economy thrown open.[121]

The heyday of laissez-faire liberalism truly began. The result of the Reform acts was a middle class betrayal of their working class ally. And, "of all governments, a government by the middle classes is the most grinding and remorseless."[122]

Clearly, the working class elements in the Reform movement had different expectations. In Lancashire, for Doherty, and the National Association for the Protection of Labour, "universal sufferage means nothing more than a power given to every man to protect his own labour from being devoured by others."[123] Indeed, many working class organizations combined their claim for universal sufferage with demands for factory reform, a 10 hour day for children, and the Anti-Poor Law campaign.[124] Another theme was a sort of syndicalism where, as this member of the Builder's union claimed, they

> will ultimately abolish wages, become their own masters, and work for each other; labour and capital will no longer be separate but they will be indissolubly joined together in the hands of workmen and workwomen.[125]

Discussed in the *Pioneer*, a rather different notion of Parliament appeared where a House of Trades,

> must supply the place of the present House of Commons and direct the commercial affairs of the country, according to the will of the trades which compose associations of the industry. This is the ascendancy scale by which we arrive to universal sufferage. It will begin in our lodges, extend to our general union, embrace the management of trade, and finally swallow up the whole political power.[126]

So the claim for the right to vote, made by working class activists meant that working people were, "reaching out ... for *social control* over their condition of life and labour."[127]

Working class demands for universal sufferage resurfaced five years later in the Chartist movement. Chartism grew out of the large industrial cities, in a period of economic distress,where industrial towns, such as Trowbridge, decayed, or Stockport, which was 'one of the darkest smokiest holes in the whole industrial area.'[128] And indeed, the Chartist demands were similar to those of '31 and '32: universal sufferage and parliamentary reform, factory legislation and poor law reform, sufficient work and sufficient wages.[129] Huge petitions were presented to Parliament; huge demonstrations, marches and meetings, organized. Chartism,

however, did not succeed. Trade prosperity returned and undermined the movement's unity, and the trade unions turned to more narrow political and industrial purposes.

From experience in organizing self-help societies, and participation in social movements, working class institutions acquired more determinate social practices and institutions. They clarified the relationship between political and economic/industrial action, as well as their larger aspirations for social, economic and political change. During the early years, political and industrial protest were less differentiated; during the mid century, however, trade unions narrowly limited their purposes and political action; and during the late 19th century, a more complex political and industrial *projet* re-emerged, re-integrated within a broad political movement.

After the repeal of the Combination acts in 1824/5, trade unionists attempted to create large national unions whose purposes were unclear, but grand in strategy. "That labour is the source of all wealth" was the potential common bond; "that wealth can be retained in the hands of the producers by a universal compact among the productive classes" was the potential new social order.[130] How would the transfer of power occur? A general strike, "the mere passive resistance of which would, without violence or conflict, bring down all existing institutions."[131] This became the *projet* of organizations such as the General Union of All Trades, the General Union of the Productive Classes, the Builders Parliament, and so forth.[132] The most successful organization to express these ideas was, however, the Owenite Grand National Consolidated Trades Union which claimed to have 800,000 members at its peak.[133] Its long term objectives were two fold: first, it tried to rationalize the structure of combinations, control movements for wage advances, co-ordinate assistance for strikes; second, it would aid unemployed workers by creating

industries based upon co-operative production.[134] The Webbs argue the Grand National was part of a larger Owenite aspiration to create "a universal voluntary association of workers for productive purposes, whereas later authors, such as Hunt and Pelling, are much more cautious and focus upon its industrial relations purposes.[135] All, however, agree that both purposes were present, a "jumble of ordinary trade union aims and communist aspirations."[136] The Grand National eventually fell apart in the mid 1830's when they could neither support, nor control strikes, nor resist the general repression of trade unions by employers and government. From experience, working class activists learned one institution could not do *everything* successfully.

Learning from the failure of large general unions, English trade unionists engaged a more limited strategy, which became known as New Model unionism. Trade unions, such as the Friendly Society of Operative Stone masons, set the pace of a rather different strategy for successful trade unionism:

> No proposition of a political nature, beyond what has been already alluded to, should be introduced, or occupy its attention ... the only way to carry out these desirable objects satisfactorily .. is to consider and dispose of but one question at a time. and, moreover to keep trade matters and politics as separate and distinct as circumstances will justify.[137]

Trade unions amalgamated into large, efficient organizations administrated by professional activists. Their leaders such as William Allen of the Amalgamated Society of Engineers (ASE), and Robert Appelgarth of the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners (ASCJ), among others, formed a clique of powerful labour leaders informally called the Junta, *circa* 1860. The object of New Model unionism was to secure financial stability, accent friendly society services, stress trade union solidarity, control strikes, and encourage co-operation with employers.[138] Throughout the mid 19th century, the Junta tried to legitimize trade unionism; in a word, make trade unionism acceptable to middle class Englishmen while preserving basic trade union principles such as the right to bargain collectively and to organize

trade unions legally. With these aims English trade unions adopted laissez-faire economic arguments for trade unionism, and engaged in limited political activity.

In the mid 1860's, Trade union leaders used the language of laissez-faire and hard nosed English utilitarianism to justify collective bargaining. Here, the Webbs summarize the argument succinctly.

> They insisted only on the right of every Englishman to bargain for the sale of his labour in the manner he thought most conducive to his own interests What they demanded was perfect freedom for a workman to substitute collective for individual bargaining, if he imagined such a course to be for his own advantage. Freedom of association in matters of contract became, therefore, the the rejoinder to the employers' cry of freedom of competition.[139]

Though arguments such as this made the trade union movement appear to be sliding comfortably into middle class England, behind it lay more traditional claims. Collective bargaining became the trade unionists' substitute for protecting the Standard of Life, a standard protecting wage earners from general degradation. In the past, the Standard of Life was protected, remember, through law and custom.[140] Moreover, this laissez-faire twist, in mid century, did not restrict trade union support for political action in order to achieve factory reform, minimum wages, or limit working hours.

Some political action was obviously necessary to secure collective bargaining, and indeed, the right to associate in trade unions. So, much of the trade union history from the 1860's to 1875 concerned the fight for legal protection for trade union rights. Though the goals of the Junta were clear, they had no systematic political theory from which to project political action.[141] Rather, the Trades Union Congress (TUC), and its Parliamentary Committee, dealt with problems as they arose, which were usually caused by judicial interpretations of the Criminal Law and Master and Servants acts. Through each practical situation the TUC acquired pressure groups skills; it lobbied cabinet ministers, provided ministry officials with

statistical information, supported individual candidates sympathetic to TUC policy, and participated upon Royal Commissions which inquired into the affairs of trade unions, the conditions of poverty, and so on. Though clear on trade union principles, the political bent of the TUC was not; some leaders were involved in socialist organizations, such as the International Association of Working Men, or mainstream political parties, and, some did not participate in political organizations at all. Moreover, the political activity of the trade union movement was diversified somewhat because, the TUC encouraged the creation of local Trades Councils, in cities, which inevitably became embroiled in municipal politics. Indeed, these municipal trades councils were a means for the TUC to side step the traditional no politics rules of some trade unions.[142]

When the Docker's strike broke the surface of trade union consciousness in 1889, the New Model unions became 'Old Unionism'. In mid August that year, a small strike spread into a massive walkout of semi and unskilled workers, and created a union of over 30,000 members. The strike was financially secured by a massive strike fund which banked the currency of a sympathetic English and Australian public.[143] Two trends made New Unionism new. First, unskilled and semi-skilled workers organized trade unions; second, politics and political parties played a distinct role. Unlike the old craft unions, the new unions imposed few entry restrictions upon members such as skill qualifications or high union dues which, formerly, excluded most labourers[144] New Unionists envisioned a different sort of relationship between industrial relations and political action. Trade union funds focused sharply upon strike support; the Standard of Life problems assuaged by friendly society insurance schemes, under Old Unionism, was replaced by political efforts to control conditions of work through legislation. The General Secretary of the National Union of Gas-Workers and General Labourers argued, in 1890,

> It is true we have only one benefit attached, and that is strike pay. I do not believe in having sick pay, out of work pay, and a number of other pays.... The whole aim and intention of this union is to reduce the hours of labour and reduce Sunday work.[145]

Not only were New trade union leaders more political, the Social Democratic Federation (SDF), a political party, helped organize the new trade union movement. Indeed, the SDF was a Marxist party and professed a doctrine of state socialism which argued that, workers "may themselves take hold of the means of production and organize a Co-operative Commonwealth."[146] The party's policies demanded the general regulation of working conditions, and more precisely, a compulsory eight hour day.[147] During the mid 80's, SDF activists fanned out, to mines and docks, where they preached organized industrial revolt amongst semi-skilled, unskilled workers, and the unemployed.[148] After the Docker's strike, the socialist leaders, involved in the new trade unions, acquired a constituency of over 350,000 workers from which they legitimized a distinctly socialist worldview in the the English labour movement.

In the 1890's, the trade union movement turned toward politics for several reasons. Chronic unemployment led to a general, pervasive disenchantment with laissez-faire economic doctrines, and so, put into question a political solution to workers' problems.[149] Since, in this atmosphere, the radicals in the Old Unions, and the political activists in the New Unions gained popularity in the 1890's, internal pressures within the trade union movement forced the trade unions to drift toward political action.[150] And political action acquired momentum since it was successful. Through municipal political activity, trade unions, the SDF, the newly formed Independent Labour Party, and the Fabian society increased the quality of working-class life; they influenced school and poor law boards, forced employers to include "fair wage" clauses in municipal contracts, and they municipalized gas works, waterworks and urban transit.[151] But, it was in another domain that trade unionists

turned decisively to political action. Trade unionists feared legal interpretation of trade union practices by the Judiciary, especially after the 1901 Taff Vale decision, which made trade unions liable for civil damages. Taff Vale meant that employers could now sue trade unions for their financial losses caused by strikes. And only Parliament could give the unions legal immunities; only politics could solve this very specific problem. So the decision to stress political action turned upon a complex web of general tendencies, practical successes in municipal politics, and specific reasons which related to the logic of the British political process.

The need for political action forced the working-class social movement to address British party politics. Trade unionists and socialists had to decide between further participation in the Liberal party, or their own political party. To the socialists, the answer was clear; the TUC, however, was reticent since the socialists could never present just *one* political party to represent working class interests.

Two political trends in the 1890's brought the trade unions and socialists together. First, the TUC became increasingly unsatisfied with the Liberal party; second, the socialists were able to unify around pragmatic policies which suited the trade unions' needs. Though the TUC leaders, at the national level, had influence with the Liberal party, they were still outside, meaning few working class MP's represented trade union interests within the party. This reflected problems at the local constituency level. The Liberal constituencies associations were managed mostly by middle class employers who did not support working class candidates, and were hesitant in supporting local working class causes.[152] Moreover, the Liberals were just not responding fast enough, nor thorough enough, to suit the trade unions.[153] Meanwhile, the SDF and ILP successfully convinced the Trade unions some independent political force was necessary, even if they did not completely agree amongst themselves what that force would look like. And indeed, the two

socialist alternatives differed significantly. The SDF tended to be doctrinaire, and quite clearly disapproved of trade unions, since they were unenthusiastic about revolutionary political action.[154] The ILP, by contrast, was more flexible in its socialist analytic tenets, accomodative toward trade unions, and sympathetic toward ethical principles from which society ought to be organized. "The ILP," said Kier Hardie

> starts from the assumption that the worker should be as free economically as he is supposed to be politically, and the instruments of production should be owned by the community.[155]

Despite these cross pressures between their political methods and aspirations, the ILP and the SDF were able to co-operate so that an alternative working class party formed which then created sufficient pressure from the left to inspire the Liberal party to legislate progressive reforms. So, indeed, the trade unionists and socialists edged closer to a fuller, more systematic, co-operative effort.

The years of political organization quickened, in 1906, and birthed the Labour party. As early as 1869, when the TUC created the Labour Representation League, trade unions were concerned with electing more working class MP's.[156] In 1899, the TUC supported an ILP resolution for a separate political party which would represent trade union and working class interests; the Labour Representation Committee formed one year later.[157] For trade union financial and organizational support, the socialists agreed to minimize claims for radical political change. They replaced them with more pragmatic policies, and so, accented social issues such as the protection of trade unions, and supported piece-meal social policies. After 1906, when the Labour party won 29 seats, they paid their political debts. They pressured the Liberal government to provide services such as meals and medical care for school children, a non-contributory old-age pension, an eight hour day for miners, and a minimum wages act.[158]

Both the socialists and trade unionists, however, were not satisfied. Some trade unions feared a loss of autonomy, especially when the state began to assume responsibilities traditionally held by Friendly societies; some socialists found it distasteful that the Labour party lacked a coherent political philosophy and did not pursue policies for sweeping social change.[159] Some militants turned to syndicalism, *circa* 1910, and did influence the development of the Triple Alliance, which was an alliance between the National Union of Railwaymen, and the Transport Workers Federation created just before the Great War.[160] The syndicalists distrusted the mainstream trade union movement, and the political process, as a medium through which social change could occur; rather they preferred industrial union organizations for whom strikes could force industrial and political demands. Despite the syndicalist turn, the trade unions and Labourites stayed with the Labour party, very much a creation of the TUC, and thus, combined the English mainstream working class political traditions: a strong trade union movement allied to a political party; a party part reformist, and part socialist.

Through an historical process, then, the English working class acquired a self-identity in its community life. From national political traditions, the English working-class inherited beliefs concerning the worth of civil rights and faith in democracy. These beliefs structured the mechanics of their own self-governing institutions such as friendly societies, co-operatives, political clubs, trade unions. These institutions provided a foundation upon which mass movements organized, through out the 19th century, to protect or expand English rights; Peterloo - freedom of association, press, and universal sufferage; the Reform acts and Chartism - universal sufferage, factory legislation, Poor Law reform; combination acts - freedom of association in trade unions. From these early attempts to define working class rights, trade union and political activists created more determinate social practices, systems, and models of class economic and political action which

culminated in a complex alliance between the Labour party and the TUC. So, indeed, the English working-class identity became fixed within a complexly interrelated web of English traditions, English politics, and English economic relationships.

This sense of self-identity was holistic, and the parts were so interrelated that the whole is not easily broken down into its constituent parts. Political and economic action were not conveniently separable. In his address to the Manhood Sufferage and Vote by Ballot Association, Applegarth counselled,

> We do not wish you to relax one iota of your efforts in reference to the amelioration of our social condition ....Nor do we wish to turn our trade societies into political organizations to divert them from their social objects; but we must not forget that we are citizens, and as such should have citizens rights Recollect also, that by obtaining these rights we shall be able more effectively to secure our legitimate demands as unionists [161]

The concept that unifies political and economic concerns is citizenship, meaning that, ones status as a responsible agent was made possible through one's social institutions. Through these institutions, the working man acquired an education, some economic security, and the capacity to judge the nature of the community's interest, his own class interest and the national interest.

Through this historical process, the English working class also acquired standards from which they critiqued and judged their society. At the one level, national political traditions projected that standard, civil and political rights, from which the working-class could project just claims based upon tradition: the right to express political views in political associations, associations of workers with similar economic interests, and the expansion of citizenship through sufferage. Certain associations, *viz.* trade unions, came to represent the essence of the working class claims to traditional rights. At another level, there existed a consistent pulse within the Radical tradition for reform and revolution; the Jacobins, Owenites, Syndicalists and Communists. All sought a transfer of power, though not necessarily through

violent means. They also had meet two conditions; that their *projet de société* would alleviated the present features of domination *and* protect, express, realize those English political traditions in a more authentic way, given the situation of modern society. Though the English are famous for their lack of revolutionary tradition, there was always hope, within radical circles, because, even the most conservative trade union passed onto its members a tradition of disobeying the laws governments passed which trampled upon their constitutional rights. If a transfer of power in revolutionary activity was not realistic, then some drive for a *transition* from a capitalist to socialist society was always possible. The transition might come from the practical activity of workers within the system, or from those working-class activists who created new institutions from which social change could be projected. And, in England, for the English working class, that key institution was the trade union. It was the central feature in self-help institutions such as friendly societies and mutual insurance funds, the forming of the Labour party, and the projection of social policies and models for minimum wages, health insurance and workman's compensation, all implemented in the early twentieth century. Indeed, the right to organize a trade union was, now, part of the Constitution.

IV

In Canada, both immigrant groups fell back upon their culture in order to create some familiar social organizations in an alien land. Ukrainians were most confused; they now lived in a land with an alien language, alien religions, and alien social, economic, and political institutions. Yet once in Canada, certain Ukrainian traditions flourished, namely, an increased awareness of democratic practices, since

political options, such as radicalism and socialism, were more ready-to-hand. These options were indeed realistic since Canada was an industrializing country. Furthermore, for many Ukrainiáns, their class practical experience and education would form in Canada. Englishmen were more at home; they now lived in a land with the same language, religions,and social, economic, and political institutions. And more, this country aspired to *be* British, and found its identity in North America through its Britishness. Between the two ethnic groups, some class unity existed, through institutions such as trade unions and political parties; in reality, however, social intercourse mostly occurred between elite activists. So class movements were fractured ethnically. Of more concern to working class activists, be they trade unionists, socialists, and so on, was that there was no general common agreement as to how the movement, as a whole, ought be organized. So class movements were also fractured ideologically.

The dynamics of leadership within the Ukrainian-Galician community changed dramatically once in Canada. The clergy, comfortable in Galicia, did not follow its emigrating flock, at least in the early years. The radicals and socialists did. This does not mean the Ukrainian peasant ceased to practice his religion. Yuzyck attributes the readiness of Ukrainians to adapt and understand Canadian democracy, in part, to the practical needs of religious worship. "Forced to administer parish properties, and religious services, Ukrainian farmers practiced democratic lay control."[162] So, the least democratic Galician institution, for a few crucial formative years, was not a part of the Galician Canadian experience. In this leadership vacuum, left by the church, the small group of intellectuals, sympathetic to Drahmonovian or Marxist socialism, who followed the immigrants to Canada, stepped in to lead the Galician community.

The social structure, into which Galician Ukrainians emigrated, was conducive

to the development of class movements and political activity. Canadian immigration policy combined the needs of Canada's railway and resource extraction industries with the larger need for a secure agricultural industry.[163] So, at least fifty per cent of Ukrainian farmers, at one time or another, were wage labourers before homesteading; indeed, 13 per cent of all railroad Navvies were Ukrainian.[164] Moreover, at least twenty percent of Ukrainian immigrants remained in prairie urban centres, so they were very much a part of Canada's urban development.[165] This meant that, to exist, these Galicians depended upon wages, not farming. Thus, thrown into Canada's industrial structure, with its modern wage relationship, Ukrainians now faced different social problems, which, ultimately, were open to radical and socialist explanations of social relations and social conflict.

The *chytalnia* was among one of the first Galician Ukrainian social institutions re-established in Canada. The Shevchenko Reading Association, founded at Winnipeg in 1899, aspired to similar populist goals such as national, social and political consciousness raising, as well as the elimination of illiteracy, the discussion of social action and policies in the new land, and generally, the elevation of the peasant's economic, moral and political liberation.[166] The Ukrainian secular intelligentsia concerned itself with continuity of Ukrainian cultural aspirations and practical action in the new land.

Soon, however, the Radicals and Social Democrats split since the external pressures that helped unify them in Galicia no longer existed in Canada. The right wing of the Radical party found its feet with the Liberal party. They counselled Ukrainians to strive for economic success through the existing economic and political system. For them, then, the role of the *chytalnia*, and other Ukrainian institutions, included accenting cultural identity, educating people about the economic and political system, and manipulating Canadian party dynamics for

Ukrainian purposes. Indeed, a certain Thoma Yastrmsky created an elaborate Conservative party machine, in 1903, from which he could deliver 1,500 votes consistently in exchange for language protection and Ukrainian school teachers.[167] The left wing of the Radical party, and the Social Democrats, argued the economic and political system must change and be reorganized on different principles. Again the labour theory of value structured an ethical worldview:

> (If) workers provide mankind with all its material goods and services they are entitled to benefit from these themselves. They are entitled to have comfortable dwellings, good food, good and comfortable clothing and access to schools theaters and libraries....[168]

The role of the *chytalnia*, and other institutions, was to stimulate class consciousness amongst workers.[169] So, in 1906, the socialists organized there own reading circle, and called it Taras Schevchenko Educational Association, from which other socialist organizations developed, such as the Ukrainian Free Thought Federation in 1907, a Ukrainian branch of the SPC in 1907, and the Federation of Social Democrats in 1912.[170]

For the Ukrainian worker and socialist activist the political party was omnipresent. The Ukrainian Social Democratic Party (USDP) in Winnipeg was a well integrated institution; it provided social services, education; it acted as a job exchange, and sometimes, as a trade union. The party even provided a temporary boarding house. There were also social activities such as dances, parties, sports, so Ukrainians could meet and socialize in a familiar context, in an unfamiliar land. Consequently, these manifold, tangible social services not only re-inforced party loyalty, but made the Ukrainian political party something more than a political party which promoted a particular worldview.[171]

Through the party, Ukrainian workers were indoctrinated into a class movement where they learned philosophy, social science, and so forth. The USDP had a party paper, the *Robotchny Narod*, for party propaganda, political analysis,

and political debate. The party was also a sort of university: it had classes in political economy, organization, and revolution, as well as a library stocked with journals, texts and criticism.[172] Most important, however, the library and classes provided a *place* to read and learn. The purpose of the party, then, was to protect Ukrainian culture, protect workers in the capitalist system, and provide a means through which workers could internalize the socialist worldview.

Part of USDP practical activity concerned organizing trade unions. "Social Democracy", one party activist wrote, "represents the working man. The trade union movement and political movement are the two arms; we can not work with one arm."[173] Along with the expression of Marxist principles, the USDP platform included practical social reforms which addressed social and political issues such as a legislated eight hour day, and the abolition of the Canadian senate. So the political task was "the overthrow of capitalism and establish the co-operative commonwealth", yet bound within a reformed democratic process with expanded sufferage and better representation.[174] Workers, and their trade unions, needed political support. The USDP also directly acted upon workers trade union needs. The party organized the unemployed and led demonstrations for "bread and work"; in 1914, for example, some 2,000 unemployed Ukrainians marched through Winnipeg city streets.[175] During Winnipeg's wave of strikes in 1917-18, the USDP also helped Ukrainian labourers, in the construction industry, win collective bargaining rights and trade union recognition. The USDP also encouraged Ukrainian workers to join syndicalist unions such as the IWW.[176] So, by the 1910's, the Ukrainian community had a well knit socialist, working class movement which related Marxist social science to pragmatic political and trade union activity.

For most Ukrainian labourers the mainstream trade union movement was indeed remote. The North American syndicalist unions filled this lacuna left by

craft unions, and made trade unionism accessible to unskilled east European labourers. In Winnipeg, for example, an IWW branch existed with about 400 Polish and Ukrainian members.[177] Since the Wobblies serviced itinerant workers in lumber and mining camps, their constituency was highly mobile. In many communities the IWW built halls, stocked libraries, and gave lectures and seminars on politics and economics from their own peculiar perspective. Wobblies put their faith in the industrial union as the most natural political as well as industrial organization, from which, the class struggle could be engaged and the transition to socialism forced. Between political and industrial action a line did not exist. Unable to mediate the socialist transition through any political process, the Wobblies argued the class war must be fought at the job site. They counselled mass strikes, industrial violence against capital, which would culminate in one general strike, one bold stroke, against the entire capitalist system. Indeed, the general strike became the Wobbly *souci*. It consumed their philosophical energy and left them unthinking about the structure of the social order after the deluge. Because they assumed an industrial dispute strategy was equivalent to a social *telos*, they lost perspective on the social relations beyond their lumber and mining camps.

Apart from revolutionary syndicalism, eastern and southern Europeans were also exposed to the IWW's formidable concern for civil rights. Indeed, their uncompromising struggle for civil rights, especially free speech, association and assembly, was well known, and later, romanticized by Wobbly bards such as Joe Hill. One practice was particularly effective. When a city government, such as Vancouver's, in 1912, would harass IWW street orators, and ban their right to speak on political issues, Wobblies from throughout the West would descend upon the errant city, march in its streets, and disobey its flawed law.[178]

Little is known, however, about the east and south Europeans who were

attracted to syndicalism. Some historians such as A.R. McCormack take this view.

> B C Wobblies had explicitly advocated sabotage for some time. The tactic likely had great appeal for eastern and southern European immigrants, pre-modern workers, who had traditions of machine breaking and direct action against oppressive employers [179]

Given the brutality of camp life, and the oppressive authority relationships on the job, where overseers did not quite view the eastern European as completely human, the willingness to turn to revolutionary organizations and violent conflict is understandable. Yet, from the IWW organizers, immigrants also became familiar with political and industrial conflict, and concepts which included general strikes and civil rights.

Clearly most Ukrainian peasants did not understand completely the various socialist social movements, trade unionism and syndicalism or democracy and civil rights. Most still suffered poverty, and misery, tangled in the mesh of ignorance and superstition. What is important, here, is that Ukrainians were in the process of awakening. For some, like this labourer below, concepts such as Bolshevism were interpreted through a vague millennial vision reminiscent of the Zaporizhian *sich*.

> (Bolshevism means) equal rights for men and women, no child labour, no poverty, misery or degradation, no prostitution, no mortgages on farms, no revolting bills for machinery to keep peasants poor till the grave, no sweat shops no long hours of heavy toil for a meager existence but an equal opportunity for all, a life made worth living with ultimate possibilities to all, aided by a splendid machinery to make (the) earth a real paradise where nothing but happiness can prevail .... This is Bolshevism.[180]

For those Ukrainian immigrants who found themselves in exploitive capitalist relationships once in Canada, an authentic Ukrainian class movement existed, one alternative to which they could turn. Ukrainian socialist activists and institutions brought Ukrainian traditions to Canada, and thus created some continuity between old and new countries. From the old, country Galicians already had experience organizing social movements within a constitutional monarchy. They already had

political and economic concepts, and indeed, some which reached as far back as Kievan Rus and the Zaporizhian *sich*. Other economic and political concepts originated in Radical and Social Democratic political theory. Once in Canada, other social movements with similar aspirations also existed which could be reached through Ukrainian-Canadian institutions to initiate some co-ordinated social action.

The British tradesman also brought his working class culture to Canada. As one artisan claimed,

> Unionism is bred into your blood over there. I was born into it myself; I've been a member for 35 years. I can't conceive of any circumstance in which I would leave the union [181]

This sentiment was expressed in the life-world of British immigrants; their family-life, education, church and economic support structures, friendly societies, trade unions.[182]

For those British tradesmen who came to Winnipeg, a vibrant trade union movement already existed. The first unions, in the 1870's and 80's, were formed by skilled printers who were followed by the transportation unions, building and metal trades unions.[183] Moreover, some Winnipeg unions were branches of British unions, such as Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners, established in Winnipeg in 1881, which later merged with the International Association of Machinists.[184] Though craft unions dominated the trade union movement, public sector unions, such as the water works employees, were organized as well as sporadic labourer's unions.[185] As in Britain, a city wide trades and labour council was organized under the auspices of political organizations and trade unions. After two attempts to organize a trades and labour council in the 1880's, the Winnipeg Trades and Labour Council (WTLC) was formed in 1894, with ten affiliated trade unions, which printed a publication called *The People's Voice*.[186] The WTLC's purpose was to provide a medium through which trade unionists could discuss and

form common trade union, industrial, and political policies. This was indeed similar to the British experience since the WTLC supported an independent labour party, as early as February 1895, and organized a labour coalition in 1899, in conjunction with the Winnipeg Labour party, to elect the editor of its journal, A.W. Puttee, to Parliament.[187]

The British experience certainly influenced the development of Winnipeg's Labour politics. Following the Independent Labour Party's (ILP) successes in the 1892 British general election, Winnipeg Labour activists enthusiastically agitated for their own independent labour party.[188] These activists, primarily A.W. Puttee, were influential in founding the WTLC, as well as the Winnipeg Labour party whose purpose was

> to study economic subjects affecting the welfare of labour and the promulgation of information regarding same; and also to secure for labour a just share of the wealth it produces by such means as obtaining representation from our own ranks in the Parliamentary and municipal bodies of the country.[189]

Labourism, as a political ideology, was diffuse meaning Marxist, ethical socialist, christian socialist and liberal tenets came roughly together, mostly upon a producerist critique of capitalist society.[190] The ethical humanism which underscored Labourism was clear since it concerned the physical and spiritual development of the worker in the capitalist system. The regulation and reduction of hours of work, for example, meant "a stepping stone to a higher state of civilization" because, "long hours of labour have a tendency to stifle the intellect, to impair the energy and the vital organs of the body and to reduce the opportunity for physical and mental improvement."[191] The ILP did not support revolution. It chose, instead, the British Labour Party/TUC model of political and industrial action to reduce in the inequalities of society, within the existing political process, and so, improve the quality of worker's lives.[192] Their policies were pragmatic, and thus addressed issues such as unsafe factories, long hours, fair wages, and unfair

municipal franchises.[193] Though Labourites never fully succeeded in their efforts to create a unified labour movement, they came close several times as their Labour Representation Committees garnered the support of trade unions willing to affiliate, contribute funds, and organize votes.[194]

One can not separate the influence of trade unionism and Labour political education upon English Canadian skilled workers too much since both helped form the individual as a complete person. "Their libertarian style of work" wrote Craig Herron,

> their rugged shop-floor equality, the self-respect and pride in accomplishment, the spirit of comradeship, nourished in the workshop, construction site, or mine reinforced in their craft unions, were all carried out ward to social and political relationships in the wider community.[195]

Their working lives, political and economic views were interrelated so that one could not alter the part without altering the whole.

Much to the left of the JLP, the Socialist Party of Canada (SPC) was another Anglo-Saxon dominated radical party. Following precise notions of party organization and discipline, the SPC was a tight knit core of activists whose role was to indoctrinate the masses with revolutionary theory; they were preachers.[196] So the role of a socialist party, and a socialist activist, was that of an educator. For the SPC, the electoral system was only one means to verify the extent to which their lessons diffused amongst workers, and so, test the general "level of class consciousness."[197] Their message to the electorate was that of Impossiblism, which simply meant that capitalism could not be reformed.[198] To abolish the system, workers must control the state since,

> By means of the state the workers have been held in subjection, and by means of the state they shall be emancipated. The state is that which guarantees to the master class, ownership of the means of production .... The state is the sword of the master class. It lives by the sword and by this sword it shall perish.[199]

In a sense, the SPC was right to question the reformist strains in other socialist parties, especially from the perspective of some workers since some employers did not necessarily obey laws; as Bill Pritchard of British Columbia argued,for example, "they had the finest ... coal mine regulation act in this province (and) it is violated every day and in every clause."[200] Trade unions were worthless since they "diverted working men from the true cause of revolution," and existed "... solely as part and parcel of the capitalist system of property in the means of wealth production."[201] Indeed, trade unions were only legitimate if they conquered "political power for the purpose of abolishing capitalist ownership of the means of production...."[202] Yet not all SPC activists and leaders were so dogmatic as all that, especially those who were elected to Parliament, or trade union executives; indeed, these men were often criticized for broadly interpreting SPC Marxist - socialism.[203] Of the SPC's behaviour, Ramsay MacDonald aptly described it as such;

> They are grinding away, at their cold aggressive academic, formulae about 'class war', 'economic determinism', 'a class proletariat', and everyone who does not agree with them is a fakir or scoundrel of some degree or other.[204]

Through the SPC, English and Ukrainian socialism first had intercourse. The SPC helped organize many east and south European immigrants into socialist parties. Meetings were held and propaganda printed, in as many languages as was necessary: Russian, Hebrew, Polish, Ukrainian, Finnish. Indeed, in

> every speech reference to the founder of scientific socialism, Karl Marx, was noted, thus demonstrating a common source of inspiration and proved that the questions discussed were from a strongly proletarian view point.[205]

The bridges between ethnic groups were fashioned by versatile, perceptive SPC organizers such as Jacob Penner who described his activity in this way.

> Our small socialist group (SPC) in Winnipeg was growing, and being constantly on the lookout for new recruits, we concluded that there was a likelihood of finding some socialist minded persons among European immigrants since the labour movement in Europe at that time was on a higher level than in Canada. Since I could speak the language of some of these groups, I was delegated to contact people in their organizations as part of our recruiting endeavors. I began attending concerts and other cultural activities, arranged by these immigrant organizations, became personally acquainted

> with many of their numbers and some were quite enthusiastic ... and became active supporters of our aim.[206]

In Winnipeg's North end, eastern Europeans constituted the bulk of SPC support, and played a more significant role than Anglo-Saxons.[207] Nine SPC locals existed, which had a newspaper with a circulation of 2000.[208] Moreover, the SPC relied upon Ukrainian activists such as Herman Sliptchenko, in Winnipeg, who organized many Ukrainians in south eastern Manitoba.[209] But at no time was British domination threatened in the broad scope of party activity, nor was there an attempt to integrate ethnic groups in SPC locals.[210]

Between 1910 and 1915, the SPC became seriously divided and eventually split for two reasons. First, the ethnic groups affiliated to the SPC came into conflict with the chauvinistic English party elites.[211] The SPC leadership attempted to make English the working language of the party administration and wanted to restrict "cultural" activities. Most of all, however, many east European socialists, including Ukrainians, criticized the SPC for their other worldly dogmatism. Popovich, a Ukrainian SPC activist at the time, tells us why.

> (The SPC) took no part in the struggle for the immediate needs of the people, holding that the quicker the living standards of workers deteriorated, the sooner they will come to understand the necessity of overthrowing the capitalist system. That's why it opposed a program of immediate demands . ., opposed a program of reforms. It also refused to join an organization that was too reformist. It also took a negative attitude to the workers trade union movement .... That's why it became an organization of academic philosophic debating club, incapable of guiding the political and economic struggle of the working class.[212]

Unlike the Marxist parties in North America, of the SPC's ilk, eastern European parties were more pragmatic, weaving into Marxist political thought the gradualism of Edouard Bernstein.[213] So, in 1910, the Ukrainians, along with R.A. Rigg, Jacob Penner and others, helped form the Social Democratic Party.[214] In the newly formed SDP, then, the Ukrainians maintained their cultural identity and their participation in a broader Winnipeg class movement.

Though both Ukrainian and English Canadian immigrants brought their class culture to Canada, they did not necessarily acquire a general sense of class unity and consciousness. Indeed, the antipathy toward immigration, expressed by the TLC, was hostile and overtly racist, so eastern, southern, and central European immigrants hardly felt welcome by the craft trade union movement. English working class immigrants did their best to disassociate themselves from the more unfortunate foreigners. They practiced some ethnic exclusivity to protect their favoured status as Britons which, indeed, ensured more opportunities for good jobs.[215] The English were better than anyone else, as this Staffordshire maid in Winnipeg clearly implied when she said, "to tell the truth, I didn't bother with any foreign people. I was too English for that."[216] And the average eastern European immigrant, most certainly, felt this hostility, and reciprocated with a certain resentment. This Ukrainian, for example, rhetorically asked,

> Who leveled the mountains from sea to sea?... who built the railroads and cultivated this wasteland where formerly only the wind howled?

"We", he answered,

> the victims, who today are being tortured in a manner reminiscent of the Christian captives held by the Turks 500 years ago ... make our case known so that all Ukrainians and all nations of the world may see how the blind, "civilized" English chauvinists and their hangers on treat foreigners.[217]

And, moreover, east Europeans felt they could not criticize Canadian society unless "... you were British .... But if you weren't they blamed it on your background. You were a communist...."[218]

Although each ethnic group did not always regard each other fondly, there was some forum for *rapprochement* since working class institutions, such as trade unions and political parties, demonstrated some common sense of unity and class consciousness. Within the trade union movement, English Canadians and eastern European immigrants could meet in industrial unions such as the IWW, and the United Mine Workers of America.[219] Remarking the influence of immigrants upon

labour organization in the United States Victor Greene argued,

> far from weakening labour organizations, the Polish, Lithuanians, Slovak and Ukrainian mine workers and their communities, supported labor protest more enthusiastically than many other groups and were essential to the establishment of unionism permanently in the coal fields.[220]

In the mining and lumbering communities, in the B.C. interior, these immigrants participated with their English speaking leaders and co-workers in many fierce industrial strikes, and so, acquired "a pronounced sense of class consciousness."[221]

Despite the fissiparous nature of Winnipeg labour politics, prior to the Great War, some class unity trumped serious ethnic divisions. As mentioned above, Ukrainian and English Canadian socialists did correspond through their political parties such as the SPC and SDP. After years of organization in Winnipeg's North end, the SDP's political activism bore fruit when R.A. Rigg won a seat in the 1915 provincial election. What made this significant was that Rigg, an English immigrant, beat a Ukrainian Liberal in the North end.[222] Moreover, a common sense of unity often bridged ethnic diversity, especially when some principle such as civil rights was in question. When a Russian revolutionary, named Federenko, was threatened with extradition for his political views, the Winnipeg labour movement stood squarely behind him and successfully lobbied the Canadian Parliament to deny the Russian government's request.[223] Again, in 1918, Anglo-Canadian socialists stood with eastern European immigrants to protest the the conviction of Michael Charitinoff, former editor of the *Robotchny Narod*, for possession of prohibited literature. So class solidarity was an important factor in Winnipeg, in electoral politics, and, in defense of civil rights.

Despite the gradual successes in the fashioning of a common class interest, the fact still remained that Ukrainians simply understood class politics differently from their English brothers. Characterizing the English trade unionist the *Robotchny Narod* explained,

> They aren't interested in politics, except when it is a matter of how many dollars it will bring them ... when one considers the English working class ... they have no class consciousness and their social democratic movement (political party) is very weak, greatly weaker than the Ukrainian. In truth the greater part of them are organizing into unions but these unions are not interested in anything. Each of them belongs to union because the union assures him of higher pay.[224]

What the *Robotchny Narod* really meant to say was that the English working class did not have a consciousness like *theirs*. Like Ukrainians, the English were only following their working class traditions of trade unionism developed in the old country. So Ukrainians and Anglo-Canadians found it difficult to find their feet with one another. Cultural differences made the already difficult task of forming a unified class movement even more difficult.

V

Both Ukrainian and English immigrants were born into societies with political traditions which included democratic practices and concern for civil and political rights. The Ukrainian understanding of political theory was indeed less complex than that of the English since they never had a state nor a distinct political elite. Once the Austro-Hungarian empire swallowed Galicia, in the 18th century, Ukrainians acquired an understanding of the rule of law, the nature of the bureaucratic state, and the practices of a constitutional monarchy. As the Ukrainian community organized, Ukrainians began to appreciate, and use, basic liberal freedoms such as democratic formalism, village government, party systems, freedom of expression, association, and other civil liberties. For the Englishman, of the 18th century, many of these notions were birthrights: certainly some civil liberties and the rule of law. Regarding political theory, Britain had a long tradition

which, by the 19th century, included commoners and artisans such as Paine and Thelwal. Indeed, the political system's logic was well understood by most Englishmen and defined the means and substance of reform since many groups such, as the Chartists, equated parliamentary reform with concrete raising of living standards. For both Ukrainians and Englishmen, then, knowledge of democracy, civil and political rights was available along with an understanding of the meaning these concepts had, for them, in their daily lives.

Each ethnic group also acquired a certain sense of community bonding and spirit. Suffering within oppressive economic and political social relations, they generated a common grievance, an understanding of self, and consequently a community, within their respective cultures. For the Ukrainian, the solidarity of, and the loyalty to, the village commune was a higher duty than toward the lord. For the English, loyalty to Ned Ludd, or the fearsome rituals and oaths associated with early trade unionism, expressed the seriousness of the need for solidarity. It was through protest that the community reinforced its solidarity. The principle is a simple one; that people sharing conflict against a common enemy reinforces the group's identity. The Ukrainian peasant strike, the English march and petition to Parliament, are routine examples of conflict which created community bonds. Within these oppressive social, economic, political relationships both Ukrainians and Englishmen created new institutions which hardened and systemized their grievances from which, further community solidarity would be possible: trade unions, co-operatives, political clubs and parties.

"Historically speaking," wrote Hobsbawn,

> the process of building new institutions, new ideas, new theories and tactics rarely starts as a deliberate job of social engineering. Men live surrounded by a vast accumulation of social devices, and it is natural to pick the most suitable of these, and to adapt them for their own (and novel) purposes.[225]

Indeed, in both Galicia and England, working-class social movements developed, and then pursued economic and political purposes. In Galicia, the economic structure was not conducive to the proletarianization of the craftsman and labourer, except in isolated cases, such as Boroslav's petroleum industry. Here, a Marxist cadre did organize a typical working class movement. This did not mean the bulk of Galicians had not become acquainted with socialism since, after all, the peasant farmer was being proletarianized. So a Drahomanovian agrarian socialist party and program gained popularity. Once in Canada, however, with the nation's economic structure influenced by a modern industrialization policy, Ukrainian socialist parties and trade unions became an authentic Ukrainian option. Since Britain was the first country to industrialize, Englishmen developed a more complex class movement. Trade unions developed many varieties of internal administration and democratic practices, rationalized collective bargaining and strike strategies. Working class political clubs and parties defined many different ways of expanding working class political rights, and so, projected a variety of political theories and programs for change, both reformative and revolutionary. Both Ukrainian and English class movements had similar ethical principles, especially some labour theory of value, which justified their claims to a better life due them by virtue of their status as producers of social wealth. Last, workers aspired to emancipation from oppressive social relationships which, in some way, was related to democracy. Indeed, both Ukrainian and English working class movements claimed to be agents and defenders of democracy.

Though each culture had working class movements, they were not the same and indeed differed in important ways. Both Ukrainian and English culture had working-class movements in which trade unions, and political parties complemented the particular goals of each institution; trade unions assuaged the immediate needs of workers, while parties projected broader, deeper social change. If the two ethnic

groups differed, they did so in terms of emphasis, within the context of these complexly related working-class institutions. For Ukrainians, the political party was the first class institution organized. It provided for immediate needs. For the English, the trade union was the first institution established. It provided for immediate needs. It organized the first successful Parliamentary Labour party. It had some control over the party's aspirations for political change. The Ukrainians found revolutionary aims comfortable; the English did not. The Ukrainians had a penchant for radical industrial unions; the English for craft or industrial unions with industrial priorities. Ukrainians acquired experience in their political parties; Englishmen in their trade unions. Clearly these broad generalizations are porous, indeed, since many Ukrainians were not revolutionaries, and many Englishmen were; yet the class institutions of each clearly reflected their aims.

Both groups projected alternatives for a Canadian class movement. From the Ukrainians, Canada inherited a potential for a pragmatic Marxist party, the SDP, which, at one time, was satisfied with political change through Canadian democratic formalism and institutions. From the English, Canada inherited a potential for a pragmatic Labour party, associated with the trade union movement, which grounded political and economic change within Christian socialist ethical principles. Both Ukrainian and English socialist activists also supported a revolutionary Bolshevik party which had an uncompromising attitude toward Canadian social, economic, and political relationships. Indeed these *projets* overlapped. Many Englishmen supported the aspirations of a pragmatic Marxist party and trade union movement, and many Ukrainians understood the ethical ground work of the Independent Labour Party, despite the ethnic chauvinism of English Labourites.

FOOTNOTES: CHAPTER TWO

[1]David Bercuson, **Confrontation at Winnipeg,** (Montreal: McGill-Queens University press), p. 185.

[2]Since the mid 1970's, however, scholarship has been developing concerning eastern European immigrant traditions.

[3]3,000,000 and 300,000 people respectively. J.P. Himka, "Background to Emigration: Ukrainians of Galicia and Bukovyna, 1848-1914," in Manoly Lupul, ed., **A Heritage in Transition,** (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1982), p. 11.

[4]Volodymyr Kubijovyč, ed., **Ukraine: A Concise Encyclopedia,** vol 1. (Toronto: University of Toronto press), p. 595.

[5]J.P. Himka, "Serfdom in Galicia," **Journal of Ukrainian Studies** 17 (Winter 1984): 21.

[6]Kubijovyc', **Ukraine,** p. 641.

[7]Ibid.

[8]Ibid., pp. 662-7. What destroyed the **sich** was prosperity as cleavages between rich and poor developed into social conflict.

[9]Taras Shevchenko, "From the Caucacus," in **Song of Darkness,** trans. and ed., V. Swoboda, (London: Mitre press, 1961), p. 73.

[10]Kubijovyč, **Ukraine,** p. 439.

[11]Ibid.

[12]J.P. Himka, **Socialism in Galicia: The Emergence of Polish Social Democracy and Ukrainian Radicalism, 1860-1890,** (Cambridge: Harvard University press, 1983), p. 5.

[13]Robert Kann, **A History of the Hapsburg Empire 1526-1918,** (Berkeley: University of California press, 1974), chs. 5,6,7, and especially pp. 174-181, 183-199, 326-343, 391-4.

[14]Ivan Rudnytsky, "The Ukrainians in Galicia under Austrian Rule," **Austrian History Yearbook,** III Part 2 (1967): 394-6.

[15]Himka, "Serfdom," pp. 12-22.

[16]Rudnytsky "Under Austrian Rule," pp. 394-6.

[17]It was a bicameral parliament with an appointed House of Lords, and an elected House of Deputies. The House of Deputies divided into four curiae representing great landowners, commercial and industrial chambers, cities, and last

rural communities, all with differing franchise laws, seat distribution and so on. Moreover the executive was not entirely responsible to the legislature, though parliament did have the right to criticize and propose government policy. Kubijovyč, **Ukraine**, pp. 718-22.

[18]It was a unicameral system with similar curial representation as that of the National Diet. Ibid.

[19]Himka, **Socialism**, p. 167.

[20]Kubijovyč, **Ukraine**, p. 719.

[21]Rudnytsky "Under Austrian Rule," p. 416, quoting Jevhen Ckalenko, **Spohady (1861-1907)**, p. 336.

[22]Himka, "Serdom", p. 7.

[23]Ibid., p. 18.

[24]Ibid., p. 22.

[25]Ibid., p. 25.

[26]Ibid., p. 24.

[27]Ibid.

[28] This is part of a peasant oath from the Menytsia commune **circa** 1838.

[29]Ibid. These are the remarks of the attending surgeon whose role in the punishment was to estimate the amount of beating a peasant could take before death.

[30]Himka, "Backround," p. 23.

[31] Donald Avery, "Continental European Immigrant Workers in Canada 1896-1933: From 'Stalwart Peasants' to Radical Proletariat," **Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology** 12(1) 1975: 58.

[32]See Eric Hobsbawn, "Peasants and Politics," **Journal of Peasant Studies**, I (1973): 3-22.

[33]Himka, **Socialism**, p. 150, quoting Okunevsky, in Mykhailo Pavlyk, **Perepyska Drahomanova z Okunevs'kym**.

[34]Taras Schevchenko, "My Friendly Epistle," in **Song Out of Darkness**, trans. and ed., V. Swoboda, (London: Mitre Press, 1961), p. 77.

[35]Himka, "Backround," p. 20.

[36]Himka, **Socialism**, ch. 5.

[37]Rudnytsky, "Under Austrian Rule," p. 406.

[38]Himka, **Socialism,** p. 50, quoting Kachala's letter to the editorial board of **Druh** 7 August, 1876, in Pavlyk, **Perepyska Drahomanova z Okunevs'kym.** 7 vols. 2: 79-80.

[39]Ibid., p. 164.

[40]Ibid., pp 115-8.

[41]Ibid., p. 167.

[42]Ibid., p. 47.

[43]Ibid., p. 168.

[44]Himka, "Backround," p. 21

[45]Ibid.

[46]Himka, **Socialism,** p. 171, quoting W. Feldman, "Sprawa ukrainska," in Stefan kieniewicz, ed., **Galicja w dobie autonomicznej (1850-1914).** p 321

[47]Kubijovyč, **Ukraine,** p. 706

[48]Rudnytsky, "Under Austrian Rule," p 425

[49]Ibid.

[50]Himka, **Socialism,** p. 110.

[51]Rudnytsky, "Under Austrian Rule," p 417.

[52]Ibid., and Kubijovyč, **Ukraine,** p. 705.

[53]E.P. Thompson, **The Making of the English Working Class,** (Markham: Penguin Books, 1982), ch. 4.

[54]Ibid., p. 89, quoting J.P. Smith, **An Account of a Successful Experiment (1812).**

[55]Ibid., pp. 86-94.

[56]Ibid., p. 46, quoting R. Southey, **Life of Wesley and the Rise of Methodism,** (1890 edn.), p. 571.

[57]Ibid., p. 39.

[58]See E.J. Hobsbawn, "Labour Traditions," in **Labouring Men: Studies in the History of Labour.** New York: Basic Books, 1964.

[59]Ibid.

[60]See E.J. Hobsbawn, "Tom Paine," in **Labouring Men: Studies in the History of Labour.** New York: Basic Books, 1964, and Thompson, **Making,** p. 95.

[61]Thomas Paine, **Rights of Man,** (Middlesex: Penguin books, 1984), p. 159.

[62]Arthur Aspinall, **The Early English Trade Unions,** (London: Batchworth press, 1949), pp. ix-x.

[63]See Thompson, **Making,** ch. 15.

[64]Ibid.

[65]E.H. Hunt, **The British Labour Movement 1815-1914,** (Atlantic Highlands: Humanities press, 1981), p. 213.

[66]Thompson, **Making,** p. 379, quoting T. Cooper, **Some Information Respecting America,** (1794), pp. 77-8.

[67]Ibid., p. 374, quoting P. Gaskell, **The Manufacturing Population of England,** p. 7.

[68]Aristotle, **The Politics of Aristotle,** trans. and ed., Ernest Barker, (Oxford: Oxford University press, 1979), p. 5.

[69]Sidney and Beatrice Webb, **Industrial Democracy,** (New York: Augustus M. Kelly, 1965), p. 587.

[70]See E.P. Thompson, "The Moral Economy of the English Crowd in the Eighteenth Century," **Past and Present,** No. 5 (February 1971): 76-136.

[71]Timothy i,5.

[72]Henry Pelling, **A History of British Trade Unionism,** (London: St. Martin's press, 1968), p. 26.

[73]Webbs, **Industrial Democracy,** p. 8.

[74]Ibid., ch. 1.

[75]Ibid p. 84.

[76]Paine, **Rights,** pp. 257-8.

[77]Asa Briggs, ed., **Chartist Studies,** (New York: St. Martins press, 1967), p. 9, quoting **Manchester Guardian,** 26 September, 1838.

[78]Thompson, **Making,** p. 631.

[79]Ibid., p. 644, quoting W.B. Crump and G. Ghorbal, **History of Huddersfield Woollen Industry** (1935), p. 230.

[80]Webbs, **Industrial Democracy,** p. 564.

[81]Pelling, **Trade Unionism,** p. 29.

[82]Thompson, **Making,** p. 175, quoting J. Thelwal, **The Rights of Nature,** (1796), Letters I and II.

[83]Donald Read, "Chartism in Manchester," in Asa Briggs ed., **Chartist Studies,** (New York: St. Martins press, 1967), p. 34, quoting **Manchester and Salford Advertiser,** 15 September, 1838.

[84]Aspinal, **Trade Unions,** p. xxiv

[85]Eric Hopkins, **A Social History of the English Working Classes 1815-1945,** (London: Edward Arnold, 1979), pp. 52-3.

[86]Pelling, **Trade Unionism,** p. 127. One must note that trade unionists resisted the Liberal program until they were given the right to help administer and control these policies and institutions. The trade unions did not trust government with expanding services they customarily provided for their members.

[87]"How Unionism Benefits the Worker," **Western Labour News,** September 13, 1918, p. 3.

[88]Thompson, **Making,** p. 155.

[89]Pelling, **Trade Unionism,** p. 3.

[90]Ibid., p. 9.

[91]W. Hamish Fraser, **Trade Unions and Society: The Struggle for Acceptance 1850-1880,** (London: George, Allen & Unwin, 1974), pp. 190-3.

[92]Thompson, **Making,** ch. 14, especially p. 560.

[93]Ibid., pp. 637-8.

[94]Ibid., p. 550.

[95]Ibid., p. 598.

[96]Pelling, **Trade Unionism,** p. 9.

[97]Thompson, **Making,** pp. 553, 561-2.

[98]See Hobsbawn, "Tramping Artisan," in **Labouring Men: Studies in the History of Labour.** New York: Basic Books, 1964.

[99]Hunt, **British Labour Movement,** pp. 281-6.

[100]Ibid., pp. 283-4.

[101]Ibid., p. 284.

[102]Sidney and Beatrice Webb, **The History of Trade Unionism,** (New York: Augustus M. Kelly, 1965), pp. 574-5.

[103]Ibid., p. 841.

[104]Ibid., p. 848.

[105]Ibid., p. 109, and Pelling, **Trade Unionism**, p. 20.

[106]Thompson, **Making**, p. 566.

[107]Ibid., p. 565.

[108]Webbs, **Trade Unionism**, p. 105,

[109]Thompson, **Making**, p. 568.

[110]Webbs, **Trade Unionism**, p. 107.

[111]Ibid.

[112]Aspinal, **Trade Unions**, p. xxxi.

[113]Thompson, **Making**, p. 752.

[114]Ibid., ch. 14. especially p. 752.

[115]Ibid., p. 752.

[116]Hunt, **British Labour Movement**, p. 211.

[117]Thompson, **Making**, p. 893.

[118]Ibid., p. 894

[119]Hunt, **British Labour Movement**, p. 211.

[120]Thompson, **Making**, p. 900.

[121]Ibid., p. 901, quoting Baines, **Life of Edward Baines**, p. 167.

[122]Ibid., p. 903, quoting Bronterre O'Brien, **Buonarrotti's History of Babeuf's Conspiracy of Equals** (1836), p. xx.

[123]Ibid., p. 902, quoting A. Briggs, "The Language of Class in Early Nineteenth-century Britain," **Essays in Labour History**, p. 66; and Hunt, **British Labour Movement**, p. 201.

[124]Hunt, **British Labour Movement**, pp. 212-18.

[125]Thompson, **Making**, p. 912.

[126]Ibid., p. 913, quoting the **Pioneer**, 31 May, 1834.

[127]Ibid., p. 911.

[128]Briggs, **Chartism**, p. 3, quoting W.L. Mathieson, **The Awakening of Scotland**, (1910).

[129]Ibid., p. 34.

[130]Webbs, **Trade Unionism**, p. 130.

[131]Ibid., p. 164.

[132]Ibid., pp. 130, 134.

[133]Hunt, **British Labour Movement**, pp. 202-3.

[134]Pelling, **Trade Unionism**, p. 31.

[135]Ibid., p. 31, Hunt, **British Labour Movement**, p. 203, and Webbs, **Trade Unionism**, p. 155.

[136]Webbs, **Trade Unionism**, p. 157.

[137]Ibid., p. 190, quoting the Report of the London Committee of Trades delegates to the National Conference of Trades Delegates, Easter 1845.

[138]Hunt, **British Labour Movement**, p. 259.

[139]Webbs, **Trade Unionism**, p. 294.

[140]Ibid., p. 20.

[141]Hunt, **British Labour Movement**, p. 262.

[142]Webbs, **Trade Unionism**, p. 242.

[143]Ibid., pp. 401-5 and Pelling, **Trade Unionism**, pp. 94-7.

[144]Hunt, **British Labour Movement**, p. 301.

[145]Webbs, **Trade Unionism**, p. 406, quoting Congress of the General Railway Workers Union, Address to the members in First Half-Yearly Report, (London, 1889).

[146]Ibid., p. 410.

[147]Pelling, **Trade Unionism**, p. 89.

[148]Ibid., p. 90, and Webbs, **Trade Unionism**, p. 403.

[149]Hunt, **British Labour Movement**, p. 311.

[150]Ibid.

[151]Ibid., p. 310.

[152]Ibid., p. 312, and see E.P. Thompson, "Homage to Tom Maguire," in Asa Briggs and John Saville, eds. **Essays in Labour History**. London: MacMillan, 1960.

[153]Hunt, **British Labour Movement**, p. 312.

[154]Ibid., p. 309.

[155]Hopkins, **Working Classes,** p. 164.

[156]Hunt, **British Labour Movement,** p. 269.

[157]Ibid., pp. 310-11.

[158]Ibid., p. 318.

[159]Ibid., pp. 323-4.

[160]Ibid., p. 325.

[161]Pelling, **Trade Unionism,** p. 55.

[162]Paul Yuzyck "Religious Life," in Manoly Lupul, ed., **A Heritage in Transition** (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1982), p. 147, and see Timothy Smith, "Lay Initiative in the Religious Life of American Immigrants 1880-1950," in **Anonymous Americans: Explorations into Nineteenth Century Social History.** ed. Tamara Harenen, Englewood: Prentice-Hall, 1971.

[163]Avery, "Continental," pp. 54-5.

[164]Orest Martynowich, "The Ukrainian Socialist Movement in Canada 1900-1918," **Journal of Ukrainian Graduate Studies** vol. 1 (Fall 1976): 28.

[165]Ibid.

[166]Ibid., pp. 35-7.

[167]Orest Martynowich and Nadia Kazmymyra, "Political Activity in Western Canada, 1896-1923," in Manoly Lupul, ed., **A Heritage in Transition,** (Toronto: University of Toronto press, 1982), pp. 91-2.

[168]Martynowich, "Socialist," p. 35, quoting Genik, in **Svoboda** 2 January, 1902.

[169]Ol'Ha Woycenko, "Community Organizations," in Manoly Lupul ed., **A Heritage in Transition,** (Toronto: University of Toronto press, 1982), p. 174.

[170]Ibid.

[171]Donald Avery, **Dangerous Foreigners: European immigrant workers and labour radicalism in Canada 1896-1933,** (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1979), p. 61.

[172]Ibid., ch. 3.

[173]A.R.M. McCormack, **Reformers, Rebels and Revolutionaries: The Western Canadian Radical Movement 1899-1919,** (Toronto: University of Toronto press, 1977), p. 72, quoting **The Voice,** March 13, 1908.

[174]Ibid., p. 93.

[175]Donald Avery, "Ethnic and Class Tensions in Canada 1918-1920: Anglo-Canadian and the Alien Worker," in Francis Swyripa and John Herd Thompson, eds., **Loyalties in Conflict: Ukrainians in Canada During the Great War**, (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1983), p. 80.

[176]Ibid.

[177]McCormack, **Reformers**, p. 111.

[178]Ibid., p. 106.

[179]A.R.M McCormack, "Industrial Workers of the World in Western Canada 1897-1914," in W.P. Ward and R.A.J. McDonald eds., **British Columbia: Historical Readings**, (Vancouver: Douglas and McIntyre, 1981), p. 487.

[180]McCormack, **Reformers**, p. 141, quoting **Western Labour News**, August 9, 1918.

[181]Martin Robin, **Radical Politics and Canadian Labour 1880-1930**, (Kingston: Queens University press, 1968), p. 289, quoting Lloyd Reynolds, **The British Immigrant - His Social and Economic Adjustment in Canada**, (1935), p. 163.

[182]See A.R.M. McCormack, "Cloth Caps and Jobs: Ethnicity of English Immigrants in Canada, 1900-1914," Jorgen Dahlie and Tissa Fernando eds., **Ethnicity, Power and Politics in Canada**. Agincourt: Methuen, 1981.

[183]David Bercuson, **Fools and Wisemen: The Rise and Fall of the One Big Union**, (Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1978), p. 30.

[184]Robin, **Radical**, p. 21

[185]Bercuson, **Confrontation**, p. 58, and Eugene Forsey, **Trade Unions in Canada 1812-1902**, (Toronto: University of Toronto press, 1982), pp. 338-9.

[186]Bercuson, **Confrontation**, p. 8, and Forsey, **Trade Unions**, p. 38.

[187]Robin, **Radical**, pp. 37, 62.

[188]McCormack, **Reformers**, p. 78.

[189]Robin, **Radical**, p. 38, quoting **The Voice**, October, 17, 1896.

[190]Craig Heron, "Labourism and the Canadian Working Class," **Labour/Le Travailleur**, 13 (Spring 1984): 72.

[191]Ibid., p. 61, quoting **Industrial Banner**, September 1912.

[192]McCormack, **Reformers**, p. 79.

[193]Ibid., p. 97.

[194]Robin, **Radical**, p. 109.

[195]Heron, "Labourism," p. 51.

[196]Robin, **Radical**, p. 275.

[197]Ibid., p. 97.

[198]McCormack, **Reformers**, p. 54.

[199]Ibid., p. 57, quoting **Socialism and Unionism**, 10; and **Manifesto of the S.P.C.**, 29.

[200]Ibid., p. 54 quoting **Western Clarion**, May 25, 1901.

[201]Robin, **Radical**, p. 92, quoting **The Voice** April 3, 1908.

[202]McCormack, **Reformers**, p. 57.

[203]Robin, **Radical**, p. 99

[204]Ibid., p. 97, quoting **The Voice**, October 19, 1906.

[205]Ernie Chisick, "The Development of Winnipeg's Early Socialist Movement 1900-1915" (M.A. Thesis University of Manitoba, 1972), p. 51.

[206]Ibid., p. 58.

[207]McCormack, **Reformers**, p. 67.

[208]Chisick, "Early Socialist," p. 63.

[208]McCormack, **Reformers**, p. 67.

[210]Ibid.

[211]Ibid., p. 73.

[212]Chisick, "Early Socialist," p. 73.

[213]McCormack, **Reformers**, p. 72.

[214]Martynowich, "Socialist," p. 42.

[216]McCormack, **Reformers**, p. 49.

[216]Ibid., quoting Synge, "Immigrant Communities," **Oral History** (1976), p. 41.

[217]Peter Melnycky, "The Internment of Ukrainians in Canada," in Frances Swyripa and John Herd Thompson, eds., **Loyalties in Conflict: Ukrainians in Canada During the Great War**, (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1983), p. 10, quoting Orest Martynowich, "The Ukrainian Socialist and Working Class Movement in Manitoba," (Unpublished, 1973), p. 23.

[218]T. Peterson, "Ethnic and Class Politics in Manitoba," in Martin Robin, ed., **Canadian Provincial Politics: The Party Systems of the Ten Provinces**,

(Scarborough: Prentice-Hall, 1972), p. 94, quoting a personal interview.

[219]Avery "Continental," pp. 57-8.

[220]Ibid., quoting Victor Greene, **The Slavic Community on Strike: Immigrant Labour in Pennsylvania Anthracite,** (1968), p. 94.

[221]Ibid., p. 57.

[222]Donald Avery, "The Radical Alien and the Winnipeg General Strike of 1919," in Carl Berger and Ramsay Cook, **The West and the Nation,** (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1976), p. 211.

[223]Chisick, "Early Socialist," pp. 87-92.

[224]Avery, **Dangerous Foreigners,** p. 61, quoting **Robochny Narod,** January 22, 1914.

[225]Hobsbawn, "Labour Traditions," p. 331.

Chapter Three: Alternatives for a Canadian Class Movement

During the Great War, working class people acquired a general feeling that they were treated unfairly. Since the Great War was fought for democracy, this became the standard by which socialists and trade unionists measured the Canadian government's management of the war effort. Often, this meant that trade unionists and socialists equated *their* working-class interpretations of democracy with *the* democracy for which everyone fought in Europe. Since the government, indeed, oppressed immigrant groups and labour, and denied them certain customary political rights, working class leaders, therefore, argued social change, in the post-war, was imperative. Below, this chapter will relate Winnipeg's industrial relations conflict and working-class political protest, to the broader context of the Great War. The argument is as follows: discontent over unfair treatment on the job combined with fears that democratic traditions were in jeopardy, and consequently created a general feeling that workers' economic and political rights were threatened. This concern for working class rights, then, related the Winnipeg's Walker theatre meeting - political protest - to Winnipeg's industrial relations conflict - economic protest. Thus, Winnipeg's working-class acquired a general feeling that they were treated unfairly, and so, aspired to some social change.

I

The National Policy marked Winnipeg's tremendous growth in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. So transportation, agriculture, and immigration shaped Winnipeg's local economy, social structure, and, of course, its unique social problems. The National Policy, also, represented the vision of Winnipeg's Anglo-Saxon business elite for Manitoba's future; and it was primarily one of economic progress. Politics, here, played a supportive role so that businessmen could acquire wealth. This vision was not shared, in exactly the same fashion, by many immigrants who resisted its oppressive features.

Winnipeg existed because the railway existed. When Winnipeg offered to exempt the Canadian Pacific Railway from municipal taxation in perpetuity, and also granted rights of way and free land, the CPR decided to invest.[1] And indeed, Winnipeg's industry developed from the maintenance and building needs of the CPR, and only then broadened into a more diversified manufacturing base. Industry grew. In 1891, Winnipeg produced 5.6 million dollars worth of goods compared to 32.7 million twenty years later.[2] By 1911, industrial production had become extensively diversified, as manufacturers produced everything from cookies to farm implements. The major industrial force, however, was still the railway; its shops and yards, and a few principle iron foundries.

All this economic progress did not matter a wit without human resources. The Laurier government satisfied the West's need for farmers and industrial labour through an ambitious immigration policy, which eventually brought millions of people into the country. Between 1871 and 1921, Winnipeg's population rose from 241 to 179,087 people, and thus created a thriving metropolis from prairie scrub brush in only fifty years.[3] Most immigrants were of British descent, except for the twenty-two per cent who were of non-Anlgo-Saxon origin, and mostly from central and eastern Europe.[4] To the Canadian government, and Manitoba's business elite,

these immigrants were the brute human resource upon which their economic structure would rest.

Winnipeg politics was Winnipeg economics. A tightly knit business elite dominated city politics so that only those men associated with the development of industry and trade governed. Indeed, success in business, and membership in certain Winnipeg business clubs, all were essential to succeed in municipal politics.[5] This hold upon political power was, in part, assured through Winnipeg's narrow electoral base which excluded most everyone. In 1906, for example, only men who were British subjects, owners of freehold property or 100 dollars, could vote. This meant that 7,784 men in a city of about 100,000 people were registered voters.[6] So indeed, the businessmen not only owned property, they owned politics.

Given the narrow laissez-faire philosophy of this political elite, city council squeezed public services, in general, and distributed them to a small affluent portion of society, in particular.[7] One social issue, education, did dominate Winnipeg politics. When Manitoba, and especially Winnipeg, became a polyglot of different cultures, the Anglo-Saxon elite genuinely feared for their culture. So public education became an agent for immigrant socialization, and so, a justifiable public expenditure. Since the immediate needs of new immigrants were economic, and Winnipeg's government eschewed public relief, (it spent only 6,000 dollars per annum) the Canadianization process fell upon private charities such as the All Souls Mission and the Protestant churches. Here, immigrants could get both bread, and culture. The object of these public and private institutions was to teach British traditions and British religious virtues to immigrants so that Manitoba could have a unified community.

The truncated growth of Winnipeg created a city menacingly divided into sub-communities, separated by religion, class, and ethnicity. These differences were

obvious since they were spatial. The rich lived in the South, the poor Slav in the North-end, the Anglo-Saxon working-class in the West-end, and further west, the Anglo-Saxon middle class. Because these groups were so separate, each developed a distinct sense of community and institutional networks apart from the whole. Winnipeg was an ethni-city.

The ethnic cleavages in Winnipeg also shaped the nature of the labour market so that skill correlated with ethnic identity. In general, Slavs and Italians were unskilled; Anglo-Saxons and Germans skilled. As unskilled labourers east Europeans were highly mobile, in search of work in far off construction camps, dispersed upon farms, or on CPR spur lines. Since work was seasonal, temporary unemployment was a problem even when the economy was buoyant. These immigrant workers were flung to disparate parts of western Canada. Even so, these workers still relied upon the centrality of Winnipeg, where jobs were dispatched, and ethnic organizations provided both cultural services and relief for unemployment. For the British tradesman, working life was more stable and sedentary. One explanation for this ethnically split labour market, apart from the distribution of skills and economic needs of industry, is that government and employers projected their prejudice upon immigration policies and hiring practices. Simply put, the CPR and federal government believed the British craftsman was superior and the stupid old Slav was dull, docile and capable of enduring severe hardship, someone ideally suited to heavy labour.[8]

Many labourers organized industrial and craft unions in order to resist exploitation on the job site. Syndicalist unions such as the Industrial Workers of the World, or radical political parties such as the Ukrainian Social Democratic Party, tried to organize the east European unskilled labourers into industrial unions, and indeed, led many strikes for wage increases and better working conditions.[9]

This industrial unionism amongst the unskilled failed. A more solid trend toward industrial unionism developed within certain industries where technological change levelled the skills of craft unionists.[10] These workers were different; they already had unions. Nevertheless, the mainstream trade union movement in Winnipeg was dominated by craft unions. The first Winnipeg trade unions, *circa* 1893-4, were related to the railway industry or organized workers in the CPR maintenance shops.[11] Also, trade union activity developed within the building trades, and even the public sector. In 1893 the Winnipeg Trades and Labour council was founded so that trade unionists could discuss mutual problems and, in general, the trade union community Indeed, by 1919, some 91 trade unions with 12,050 members existed in Winnipeg,[12] of which 66 unions, with 10,500 members, were affiliated with the WTLC,[13] thus making Winnipeg one of the most unionized city in Canada.[14]

As far as the economic elite was concerned, trade unionism restrained economic progress. It was through a rude prism of laissez-faire economics that their view of Canada's economic progress was refracted. So any interference with individual freedom, *qua* property rights, ought not be tolerated in principle. But one did not need theoretical principles to restrict labour's role in progress. At the practical level, it was thought, any unnatural restriction of the labour market would restrict the employer's profit, Winnipeg's economic growth, then consequently the common good of all; and so it goes.

Employers treated unskilled eastern Europeans much differently from Anglo-Saxon skilled workers, and so, each ethnic group developed different patterns of resistance. A combination of factors made mines and construction camps breeding grounds for violent, desperate men. These unskilled immigrants were payed low wages, cheated on their wages, and forced to pay exorbitant prices for food and lodging in company owned towns. This meant that the firm completely controlled a

man's life. Indeed, a private police force was used, often, to discipline workers, especially those who organized unions, and thus kept a company public order. And furthermore, when industrial unions and strikes were organized, it seemed that the companies could count on the RNWMP to protect their property, and the Ministry of the Interior to provide a pool of strike breakers, all babbling different languages, to cross picket lines. Indeed, violence became a way of life; on the job, and during strikes. These camps became an unintended agent of socialization into Canadian life.[15]

Life was different for Anglo-Saxon skilled workers. Unlike eastern European labourers, they were not prone to violent behaviour because, generally, they had deeper roots within any particular community, meaning, their jobs were more stable, and they could acquire some property. The police, government and employer were less willing to attack them physically. Since their skills were in demand, especially during Winnipeg's boom years, and Anglo-Saxon workers understood the behaviour of labour markets, they knew how, and when, to bargain for better wages and working conditions. Indeed, their trade unionism, to a certain extent, was encouraged by government and even some employers, in order to attract skilled labour to Canada. Trade unions were legalized in 1871 with this in consideration, a department of Labour created in 1909, and some corporations, such as the CPR, even approached English trade unions to organize in Canada so that a supply skilled labour would be secure.[16] More often, though, trade union organization was still bitterly resisted, especially in smaller firms, and particularly so in Winnipeg.

The conflict between the Contract shops and the Metal trades unions marked the bitterness in Winnipeg's industrial relations. Among the employers, the participants included the Manitoba Bridge and Iron Works, the Dominion Bridge company and the Vulcan Iron works - the Contract shops - and three railroad firms,

the CPR, Grand Trunk Pacific, and Canadian Northern.[17] Five trade unions, the IAM lodges 122 and 189, Blacksmith lodges 147 and 335, and the Moulders lodge 174, represented all machinists in all six firms.[18] The issues were two fold. First, those working for the railroads earned more than those in the Contract shops, so the trade unions wanted parity. A larger issue was trade union recognition; the railway firms recognized the trade unions and the Contract shop employers did not. This conflict sparked the general strike of 1919.

Over a period of 25 to 30 years, this issue became increasingly intense. In the backwash of industrial conflict two lessons were learned: first, that government and the judiciary would support the employer; and second, that an industrial union could be a source of strength since it combined many craft unions into one large union. Beginning in 1906, the above five unions struck for wage parity and recognition. The strike failed when companies convinced the courts to force the unions to compensate their financial losses, about 500 dollars.[19] Like the Taff Vale decision in Britain, this demonstrated to trade union leaders that they needed Parliament, in Manitoba, to protect trade union rights against the courts. So trade unions turned to politics, and labour political parties which, still, could not secure political power. It was therefore clear indeed that Labour was excluded from political, economic, and community life. Again, in 1917, the IAM struck, and again, relented when threatened by a 50,000 dollar civil suit.[20]

After this last defeat, in 1917, the Metal Trades Council was formed. Its purpose was to withdraw all labour to defend one union's interest.[21] One year later, in support of the Winnipeg public sector unions, the MTC joined the Building trades council, and the WTLC, to threaten a general strike against the city. Faced by this threat, the city government granted all public servants, except firemen, the right to bargain collectively, and if necessary, to strike. Flush with victory, the MTC struck

the Contract shops. They lost. This time though, the victory of the public servants brought a renewed sense of confidence to Labour for their newly developed industrial unionism. Massive industrial action was succeeding.

The Great War sharpened industrial conflict. It took almost two years, once the war started, for the economy to escape the pre-war depression. During those years many unskilled labourers were the first to suffer the impact of mass unemployment. Those more cynical about patriotic motives for enlistment, in 1914, suggest areas which suffered high unemployment provided the most recruits.[22] But by 1916-17, however, labour markets squeezed. Employers needed roughly 100,000 workers.[23] So the trade unions seized their opportunity to increase their memberships, create other trade unions, and force firms to recognize their right to represent the workingman's interests. Trade union membership jumped from 133,000 in 1913 to 249,000 in 1918.[24] Since no mechanism for trade union certification existed, trade unions won recognition through strikes. Indeed, strikes, in general, dramatically increased, especially in 1917, when they rose from 45 in 1913, to 313 nation wide.[25]

Though trade unions did well during the war, nevertheless, there was a tremendous sentiment of discontent since business profits outpaced the labourer's wage gains. It was more than an issue of increased wages. Labour believed it was sacrificing for the war effort, but the boss was not. Furthermore, despite the upsurge in trade union power, their role in the economic life of the country was still not considered legitimate. This became clear when, in the face of political pressure from both the British and less so, Canadian governments, the director of the immensely influential Imperial Munitions Board, Sir Joseph Flavelle, refused to recognize trade unions, or force companies with government contracts to do so.[26] So the trade unions believed government and employers ignored their contribution

to the war effort, their legitimate place in Canadian economic life, and their criticisms concerning the distribution of wealth.

Labour's role in the economic order was defined by those who were not Labour. If the political and economic elite had a coherent economic model, from which to plan Canada's economic growth, Labour, trapped inside that model, did not have a unified alternative from which it could protest. Divided along ethnic/skill cleavages, different labourers experienced many different problems, and indeed, lived in many different worlds. The unskilled Ukrainian and skilled Anglo-Saxon had little in common, except, if abstracted from their social situation, then identified as quantifiable labour inputs for the National Policy. So resistance was truncated. Trade union organization amongst the skilled, by far, out paced that of the unskilled. Though the trade union movement could ameliorate parts of the problem, even its moderate demands were bitterly resisted. As the trade union movement grew in power, especially during the war, its demand for greater participation in the country's economic life was spurned. Employers, still, would not recognize the legitimacy of trade unionism. And, as far as Labour was concerned, trade union recognition, and the right to bargain collectively, were fundamental rights. Trade unionists felt wronged.

II

During the Great War the Conservative government became increasingly desperate to fulfill its commitments to the Allies. In doing so, it became oppressive toward the Labour movement, and the east European community. Alienated from the political community, yet expected to support its policies with unwavering loyalty,

Labour and east Europeans feared for Canadian democracy and their civil rights. Indeed, this fear was justified since their social organizations and practices were systematically repressed. Though below, the experiences of both Anglo-Saxon labour and east Europeans will be compared, in no way must the reader infer that, in general, open channels of communication between the two existed.

The Ukrainian community was not sympathetic to the Central powers when the war broke out. In part, they were indifferent toward the Central powers because Ukrainians from the Austro-Hungarian Empire had been an oppressed minority, without economic power, and limited constitutional rights. In Canada, Ukrainians were particularly self-conscious about Anglo-Saxon perceptions of their loyalty to the Empire, especially after the Budka incident. Budka, an Orthodox Catholic Bishop from Winnipeg, upon the request of the Austro-Hungarian consulate, issued a pastoral letter to "all Austrian subjects who were under military obligation to return to Austria, there to be ready, to defend the state."[27] The Canadian Ukrainian community at Winnipeg immediately repudiated this statement, as did the Bishop himself, once it became clear Britain would go to war against Austria.[28] The Ukrainian community did not unanimously support the war effort. The USDP clearly opposed the war, but they did so as international socialists, and not from any Ukrainian point of view.[29] And many individual Ukrainians did support the war anyway, through donations to the Patriotic Fund, or enlisted in the army - roughly 10,000, of which 750 came from Winnipeg.[30] Yet this support was somewhat forced, as Ukrainian organizations, in desperation, demanded Ukrainians demonstrate their Canadian loyalties.[31] So indeed, when war was declared, the Ukrainian community feared for themselves. They lived in an Anglo-Saxon country, at war with their former political masters.

Ukrainian labourers were particularly exposed when the Great War began.

Already despised by many Anglo-Saxon working men, the war and the pre-war depression increased racial prejudice. Some Ukrainians were fired to provide jobs for English Canadians; they had been accused of taking jobs rightfully belonging to English Canadians who would, otherwise, have to apply to charitable institutions for support; and this in a British country.[32] It became clear that all Ukrainians were somehow foreign and less deserving of scarce social opportunities.

For those Ukrainians out of work, who were not naturalized Canadians, their job situation could lead to imprisonment. On August 15 1914, the federal government passed an Order-in-council which authorized the cabinet to intern all unnaturalized immigrants from enemy countries.[33] In practice this meant the unemployed. Some 3,000 Ukrainians were interned because they were either unemployed, trade union activists, or socialists.[34] When Canada was in the midst of labour shortages by 1916, however, these internment camps were used to provide labour; many Ukrainians, hence, were forced to take jobs in isolated regions, and lived incarcerated in camps. This meant Labour camps. If labourers complained, or went on strike, they could receive *sentences* to industrial prison farms, as was the experience of thirty-two Ukrainian internees who protested unsafe, unsanitary working conditions in a CPR camp.[35] This experience of repression had meaning for workers as workers because they were systematically incarcerated for thinly disguised economic reasons. Institutions were erected whose purpose was to rationally control a group of people because they did not have a job, and later, when their labour was needed, to distribute their labour where needed.

Let us put some emotional colouring on this repression; it will make sense of Ukrainian fear and outrage because, after all, it was an emotional issue. Left without any means of support after her husband was interned, Catherine Boychuk was convicted of minor theft and imprisoned for one month. Meanwhile her eight

month old daughter was placed un an orphanage where she died eight days later of "natural causes."[36] Others suffered mental break down: this man's brother-in-law

> went nuts in one of their camps. He was taken away and when he finally got back he was never the same man again. They had broken his spirit up there in northern Ontario. He could never get over the injustice of his treatment, the falseness of his hopes in this new world.[37]

Incidents such as this, a mother in distress, her child dies, coloured the Ukrainian's global perception of Canada. "It is charged", said Petro Karmansky, "that Galicians look upon Canada as an absolute savage country, a country of hold ups and thieves and devoid of ideals and ethics. Do they? Well, then prove that they are mistaken."[38]

Indeed, for the unnaturalized Ukrainians, the rule of law seemed to slip off the world's edge and fall into the nether world of arbitrary rule. Some of the reasons for internment enumerated below illustrates Canadian justice.

> Other reasons were less concrete, illustrating the extent of the power of the law: acting in a "very suspicious manner" or showing "a general tendency toward sedition"... being found hidden in a freight car or generally "unreliable" of "shiftless character" and "undesirable."[39]

It does not take much to understand the average Ukrainian's fear of the state. Any individual policeman, or CPR security guard, could interpret the scope of government's internment policy broadly, in most any situation. All this left the entire Ukrainian community, as well as Ukrainian labour, with a sense that the Canadian government governed arbitrarily. Just like the Czar.

Ukrainians were right. The Canadian government applied laws arbitrarily to Ukrainian unnaturalized immigrants. Barbara Roberts forcefully argued this position when she discussed Canada's deportation policy.[40] The Canadian government deported undesirable aliens for economic and later political reasons. If one applied for community charity, due to circumstances such as unemployment, an industrial accident, or any illness, one risked deportation; if one's name appeared

on an employer's black list - deportation.[41] Immigrants were subject to rules and regulations administered by civil servants, whose actions, after "a critical reading of the internal documents", claims Roberts,

> Reveals that immigration officials repeatedly violated the letter and spirit of the law, routinely concealed their activities behind bureaucratic reporting procedures, sometimes falsified statistics, and when necessary deliberately and systematically lied to the public and politicians.[42]

Thus, the law could be applied to immigrants in a peculiar fashion, and, indeed, done so silently, without due process. One colonel Colson from Calgary suggested, during the General strike, that the enemy aliens involved be "quietly deported without any fuss or bother, simply just put them across the border without public trial or advertisement."[43] Later we shall find that this advice was indeed acted upon. When the War Measures act was declared, it created new political crimes because radical associations, parties and trade unions, which already existed for years, now became illegal. Membership in one of these associations, even if only briefly, meant possible internment, and after the war, deportation. So indeed, the Canadian government, especially an arbitrary bureaucracy, threatened the immigrant's basic civil rights. And this threat was a part of everyday life for most Ukrainians.

For many Ukrainians, their perception of Canada's meaning dramatically changed. Canada oppressed them in familiar ways; it became a boorish, racist, Czarist autocracy. In 1916, Manitoban Ukrainians lost their linguistic rights in the public school system.[44] Throughout the early 1900's, especially during the Great War, Ukrainians also suffered economic exploitation. Moreover, general Anglo-Canadian animosity against Ukrainians darkly shaded this linguistic and economic prejudice. How did the government relate to Ukrainians? An arbitrary bureaucracy, withdrawal of political and civil rights, and conscription of men into the military and labour gangs; it all all raised old familiar sensations. They were an exploited ethnic, linguistic minority without any political institutions for protection.

Indeed, 700 years of historical experience, as an isolated community in eastern Europe, reappeared and marked Ukrainian psychology in early twentieth century Canada. "As for Canada", this Ukrainian Social Democrat remarked after careful, measured reflection,

> The government appealed to us, guaranteed work and freedom from conscription. We fled from the tsarist detachments and Austrian regiments cursed the tsar and kaiser and made our way to the 'free' Canadian soil, to build with settlers from all other nations who had settled here, a single, mighty, new Canadian nation And how have we been received? Why as enemies of the Empire ... Having entered into an alliance with Russia, the Canadian government has become an accomplice of the Russian Black One Hundred Gangs [45]

Though all of Labour was against the war, it did not speak with one voice. The militants and socialists were much in agreement with the Second International's view *viz.*, the next war would be caused by capitalists who would destroy their own socio-political systems. For the worker, enunciated a TLC resolution in 1914, "the only result that a war between Britain and Germany would achieve would be the degradation of the toilers."[46] There was a bright spot in all this pain insofar as

> despotism in Europe will be hurled to its final destruction, to make way for constitutional freedom in all countries in Europe, in preparation for the last and great struggle of the working class for their own actual freedom.[47]

For more moderate leaders, however, the outcome of the war would not inadvertently bring about a democratic millennium, since Britain was fighting for democracy now. Nevertheless, it was still a British war for which Labour was neither responsible nor could condone. Despite all this, the individual worker could voluntarily support the war, but Labour as a group could not rightly be coerced to fight.[48] While Labour leaders debated the significance of the war, rank and file trade unionists, mostly of British descent, enlisted in large numbers.[49] Labour's initial impressions of the war, its causes, and their support for it, were mixed.

As the war progressed, the war effort became a sort of technical problem that

government had to solve by mobilizing, organizing, and distributing Canada's natural and social resources. Many authors, therefore, point to the war to explain the rise of the positive state in Canada, and its newly acquired status as a modern nation.[50] Labour, however, was not taken into the Borden government's policy making process. Once Parliament assented to the War Measures act, in 1914, Canada, in essence, became governed by cabinet through the use of Orders-in-council. Policy decision-making, then, slipped from Parliament, and the party system, to the cabinet and administrative boards such as the Fuel Controllers Office, Food Controllers Office, and the Munitions Board.[51] Even the thorny issue of wages was regulated under the administration of the Industrial Disputes and Investigation act.[52] Throughout much of the war, Labour, even members of the moderate TLC executive, was not represented upon these boards which controlled the daily lives of Canadians. "The politician", claimed SPC activist William Pritchard, "has been replaced by the expert."[53] Expert, here, meant good businessman, someone like Joseph Flavelle of the Imperial Munitions Board. So the nature of problem solving shifted from political to technical activity, which really meant that, the government's imprecise political assumptions of social reality were taken as given; and Labour's assumptions were not.

The clearest example of this was the National Registration program which Labour opposed for many reasons. Under the National Registration act, the administrative board was empowered to make an inventory of Canada's labour force to assess and plan the most efficient means of distributing labour resources. A National Registration Board had the power to determine which industries were crucial to the war effort, and implicitly, in which industries men could be spared for military service. Organized labour was not amused. It was not given any role in creating or administering this bureau.[54]

The TLC was suspicious of the National Registration Board. Indeed, Labour leaders thought it would interfere with trade union activity since,

> (Registration) would bring the worker to heel, depriving him of the right of collective bargaining and forcing him to accept what ever terms might be offered.[55]

If Labour was conscripted, some leaders argued, labour was not free, hence subject to arbitrary collective agreements. This meant that wages would be artificially low, and the worker would not have the freedom to change jobs.[56] Furthermore, registration could also lead to supervision by the military; and in Labour's experience, the military was hostile institution which helped employers break strikes.[57] Thus, Labour genuinely feared the state would systematically control workers, and worse, without their representation.

With his mandate running out, after six years of governing, Robert Borden first tried to avoid a wartime election, and failing this, then created the political conditions which could ensure victory. The immediate problem, in early 1917, was that the Canadian Expeditionary force needed men, but relatively few were enlisting. Thus, the wartime election was about conscription, in particular, and support for the war effort in general. Borden ensured victory in a number of ways. First, he divided the English and French wings of the Liberal party when the Union coalition was formed to provide "National" - English Canadian - support for conscription. Second, through the Wartimes Election act and the Military Voters act, the Conservatives cut deep into the traditional Liberal voting strength, in the West, by disenfranchising all German and Austro-Hungarian immigrants naturalized after 1902, enfranchising women who had relatives fighting in France, and allowing soldiers to vote in any constituency. What these two prongs in the Union election strategy had in common was that they divided the electorate along ethnic lines: in eastern Canada French Canadians supported the Hun, and in western Canada east Europeans were the Huns.[58] Essentially, Borden and the Unionists tried to

circumvent the democratic process by avoiding an election; and when that did not work, they fixed it.

The 1917 election was about national unity, the war effort, and conscription. Labour supported this issue in principle, but opposed the Union coalition's interpretation of Canada's war effort needs. In short, Labour was unwilling to support a government which would conscript men before wealth. At home, business made huge profits which Labour causally related to economic pressures which in turn negated wage increases. The cost of living rose dramatically. In Labour's mind, the employer, with the help of government, profited from the war, was unwilling to share or risk its wealth, yet demanded workers to sacrifice their wages and *lives* for the cause. When Labour projected their reservations into the arena of political debate, Union candidates accused labour leaders of selfishly representing narrow class interests at the expense of the common good.[59] Yet labour leaders knew well that their interests were excluded from national decision-making. For Labour, the question of the 1917 election, then, was one of fairness. Fairness, here, meant not contributing more than one's share in an economic and political system that was stacked against them. The Union coalition won the election handily despite Labour's protest.

After the election, the repression of Labour increased. Sometimes this repression struck people in direct and personal ways. In 1918, for example, Ginger Goodwin, a socialist, vice president of the B.C. Federation of Labour, and organizer for the Mill and Smelterman's Union, was shot dead, and in the back, by police while evading the draft. It was widely believed he was conscripted for his pacifist and socialist views, and in particular, his trade union activity. The military had already classified him unfit for service since he had tuberculosis, yet he was conveniently conscripted after leading a strike in Trail B.C..[60] Labour leaders,

however, were not the only people to die for reasons related to conscription. David Wells, a carpenter and conscientious objector, died in Manitoba's Stoney Mountain penitentiary; since he was inducted into the military, perhaps he entered the prison quite healthy.[61] Both incidents prompted demonstrations organized by Labour radicals in Winnipeg and Vancouver.

Behind the tragic personal experiences of some individuals, the repression of Labour and east European ethnic groups was more systematic. Indeed, this repression of east Europeans was further increased once the Russian Bolsheviks took power, in 1917, from the Kerensky provisional government; the Canadian Union politicians, in their own minds, were able to see clearly a relationship between aliens, Bolshevism, and labour agitation. A series of specific Orders-in-council were passed, by cabinet, whose purpose was to restrain socialist agitation and trade union militancy. In mid-September 1918, fourteen radical associations, among them the IWW, SDP, and USDP were suppressed, as well as meetings held in languages of countries with which Canada was at war, including Russian, Ukrainain, and Finnish.[62] This was extended to meetings held by alien churches as well as socialist parties. The radical press was also suppressed. The *Robtchny Narod* and *Western Clarion* were prohibited, and other Labour papers were threatened with closure by censors if editorial policies toward revolutionary politics, and criticism of the war effort, did not change.[63] Indeed, possession of such material, from banned newspapers, could lead to prison sentences. Furthermore, the government passed a rather vague Order-in-council prohibiting criticism of its war policies, and in effect, revoked the right to criticize government.[64] Later in October, after taking a swipe at the socialist parties and syndicalist unions, the government swung squarely at trade unions revoking the right to strike.[65] Concurrent with these Orders-in-council, a Director of Public Safety, who had the power to declare any association illegal, was appointed to monitor and censor the

activities of subversive groups.[66] The cabinet also gave the RNWMP extensive surveillance powers, including the right to open mail and infiltrate radical organizations. Therefore, by the end of the war, basic fundamental freedoms, such as association, speech, and the right to criticize government were restricted, sometimes harshly, sometimes only with potential threat, by cabinet proclamations

These restrictions reinforced sentiments within the labour movement that democracy, civil and political rights were slipping away. When in Winnipeg, the Anti-Conscription League's public meetings were violently attacked during the summer of 1917, Puttee foreshadowed working class sentiments toward the war. "It seems strange", he foamed, "and ironical" he hissed,

> that free speech, the basic stone of democracy, should be so imperilled and condemned by those who say that they are fighting to preserve democracy from the attack of an overwhelming autocracy [67]

"A forward move in democracy of the real kind", lay in the foundation of the Labour parties and Non-Partizan Leagues, and not the traditional parties with whom many Anglo-Canadian trade unionists viewed with growing cynicism [68] For radical and labourite parties, and the trade union movement, democracy was at stake

When the Union government repressed radical societies, the trade union movement, and especially radical parties, primarily the SPC, sharply defined the issue as one concerned about civil rights The SPC recognized the resentment amongst workers against these Orders-in-council which seized upon civil liberties [69] The party organized meetings in mining camps and urban centres to denounce arbitrary government.[70] The socialists protested for the release of political prisoners, lifting censorship, and against the arrest of workers found with illegal literature.[71] "We will say what we like", Pritchard's rhetoric caught fire, "We will think what we like, we will write what we like...."[72] These demands projected political themes into the Western Labour Conference and OBU.[73] Even the TLC

denounced the government's "Prussianism".[74] And, in Victoria, Vancouver, Regina and Winnipeg, the city trades and labour councils threatened a general strike in order to force the federal government to restore civil liberties.[75] Indeed, the solidarity upon this issue stretched across ethnic differences, across prejudice, when the Labour movement uniformly supported Charitinoff, a Ukrainian SDP activist, who was fined and imprisoned for possessing illegal literature [76] Like Ukrainians, the Labour movement drew an explicit parallel between the Canadian government and autocracy.

> During the last four years the master class has never lost an opportunity to cripple the mentality of the slave and rivet the chains of serfdom more firmly on his limbs, the the government of Canada is the most autocratic in the Empire and the most ignorant on the planet [77]

The legitimacy of the Canadian government's right to govern appeared to shake loose Amongst many groups in society, at the end of the war there was a feeling, from which some found fear and others hope, that everything would fly apart Many had sacrificed much and expected much Some believed society had to change And labour radicals were not alone in this The Progressives with their antipathy for the party system, pathology about monopolies, and faith in direct democracy are one example. At wars end, as men lost their jobs, as veterans struggled to find employment, as prices rose, the cry for a reorganized, reconstructed society grew [78] For some it was the working class who ought to inherit society;[79] for others it was the working class who was indeed the last bastion which protected democratic traditions. So,

> Increasingly, the labourists seized upon the war time rhetoric of defending democracy and and turned it back on the country's political leaders Immediately after the war, it seems, they concluded that the mantle of true defenders of democratic traditions had fallen to the "masses", especially workers and farmers The legacy of Radical liberalism was theirs alone to preserve [80]

For some Ukrainian radicals, the loss of civil liberties and complete lapse of

democratic safe guards exposed the emptiness of Canadian democracy.

> The social democrat's exposure to Bolshevik views coincided with the curtailment of civil liberties in Canada and on unprecedented nativist hostility toward enemy aliens As the distinction between conditions in the British Empire and the despotic empires abandoned by the immigrants became increasingly blurred, Bolshevik declarations became more relevant to the immediate experience of some Ukrainians in Canada.[81]

In a very real sense, the legitimacy of the government's right to govern was placed in question Its performance during the Great War was measured against a standard defined by well established democratic customs. From within the Labour movement, alternative social practices and institutions were projected in order to respond to the government's failure

III

Since the federal government assumed control of the nation's economic infrastructure, and wove the nation's productive life into the political process, the Labour movement was forced to become political. For Labour the question was how: through direct or political action, meaning general strikes or Parliamentary politics.

By the Great War's mid point, the Labour movement became increasingly radical. The efforts of radical party and trade union activists to educate workers, and spread the socialist word, began to succeed, especially after the 1917 Bolshevik revolution. For this B.C., miner the Soviet revolution meant that socialism and democracy came together in the hands of workers.

> During no revolution that has yet occurred in human history has the red flag of labour been so completely in evidence . The supreme command appears to be in the hands of the workers and others who are disciples of democracy and warriors of the social revolution.[82]

Later, in early 1919, the Mathers Royal Commission on Industrial Relations became a barometer which measured radical attitudes of ordinary workers and trade union leaders. Here we feel the radical itch. A railway machinist in Edmonton claimed, "we are the producers and we are not getting what what we produce", so the "complete ownership of the means of production by the working class," was necessary.[83] Even the texture of the language reflects radical jargon. For trade union leaders, there existed radical pressures from the shop floor. The western representative for the International Association of Machinists described rank and file attitudes:

> they do not recognize the authority even in their their own organization One of the things they want first is nothing short of a transfer of the means of production, wealth production, from that of private control to that of collective ownership, for they know that is the only solution [84]

Through out the country a cumulation of events, tendencies, and impulses created a feeling that society was pregnant with dramatic change: the Bolshevik revolution, increasing strike activity, a radicalizing of Labour attitudes.

If radicalism scented the air, it was not clear which radicalism All socialists agreed the means of production must be owned by the community, but this did not mean they agreed upon how workers should achieve that goal. The basic choice was between direct or political action. The roots of this choice lay deep in the experience of the Great War when the labour movement resisted the Borden government's conscription policy. Impulses supportive of direct and political protest existed as early as 1911 within the TLC. In Calgary, a resolution was passed supporting a general strike in the case that the Canadian government became involved in a European war.[85] The TLC even agreed with the Second International's general condemnation of war. Yet once war was declared, the TLC gave the government qualified support as long as voluntary assistance underscored the Borden government's demands upon Labour. This meant no conscription, and no

restriction of trade union rights.

The Conservatives broke the compact in 1916-17. When the National Registration program, conscription and the Wartimes Election act came into the political foreground the choice of political action, direct or Parliamentary, faced labour. The Vancouver Trades and Labour Council passed a resolution for a general strike against conscription, and the WTLC president Harry Vietch declared he would not sign a National Service card, counselling others to break the law likewise.[86] In late December 1916, the WTLC and the SDP established the Anti-Registration League, and held a rally to protest registration at which 4,000 people attended.[87] The TLC by contrast argued direct action was foolhardy since conscription "was the law of the land and laws could not and should not be changed by direct action in the form of a general strike."[88]

Hastily formed, the Canadian Labour Party was in reality a coalition of social groups in particular communities. In Winnipeg, on November 17th, a convention of 600 people nominated two Labour party candidates, R.S. Ward and R.A. Rigg, to run against Unionist candidates in Winnipeg Centre and Winnipeg North, both working class constituencies. The delegates represented most all the socialist parties in the province including Labour Representation Committee, the Social Democrats, and the Socialist Party of Canada. It was a forced unification.[89] The issue was conscription against which Labour proposed some conscription of wealth and the nationalization of industry.[90] Through the froth of election rhetoric the concern for democracy boiled. Rigg was the "champion of Real Democracy and (of) the rights of common people."[91] Desperate, short of time, the various strains within the Labour movement fought the Union coalition at the polls.

None of the candidates were elected. In 27 constituencies the candidates did not win twenty per cent of the popular vote.[92] In Winnipeg Rigg claimed the highest

percentage of the popular vote at twenty-six per cent.[93] Labour lost badly. Why? The Union campaign was powerful because it promised union; union of community forces, Conservative and Liberal, Labour and Farmer. The Union platform had broad appeal for the West. It promised patronage reform, taxation of income (conscription of wealth), measures to prevent excessive profits - reduce inflation, graft, greed.[94] The Unionists split the country linguistically and culturally: a vote for the Unionists was a vote against Quebec. With surgical precision Labour was sliced into sections. Thousands of trade unionists were already in France at Passchendale, the Somme, Vimy Ridge, so dissenting Labour and Socialist leaders, indeed, appeared to be out of step with the rank and file. The central Canadian craft union leaders were offered positions on regulatory boards and Gideon Robertson, vice president of the Order of Railway Telegraphers was appointed to the Senate (the least democratic of Canadian political institutions), and later, cabinet as minister of Labour.[95] Marxists, socialists, and Lib-Labs were lumped together as selfish, sectional activists serving a narrow social interest - class - who in general were enemy aliens. The message was clear; socialism was alien, ethnically and ideologically.[96] Moreover, the hastily formed Labour party was clearly inadequate, without a wisp of a hope as a real alternative, in this situation. Last, the manipulation of the electoral process did not hurt.

The failure of the Canadian Labour party sharpened the choice between direct and parliamentary political action. These alternatives both divided and unified the left. The two options that wriggled to the surface of Labour thinking were continued efforts to found a Labour party and militant industrial unionism. City labour councils, assorted trade unions, Fabians and the ILP continued to organize the Canadian Labour party.[97] Quickly, familiar problems split committees and caucus meetings. Hard nosed socialists tried to force the CLP to recognize the unreconcilable interests that inhere to capitalist society. Farmers balked, some craft

unions waffled, and Labourites accused the SPC of causing internal dissention and of being incapable of practical action. But since the Liberal party, at least in the West and Ontario, joined the Union coalition, these estranged labour groups had no where else to go, so an alternative political mechanism of some sort was crucial.

If this unity seemed to dissipate, the opposite trend, too, appeared. Within the ranks of the SPC and SDP, the Russian soviet revolution energized revolutionary thinking and made possible a common front between the two parties. The SPC had split when the Impossiblists ignored the Russian revolution's message and tried to remain a party of educators. Others saw an opportunity to swing the SPC behind a policy of direct agitation against the capitalist system.[98] Not much, in reality, had changed since many SPC leaders were pragmatic anyway, even if they placed the party and political purposes over the interests of trade unionism. What was different, here, was that political success seemed quite possible, despite the serious divisions between socialist political parties and the trade unions. As the SPC became more pragmatic, they drew closer to the SDP. And this unity hardened around direct action.

The choice between political options came to the surface and split the organized trade union movement at the TLC Quebec city conference in 1918. Motion after motion presented by Western delegates were struck down by international union delegates who dominated the congress. And this was no surprise. Radical delegates argued that trade unions should be organized by industry not craft, that international union power should be circumscribed, and that militant action for political and economic purposes, including general strikes, should be TLC policy.[99] Since opinion differed so greatly, a majority and minority report were necessary to reflect the conference's division. In the minority report, the socialists criticized the TLC for supporting the Borden government's war policy, and the

dominance of craft unions in the TLC. They argued the congress was not representative of Labour because delegate selection, TLC procedures, and committee structures, favoured the international unions.[100] For more representation, the report continued, city labour councils and provincial labour federations ought to have more access to the TLC and more power to influence its policy making.[101] This would clearly radicalize TLC policy since the socialists dominated many important city labour councils, and indeed, used them as a forum to criticize the conservative craft dominated TLC.[102] Attributing their failure at Quebec to eastern craft conservatism, the militant Western delegates called for a Western Labour Conference to project a radical alternative into the national Labour movement.

Syndicalist and industrial union impulses came together at the Western Labour Convention at Calgary, in March 1919, to form the One Big Union. The new organization expressed traditional socialist doctrine: the abolition of production for profit, the overthrow of capitalism, and the creation of an economic system based upon need.[103] Trade unions, postulated the Conference, must organize along industrial lines, "so that by virtue of their industrial strength the workers may be better prepared to enforce any demands they consider essential to their maintenance and well being."[104] The conference was vague enough to create a coalition of forces among socialists discontent with Labourite parliamentary political action and among trade unionists concerned with the TLC's dogmatic craft unionism.

The OBU provoked controversy from its conception. Foremost in everyone's mind was the question of revolutionary intent. The Borden government certainly found evil in the OBU. Business feared the cutting edge of revolutionary politics. And the TLC saw the OBU as a threat to political order. To answer this question one must understand SPC intentions since the OBU was its child. The OBU was an

organization from which a conscious, disciplined working class could evolve.[105] Like an Hegelian slave bursting the Master's bonds, the OBU would prepare for the future socialist society, from within capitalist society.[106] Within the OBU, however, the SPC leadership explicitly distanced itself from the syndicalists of IWW ilk for whom the OBU was an instrument for revolutionary change in itself.[107] Indeed, the OBU expressed the change in SPC political thinking wherein the political party would lead an industrial union movement for economic and political purposes.[108] So, in itself, the OBU was not a revolutionary instrument, nor was the general strike. It was a forum through which a revolutionary movement could evolve in pursuit of peaceful change at some undefined future point.[109]

Did the OBU reflect popular working class views or just those of a radical elite? This question was always hotly debated by participants and academics. For Meighen and Robertson, the OBU was spawned by communist agitators who took advantage of discontented, though loyal, working class citizens. For Kavanaugh, Pritchard and Russell, the OBU represented working class aspirations for political/industrial change and eventually a transition to socialism. Much historical interpretation from Bercuson and McNaught, to Freisan and Kealey, roam between the above points of view. Both are right. The SPC did take advantage of western Labour's discontent, but they also agitated for radical action through trade union democratic processes. They petitioned, preached, harangued trade unionists to send SPC supported delegates to the Western Labour Conference. SPC organizers canvassed the country and received much sympathy even in eastern Canada.[110] Many trade unions did affiliate with the OBU despite the debacle of industrial unionism at Winnipeg.[111] Moreover, the SPC leadership felt pushed into strikes they would not have otherwise chosen to fight. Russell, for example, opposed the Winnipeg general strike.[112] Indeed, the SPC leadership felt duty bound to lead despite the consequences. "(I)f the workers decide to go out", exclaimed the SPC's

Carl Berg,

> Then we will have to act and do the best we can, we can not back out of anything(.) we are to fight and to show the way, but we will have to use what little grey matter we possess to see that we do not get into any traps laid by the masters ....[113]

So, much of the pressure for quick decisive action came from below, forcing the radical elite to act or be left behind.

If the virulent animosity of the government and the TLC toward the OBU is any measurement of the seriousness of radical sympathies amongst ordinary trade unionists, then clearly, Labour's radical turn was significant. The crown charged SPC activists after the Winnipeg general strike with sedition, some of whom who were only minor figures such as Pritchard. The courts made it clear that a general strike was criminal. The TLC led an uncompromising campaign against OBU sympathizers, across the country, expelling trade unions from city labour councils, and the TLC. Perhaps the TLC's International union community did fear the OBU threatened the political order. But what the OBU did threaten was the structure of trade unionism and the TLC's careful building of a politically responsible labour movement, given existing political relationships and elite notions of decorum. If the government did not feel Labour's grass roots were revolutionary they did fear the SPC's potential for sharpening a radical edge to Labour politics.

Was the rise of Labour radicalism, especially Labour's civil war, and the rise of the OBU, a regional phenomenon? This question is important because, if so, the serious possibility of any SPC alternative to Canadian political and economic problems would seem even less plausible. Bercuson, McCormack, and Robin, to varying degrees, take the Western exceptionalist position. The western Labour movement was radical due to a unique fermentation of socio-economic forces: resource extraction industries semi-skilled labour, radical immigrants, and a raw frontier all congealed into radicalism. The eastern labour movement by contrast

was more conservative, industry less volatile, society more stable.[114] At the TLC convention at Quebec city, the western delegates led the radical attack: they formed their own caucus, wrote the minority report, founded the OBU. By contrast, Kealey argues "our understanding of 1919 must be built on national and international conjunctures", and that "the radical west and the conservative east have become sorry shibboleths of Canadian historiography."[115] That the West may be unique is not so important since one can say the same for Hamilton, Toronto or Cape Breton Island: working class development differs from community to community anyway.[116] Much socialist and militant industrial unionism, not to mention the Russian, German, Hungarian revolutions, englobed western democracies, in general, at wars end.[117] As for the TLC convention at Quebec city, Kealey argues delegate voting reflects meaningful support for the radical point of view. Though the West sent of 45 of 445 delegates many radical resolutions were only narrowly defeated, such as the motion to free political prisoners, which lost 99 to 90.[118] It seems clear, at least to Kealey, that there was sympathy for the socialist cause in eastern Canada. And Kealey is quite right; Bercuson, McCormack and Robin do not systematically prove radicalism was a western phenomenon. One thing Kealey does not mention, however, is that the SPC and SDP were predominantly western organizations.[119] The SPC's national headquarters was in B.C.; there was never a national SPC convention, and the only time members from differing provinces met at a convention was in Fernie B.C..[120] So, the radical edge of the post-war labour movement lay in western leadership, yet sympathy for radical measures, arguably, was nation wide. Moreover, the SPC leaders, the western delegatesto the Quebec and Calgary conferences themselves identified, then addressed, the problem as a western one.

Ukrainian labour and socialist activists participated in the Labour movement's protest against the war, but in a limited fashion. Most Ukrainians feared public

demonstrations against the war and for good reasons: the government interned dissenters, patriotic vigilante groups hunted bohunks in the streets.[121] We must not underestimate the Ukrainian fear of Anglo-Canadian prejudice during the war. As one Ukrainian commented,

> Owing to the unjust classification of all Slavs as Austrians and anti-allies, and owing to a certain degree of intolerance and hatred towards everything that is foreign has been transplanted in the public mind, resulting in indiscreet looting of property disturbing divine service in church, raiding of private homes and personal assaults of the gravest kind, to all those who have the appearance of foreign birth, thus rendering our lives in danger.[122]

Disenfranchised Ukrainians could not, obviously, express their dissent at the polls, but those who could vote voted overwhelmingly against the Union coalition. In some communities, such as Winnipeg, where labour coalitions formed to fight the election, some medium for participation in electoral politics existed, through their affiliation with parties such as the SDP.[123] If most Ukrainians were reticent to express dissent, the editors of the *Robotchny Narod* were not as they denounced the Wartimes Elections act.[124] Since Ukrainians were powerless, Ukrainian socialists hoped English Canadian class solidarity would protect them through the electoral process with a solid class vote.[125] When it did not, the disappointed Ukrainian socialists criticized English Canadian class solidarity, bitterly remarking, "let them unite with the A(merical) F(ederation) of L(abour) and its leaders like Gompers", and "let us take example from true workers organizations like those ... in Russia."[126]

Indeed the USDP drifted toward direct political action. Throughout 1918-19, the USDP stylized themselves after the Bolsheviks and suggested workers and soldiers establish councils.[127] USDP activists acquired organizing skills through their experience in trade union organization and strikes, especially in Winnipeg during 1917.[128] So, when Ukrainian labourers needed help in trade union activities, it was the Bolsheviks who were always there. In some cases, such as Edmonton's,

Ukrainian SDP locals "had reasonably close relations with IWW headquarters in Chicago ..."[129] No one of course argues this meant revolution was pending. It means many Ukrainians were sympathetic to socialist ideas in the context of the Great War. Since USDP membership jumped from 600 to 2000 members, between 1917 and 1918, it is reasonable to believe some Ukrainians expressed their political discontent with Canadian politics, and seriously considered a Bolshevik alternative.[130] Also remember that this growth in party membership took place when the Canadian government was interning Ukrainians who became involved in radical organizations. This sympathy was indeed broader insofar as it extended to the mining communities and factories where east European immigrants were sympathetic to syndicalist and Bolshevist ideas anyway. Indeed, the Cahan report on radicalism picked up on this.[131] Though Ukrainian socialists did not participate significantly in the founding of the OBU, directly, it was a distinctly Canadian radical medium of expression through which Ukrainian immigrants could potentially participate because, here, Anglo-Canadians did not reject the alien. Why? Because "the interests of all members of the international working class being identical ... this body of workers recognized no alien but the capitalist."[132]

During the Great War, the fractured Labour movement did acquire a common sense of purpose in their opposition to the Borden government's war policies from which four political alternatives for working class action were projected. SPC and SDP activists, Labourite and Liberal trade unionists, in many cases, were able to restrain their differences and oppose the Union coalition during the 1917 general election. Once Labour lost this election, the factions presented alternatives which were by no means mutually exclusive. First, the conservative craft unions, in the TLC, accepted the legitimacy of the Borden government's election victory, then opted to participate in the nation's management. This was not simply a return to any pre 1917 *status quo ante bellum* since the Canadian government viewed Labour

participation seriously, albeit in limited jurisdictions, at a point where government became more intrusive in private economic affairs. Moreover, Labour certainly had an impact upon the traditional party system, the evidence of which lay in the choice of W.L.M. King, a labour specialists and labour bureaucrat, as the leader of the Liberal party in 1919. Second, even the syndicalists found a place in post-war radicalism where many influenced industrial unions such as the United Mine Workers of America, and the OBU, then later fell into the ranks of the Communist Party of Canada. Third, the Marxist strains within the SDP, along with the SPC, presented an alternative at first loosely patterned upon the Bolshevik experience, then specifically upon the guidelines of the Third International. Here the Marxist parties became directly involved in militant industrial unionism; they saw themselves as a crucial force, whose activity prepared the ground for broad social, economic and political change. Yet this was not revolutionary, as in the Russian experience, since Canada was a liberal democracy where change "would come peacefully through perfectly constitutional forms."[133] Last, Labourites continued their struggle for an inclusive parliamentary socialist party which united political and economic forces within the scope of a socialist and trade union movement alliance, modelled upon the British Labour party. From the context of the Great War, these choices represented a range of alternatives from which the labour movement could structure political and economic protest, and project alternative visions of Canadian life.

IV

These national impulses for industrial, and political change also expressed local Winnipeg trade union and socialist protest. Though industrial strikes and

political protest were not systematically related, they still formed a cohesive working class front since Winnipeg's trade unionists and socialists were concerned about democracy and civil rights. So here, the demands of the strikers and the socialists at the Walker theatre meeting crossed

The gist of Winnipeg's industrial relations problems was about whether or not workers had the right to organize trade unions, in what ever fashion they chose Increasingly, so it seems, Winnipeg trade unions turned to industrial unionism. This did not necessarily mean the organization of unskilled labourers or syndicalism; it meant the unity of skilled trade unions in one bargaining council

The public servants struck in May 1918 for the right to strike [134] In the course of two weeks, 12 unions, of more than 6,800 workers, including some trade unions which went against their eastern leaders specific instructions, joined the strike in sympathy [135] The negotiations involved many groups who were not directly related to the conflict Local businessmen, city council, and the Union minister of Labour, negotiated with a special sub-committee of the WTLC's newly formed General Strike Committee, and not just the trade unions directly involved [136] Gideon Robertson stepped in to mediate the conflict, defined it as a question of trade union rights, and advised the city council to accept the unions right to strike; and for these concessions, the trade unions in return withdrew their demands for fire brigade officers' right to strike.[137] For Social Democratic alderman John Queen, the strike had to be won to "make Winnipeg safe for democracy."[138] Within the broad national context, where trade union rights seemed tenuous, the trade unions at Winnipeg stood on principle, demonstrated their power, and won.

Meanwhile, the railway shop craft unions attempted to organize the Contract shop workers. Since mid 1917, unions, such as the IAM in Winnipeg, pressed for trade union organization, along industrial lines, so labour could present a solid front

to employers. In late April 1918 the railway shop craft unions formed the Winnipeg Metal Trades Council (MTC) pressed for wage parity between railway shop and Contract shop workers, and after a successful organization drive, presented a draft agreement to forty-five shops Speculating on the MTC's tactics Bercuson argues the purpose was much deeper since,

> The unions undoubtedly asked for these high rates only for negotiation purposes and were probably willing to settle for less after bargaining with management If management bargained they would have had to recognize the unions [139]

Indeed, the Royal Commission created to inquire into the dispute seems to support this argument. If compared to wage payment scales across the country, the Commission concluded, the MTC did not have a just case since no Contract shop workers earned as much as railway shop workers. So the issue was one of principle recognition of trade unions chosen by workers - industrial unions In mid August 1918, the WTLC passed a resolution to take a general sympathy strike vote for four weeks hence By the end of August, however, the exhausted rank and file had returned to work in dribs and drabs They won a pay increase but lost the high ground for principle In early 1919, the same issue, the same trade unions, the same employers, the same industrial union *projet*, returned with dramatically increased intensity.

As Winnipeg trade unions became ever more aggressive in their collective bargaining practices, the city trades council also became increasingly radical During the 1918 MTC quarrel with the Contract shops, the WTLC, in addition to supporting a general strike, passed a resolution calling for the TLC "to immediately start a reconstruction of the worker's economic organization along the lines of industrial unionism, with the revolutionary goal the taking of the machinery of production in the interests of society ..."[140] Moreover, the WTLC passed resolutions for general strikes against the Borden government to protect trade union

principles *viz.*, the right to strike. In October, the cabinet passed an Order-in-council without consulting any Labour representatives, on any government boards, which made strikes illegal. When five Calgary shopmen were charged under this law, the WTLC and affiliated unions voted 92 percent in favour of a general strike against the law.[141] Even though the government conceded to Labour's threat, still trade unionists and socialists feared the loss of civil liberties [142] Then, in early December, the WTLC appointed Russell, Armstrong and Tipping to a committee whose purpose was to organize a meeting, which was supposed to include all political parties, to protest government wartime policies.[143] This meeting focused upon restrictions of democratic and civil rights

The Walker Theatre meeting was an expression of Winnipeg Labour's political discontent Before an audience of 1,700 people, speakers protested against the incarceration of political prisoners, and military aid to counter-revolutionary forces in the Soviet Union [144] This last item on the agenda reflected the internationalism of Canadian socialist parties, most of whom sympathized with the Bolsheviks [145] The second item enumerated specific Canadian political grievances concerning civil rights. The socialists called for the liberation of political prisoners which they divided into three classes. Reverend Ivens of the Labour church spoke against the internment of enemy aliens; he argued that the principle at stake was due process of law, and trial by Jury.[146] Second, speakers argued that Canadian citizen's lost the right to free association when government Order-in-councils made radical associations illegal.[147] Last, speakers argued those who distributed, published or wrote socialist literature lost the right to express political opinions, and criticize government.[148] One speaker grumbled, "Milton had demanded freedom to THINK to have convictions and EXPRESS these convictions above all other liberties."[149] So the speakers at the Walker theatre based their right to express an alternative political and economic worldview on ancient English political traditions and even

used English literature to clarify these rights. It was their right to express their point of view. The Walker Theatre meeting questioned the legitimacy of the government to govern based upon its own traditions. It was through Orders-in-council, cabinet made law, that British civil liberties were arbitrarily withdrawn. Arbitrary, here, meant that laws were made outside the democratic process, without parliamentary debate. This concern did much to unite labour since, as Bill Hoop argued at the meeting, Orders-in-council were used to repress legitimate political parties and trade union rights, and eventually rupture the democratic process itself.[150]

If the Walker Theatre meeting represented the increasing solidarity of Winnipeg working class opinion, it also expressed fundamental divisions and mutual suspicions within socialist politics The WTLC, remember, formed a committee to prepare a meeting of all political parties. The SPC however manipulated the circumstances to exclude other socialist parties. Two principles were in contradiction between which, the SPC members of the WTLC committee had to choose As a rule SPC activists could not speak on the same platform with other party spokesmen, unless in opposition, yet the WTLC resolution was indeed specific in its instructions to include all parties. Before the WTLC committee could meet a second time to finalize a date, the SPC members announced the Walker Theatre meeting as an SPC and WTLC event.[151] The other political parties felt cheated. One month afterward Ernest Robinson, WTLC secretary, disclaimed the council's responsibility for the meeting.[152] Nevertheless John Queen, the SDP city alderman and James Winning WTLC president and Labour party sympathizer, were present Despite the manipulative behaviour of the SPC, it is still clear that the other political parties and Labour agreed, in principle, about the reasons for which the meeting was called, though they most certainly would have presented their interpretation differently.

Strictly speaking the collective bargaining aspirations of Winnipeg trade unionists, and the Walker Theatre meeting's political protest, are not precisely related in any systematic way. The MTC concerned itself with the Contract shops; the Walker Theatre meeting with holding the government to account for its wartime conduct. Neither did the industrial union development within the MTC explicitly englobe the SPC's politically motivated industrial unionism. Both, however, expressed a common grievance against the government's disregard for democratic practices and civil liberties. The Contract shops did not recognize the *right* of workers to have trade unions they chose. The Canadian government repressed working class political expression. Trade unionists and Socialists in Winnipeg felt their principles were wronged. This vague but powerful sort of unity founded upon principles, should not be underestimated. Common sense tells us this was a potentially explosive situation because most everyone felt deprived of the just rewards due them for their tremendous sacrifices during a global war against autocracy

V

Anglo-Saxon and Ukrainian workers suffered within the Canadian economic/political system. The pressures of the Great War augmented this unfairness already structured into the system. During the war, employers and government did not support trade union rights or collective bargaining in order to smooth over potential industrial conflicts. When the realities of the sacrifices needed to win the war became apparent, the state increased the control and discipline of labour through cabinet made law. When socialist political parties,

syndicalist unions and trade unions opposed government policy, the state withdrew basic civil rights, which, indeed, make dissent possible. When government feared the consequences of a genuine election, it altered the electoral procedures and franchise. These marginalized groups in Canadian society feared for their civil, economic, and political rights; they feared political repression.

The Anglo-Canadian workers and Ukrainians did not suffer this oppression in the same way or to the same degree. The abuse of Ukrainian Canadian civil and democratic rights extended to the entire Ukrainian community especially the unnaturalized immigrant. When the Great War began, east European unnaturalized immigrants lost their civil rights; they could not belong to certain political associations, or certain trade unions. Those who did belong to these organizations risked internment and deportation without due process of law. Fear spread quickly to the rest of the east European community, especially when all naturalized enemy aliens lost the right to vote. Furthermore, they lost the right to express themselves at meetings in their own language, at church or in radical political associations. The consequences of being a community without rights was clear. Inasmuchas unemployment could lead to internment, and trade union agitation could lead to unemployment, this ethnic oppression extended across working life. And, even if one had a job, to the Anglo boss a Hun was a Hun. Furthermore, the protection of civil and democratic rights through law became meaningless because it was the law that authorized internment camps, closed down political parties, crushed trade unions. So indeed, the state provided the means by which class and ethnic prejudice turned to brute oppression.

Anglo-Canadian workers and labour leaders did not share the same intense experience of oppression, but, nevertheless, they still feared threats to their civil and political liberties, and indeed, their way of life. Their own institutions and

social practices were not recognized as legitimate. Canada fought for freedom in Europe, while at home, one could not organize trade unions without fear of the Boss' retaliation. Labour, asked to sacrifice for the nation's cause watched the employer get rich. Then, as the war progressed, government circumscribed trade union rights, closed down printing presses, and made radical associations illegal. Anglo-Canadian workers were oppressed upon the basis of class.

Although Anglo-Saxon and east European workers felt the unfairness keenly, they did not necessarily share a common sense of community. Since skilled and unskilled labour, usually, were ethnically split, workers lacked a sense of community. This ethnic pecking order, it seems, reflected employer prejudices; it was also an order by which many Anglo-Saxons benefited, and indeed, used to exclude east European workers. Most of all, the Anglo-Saxon workers shared a similar ethnic identity with Canada's economic and political elites so that the Anglo-Saxon worker appeared to have more in common with the boss than any immigrant labourer. And when the Great War broke out, Anglo-Canadian nativism, quite clearly, accented the lack of working class community solidarity across ethnic differences.

Even though marginalized, east European ethnic groups still had some links to the Canadian Labour movement. East European workers were involved in industrial unions. East European socialist leaders were in contact with Anglo-Canadian socialist leaders; their organizations affiliated to Anglo-Canadian organizations. So, in a small way, the east Europeans were part of a general unification of the Canadian Labour movement during the war years.

From common grievances, based upon fundamental issues concerning Labour, the Labour movement was able to express significant unity and present clear alternatives for a united class movement. Against the Union coalition, during the

1917 election, many of the factious working class groups unified to protest conscription and protect trade union rights. Many socialist and trade union activists argued a new class movement was imperative to protect workers' interests, a movement very different from that of the international unions and the TLC. The options were syndicalism, a militant industrial unionism associated with a revolutionary political party, and a British model Labour party for which an inclusive political party supported an affiliated trade union movement. These options, national in scope, coloured the local industrial and political conflicts in many Canadian communities including Winnipeg. And, in Winnipeg, the formation of new political options corresponded with radicalized collective bargaining conflicts whose new industrial relations methods had rich political meaning. If the Walker Theatre meeting and the dispute between the MTC and the Contract shops was related, it was through industrial unionism, a new form of trade unionism with many different meanings in 1919.

FOOTNOTES: CHAPTER THREE

[1]David Bercuson, **Confrontation at Winnipeg,** (Montreal: McGill-Queens University press, 1974), p. 3.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Alan Artibise, "Divided City: The Immigrant in Winnipeg Society 1874-1921," in G.A. Stetler and A.F.J. Artibise eds., **The Canadian City: Essays in Urban and Social History,** (Ottawa: Carleton University press, 1984), p. 364.

[4]Alan Artibise, **Winnipeg: A Social History of Urban Growth 1874-1914,** (Montreal: McGill-Queens University press, 1975), p. 142.

[5]Ibid., pp. 32-3.

[6]Ibid.

[7]Ibid., p. 285.

[8]See A.R.M. McCormack. **Reformers, Rebels and Revolutionaries: The Western Canadian Radical Movement 1899-1919.** Toronto: University of Toronto press, 1977, Donald Avery, **Dangerous Foreigners: European immigrant workers and labour radicalism in Canada 1896-1933.** Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1979, and David Bercuson, **Confrontation at Winnipeg.** Montreal: McGill-Queens University press, 1974.

[9]McCormack, **Reformers,** ch. 6.

[10]Harold Logan, **Trade Unions in Canada: Their Development and Functioning,** (Toronto: MacMillan, 1948), ch. 6.

[11]Bercuson, **Confrontation,** p. 8.

[12]Canada, Department of Labour, **Eighth Annual Report on Labour Organization in Canada, 1918,** (Ottawa: Department of labour, 1919), p. 218.

[13]Ibid., p. 213.

[14]Bercuson, **Confrontation,** p. 20.

[15]See Donald Avery," Continental European Immigrant Workers in Canada 1896-1933; From 'Stalwart Peasants' to Radical Proletariat," **Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology,** 12(1) 1975: 53-64.

[16]See A.R.M. McCormack, "Cloth Caps and Jobs: Ethnicity of English Immigrants in Canada, 1900-1914," in eds. Jorgen Dahlie and Tissa Fernando, **Ethnicity Power and Politics in Canada.** Agincourt: Methuen, 1981; and F.W. Watt, "The National Policy, the Workingman, and Proletarian Ideas in Victorian Canada," **Canadian Historical Review** 40 (March): 1-26.

[17]David Bercuson and Kenneth McNaught, **The Winnipeg General Strike: 1919,** (Don Mills: Longman, 1974), p. 9.

[18]Ibid., p. 16.

[19]Bercuson, **Confrontation,** p. 19.

[20]Ibid.

[21]Ibid., p. 72.

[22]McCormack, **Reformers,** p. 121.

[23]J. Jenson and J.M. Brodie, **Crisis, Challenge and Change: Party and Class in Canada,** (Toronto: Metheun, 1980), p. 60.

[24]Ibid.

[25]Bryan Palmer, **Working Class Experience,** (Toronto. Butterworth, 1983), p 191

[26] Bercuson and McNaught, **Winnipeg,** pp.10-12

[27]J.H. Thompson, "The Enemy Alien and the Canadian General Election of 1917," in F. Swyripa and J.H. Thompson eds. **Loyalties in Conflict: Ukrainians in Canada During the Great War,** (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1983), p. 26.

[28]Ibid.

[29]Ibid., p. 28

[30]Francis Swiyripa, "The Ukrainian Image: Loyal Citizen or Disloyal Alien," in F. Swyripa and J.H. Thompson eds. **Loyalties in Conflict: Ukrainians in Canada During the Great War,** (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1983), p. 58. No accurate figures for Ukrainian enlistment exist.

[31]Ibid.

[32]Thompson, "Enemy Alien," p. 29.

[33]Peter Melnychy, "The Internment of Ukrainians in Canada," in F. Swyripa and J.H. Thompson eds., **Loyalties in Conflict: Ukrainians in Canada During the Great War,** (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1983), p. 58.

[34]Ibid., p. 4.

[35]Ibid., p. 15.

[36]Ibid., p. 5.

[37]Ibid., p. 16, quoting Luciuk, "Internal Security and an Ethnic Minority," p. 41.

[38]Donald Avery, "Ethnic and Class Tensions in Canada 1918-20: Anglo-Canadians and the Alien Worker," in F. Swyripa and J.H. Thompson eds. **Loyalties in Conflict: Ukrainians in Canada During the Great War,** (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1983), p. 81, quoting **Manitoba Free Press,** 5 March, 1914.

[39]Melnycky, "Internment," p. 6, quoting **Internment Operations Files** files 3194(1), 333(1,5), 3466(2) and 4680, P.A.C..

[40]See Barbara Roberts, "Shovelling Out the 'Mutinous': Political Deportation from Canada Before 1936," **Labour/ Le Travail,** 18 (Fall 1986): 77-110.

[41]Ibid., pp. 80-3.

[42]Ibid., p. 79.

[43]Ibid., p. 80, quoting R.C.M.P. files RG 24 363-47-1, 4 June 1917.

[44]Manoly Lupul, "Ukrainian Language Education in Canada's Public Schools," in Manoly Lupul, ed. **A Heritage in Transition,** (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1982), pp. 216-22.

[45]Nadia O.M. Kazmymyra, "Aspects of Ukrainian Opinion in Manitoba during World War I," in Martin Kovacs, ed., **Ethnic Canadians,** (Regina: Canadian Plains Research Center, 1978), p. 125, quoting Jacques Ellul, **The Political Illusion,** 1972.

[46]Martin Robin, "Registration, Conscription, and Independent Labour Politics," **Canadian Historical Review** Vol XLVIII No. 2 (June 1966): 102.

[47]Ibid., quoting Canada, Department of Labour, **Fourth Annual Report on Labour Organization in Canada, 1914,** p. 20.

[48]Ibid.

[49]Some 26,000 by the end of 1917 had enlisted. McCormack, **Reformers,** p. 123.

[50]See Robert Brown and Ramsay Cook. **A Nation Transformed.** Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1974.

[51]J.H. Thompson, **The Harvests of War: The Prairie West,** 1914-1918, (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1978), p. 162.

[52]McCormack, **Reformers,** p. 122.

[53]William A. Pritchard, **W.A. Pritchard's Address to the Jury,** (Winnipeg: Wallingford press, 1920), p. 126.

[54]Robin, "Registration," p. 103.

[55]Robin, **Radical,** p. 126, quoting **The Voice,** December 29, 1916.

[56]McCormack, **Reformers,** p. 129.

[57]The Militia for example was called out 17 times between 1905 and 1914 for a total of 1,232 days. Jenson and Brodie, **Crisis**, p. 61.

[58]See Thompson, **Harvests**, ch. 6.

[59]Jenson and Brodie, **Crisis**, p. 85.

[60]Stanley Scott, "A Profusion of Issues: Immigrant Labour, the World War, and the Cominco Strike of 1917," **Labour/Le Travailleur** 2 (1977): 74.

[61]McCormack, **Reformers**, p. 139.

[62]Ibid., p. 152

[63]Ibid., p. 154.

[64]Thompson, **Harvests**, p. 164.

[65]Jenson and Brodie, **Crisis**, p. 100.

[66]Ibid.

[67]McCormack, **Reformers**, p.130, quoting **Western Clarion**, September, 1917.

[68]Robin, **Radical**, p. 157, and Craig Heron, "Labourism and the Canadian Working Class," **Labour/Le Travailleur** 13 (Spring 1984): 47.

[69]McCormack, **Reformers**, p. 154.

[70]Ibid.

[71]Robin, **Radical**, p. 170.

[72]McCormack, **Reformers**, p. 154, **British Columbia Federationist**, November 22, 1918.

[73]Robin, **Radical**, p. 175.

[74]David Bercuson, **Fools and Wisemen: The Rise and Fall of the One Big Union**, (Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1978), p. 71.

[75]McCormack, **Reformers**, p. 154.

[76]Avery, "Continental," p. 61.

[77]McCormack, **Reformers**, p. 154, quoting the **British Columbia Federationist** November 29, 1918.

[78]Ibid., p. 156.

[79]Ibid.

[80]Heron, "Labourism," p. 55.

[81]Orest Martynowich, "Political Activity in Western Canada 1896-1923," in Manoly Lupul, ed., **A Heritage in Transition** (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1982), p. 98.

[82]McCormack, **Reformers**, p. 139, quoting **British Columbia Federationist**, May 14, 1917.

[83]Greg Kealey, "1919: The Canadian Labour Revolt," **Labour/Le Travailleur** 13 (Spring 1984): 12.

[84]Ibid., p. 13, quoting **Royal Commission on Industrial Relations**, (Mathers Commission), Moose Jaw, Sask. 9 May, 1919, 1330-42.

[85]McCormack, **Reformers**, p. 119, and Robin, **Radical**, p. 119.

[86]Robin, **Radical**, p. 126.

[87]McCormack, **Reformers**, p. 126.

[88]Robin, **Radical**, p. 132.

[89]Ibid., p. 135.

[90]McCormack, **Reformers**, p. 134.

[91]Ibid., quoting **The Voice**, December 7, 1917.

[92]Robin, **Radical**, p. 136.

[93]Thompson, **Harvests**, p. 140.

[94]Ibid., p. 130.

[95]Bercuson, **Confrontation**, p. 64.

[96]Jenson and Brodie, **Crisis**, p. 85.

[97]Robin, **Radical**, p. 142.

[98]Ibid., p. 156.

[99]Gerald Friesen, "Yours in Revolt: Regionalism, Socialism and the Western Canadian Labour Movement," **Labour/Le Travailleur** 1 (1976): 142.

[100]Robin, **Radical**, p. 161.

[101]Freisen, "Yours," p. 142.

[102]Ibid., p. 152.

[103]Robin, **Radical**, pp. 171-5.

[104]Ibid., p. 174, quoting "The Origin of the O.B.U.," **Verbatim Report of the Calgary Labour Conference**, (1919).

[105]Friesen, "Yours," p. 146.

[106]Ibid., p. 148.

[107]Robin, **Radical,** p. 172.

[108]Friesen, "Yours," p. 154.

[109]Ibid.

[110]Bercuson, **Fools,** pp. 117-21.

[111]Robin, **Radical,** ch. xii.

[112]Ibid., p. 183.

[113]Friesen, "Yours," p. 150, quoting Russell Trial. C. Berg to W. Kollings, 2 May, 1919.

[114]See A.R.M. McCormack., **Reformers, Rebels and Revolutionaries: The Western Canadian Radical Movement 1899-1919.** Toronto: University of Toronto press, 1977; Martin Robin. **Radical Politics and Canadian Labour 1880-1930.** Kingston: Queens University press, 1968; David Bercuson. **Confrontation at Winnipeg.** Montreal: McGill-Queens University press, 1974; and David Bercuson, **Fools and Wisemen: The Rise and Fall of the One Big Union.** Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1978.

[115]Kealey, "1919," p. 15.

[116]See Gregory Kealey et al., **Primary Sources in Canadian Working Class History 1860-1930.** Kitchener: Dumont press, 1973.

[117]See Laury Peterson, "The One Big Union in International Perspective: Revolutionary Industrial Unionism 1900-1925," **Labour/Le Travailleur** 7 (Spring 1981): 41-66.

[118]Kealey, "1919," p. 36.

[119]Robin, **Radical,** p. 219

[120]Ibid., p. 100.

[121]Thompson, "Enemy Alien," p. 33.

[122]Artibise, "Divided," p. 384.

[123]Robin, **Radical,** p. 135.

[124]Thompson, "Enemy Alien," p. 34.

[125]Ibid., p. 40.

[126]Ibid., quoting **Ukrainskyi holos,** 26 December 1919.

[127]McCormack, **Reformers**, p 142.

[128]Martynowich and Kazymymyra, "Political Activity," p. 98

[129]McCormack, **Reformers**, p 150

[130]Peter Melnycky, "A Political History of the Ukrainian Community in Manitoba 1899-1922," (M A. Thesis, University of Manitoba, 1979), p 217

[131]Robin, **Radical**, pp 165-6.

[132]Avery, "Continental," p 61, quoting Chief Press Censor Files, 279-12 vol. 125 , 22 April, 1919

[133]Pritchard, **Address**, p 43

[134]Bercuson, **Confrontation**, p 61

[135]Ibid , p 62

[136]Ibid , p 63

[137]Ibid , p 64

[138] **Winnipeg Free Press**, May 9, 1918, p 2

[139]Bercuson, **Confrontation**, p 72

[140]Robin, **Radical**, p 157, quoting **Western Labour News**, August 23, 1918

[141]Ibid., pp. 167-8

[142]Ibid , p. 167

[143]Ibid , p. 168.

[144]Norman Penner, **Winnipeg 1919**, (Toronto: James Lewis and Samuel, 1973), p. 10.

[145]McCormack, **Reformers**, pp 140-3.

[146]Penner, **Winnipeg 1919**, p. 13 and F.J. Dixon, **Dixon's Address to the Jury: An Argument for Liberty of Opinion**, (Winnipeg: Wallingford press, 1920), p. 4.

[147]Ibid.

[148]Ibid.

[149]Penner, **Winnipeg 1919**, p. 13.

[150]Ibid., p. 11.

[151]Robin, **Radical**, pp. 168-9.

[152]Ibid., p. 169

Chapter Four

The General Strike: a Fragmented Unity

The Winnipeg general strike was about choice. Indeed, the range of choices were bound by the situation within which Winnipeggers found themselves, their social, economic, and political context. In order to make sense of those choices, we must understand what they meant for whom. The strike is embedded within webs of significance, an understanding of which helped the participants choose a course of action.

Since there are so many different levels of meanings, oddly related, the coherence of the strike is fragmented. Though the strike is whole, since it is one social phenomenon, and so, too, the sense of class solidarity, each part does not necessarily mesh into a logical, consistent unity of meanings. No one explanation captures the sense of the strike, nor the sense of class solidarity. It is fragmented, yet we recognize its unity. And so we must illustrate the fragments.

Certain general themes relate these fragments. Here the logic of three previous chapters guide us. They broadly define these themes woven into the fabric of the strike. Human beings are in a situation which demands action. Partly determined by their values, social practices and institutions, the practical action of human beings is also self-formative, so their values, social practices, and institutions form, harden, reform as conflict moves, as meaning and situation change. From historical experience working class communities acquired a sense of community,

class traditions, and class *projets de société*. These developed within the scope of larger democratic traditions, and intellectual movements related to the Enlightenment, which varied within different ethnic worldviews. The immediate social, economic, and political context of the Great War touched these strains so that political and economic justice became a general concern. And last, workers shared a common sense of suffering within certain social, economic, and political relationships, a suffering they could measure by their own class aspirations and notions of human dignity.

Now these fragments are connected oddly and sometimes in contradictory ways. At other times, two contexts, hardly related in a direct way, become so Odd? Here is what I mean. During the Great War, many of the strike leaders were pacifists, yet during the strike, many veterans conflated the fight for democracy in France with the fight for trade union rights in Winnipeg Democratic traditions joined two fragments But then again, many veterans were willing to disenfranchise east European brother workers; take away their civil rights. Here, claims to democratic traditions seem hollow. And again a twist. The east Europeans in the main supported the strike. They had class movements of their own steeped in democratic and class political traditions. So, at Winnipeg, there existed a fragmented unity wherein the fragments could connect in many different ways and not in others. The bewitching twist of human bonding underscored these fragments. contradictions separated and unified human beings. And the task of the strike leaders was to grasp and reconcile these opposites, the purpose of which being to unify a fragmented unity.

It is exactly this which made the Winnipeg General strike so important. The fragments of the strike could be joined in so many different ways to fix a meaning to Canadian class politics: to reconcile differences such as ethnicity or ideology, and

fashion one movement at best, or a series of increasingly determinate movements at least, which would suit Canadian life.

Class conflict marked the choices for Winnipeggers during the strike. For the Labour movement three alternative worldviews - liberal, marxist, and christian socialist - united against a common enemy in a situation where social, economic, and political relationships were becoming increasingly repressive. Each alternative worldview represented a totality, a holistic perspective which ordered social, economic and political life At certain points there were common agreements, at others, not; and where there was agreement sometimes the justification differed: a communist, a socialist, and business trade unionist could all support trade unions for different and similar reasons. So the issues which defined the causes of conflict - collective bargaining and a living wage - had a range of meanings related to each totality. These issues are related to British and Ukrainian working class traditions, so class democratic traditions, which aspired to economic and political justice, can not be ignored if the strike is to make sense. The Great War and fear of economic dislocation, contrasted democracy and economic justice, so the capacity of existing Canadian social relationships to provide both was put into question. These working class alternatives promised to reconcile these opposites, democracy and economic well being. And this promise was extended to Anglo-Saxon as well as east European Canadians. So Winnipeggers chose a particular form of class protest, the general strike, which would be good for them, something which would enhance their freedom politically and economically, in order to protect and extend their quality of life.

A very real restraint upon the aspirations of Winnipeg strikers existed. Each labour alternative does not unfold freely, consistent to its logic, as a seed might

become a tree. One restraint is the nature of the Canadian political process. Some authors such as Horowitz and Penner argue Canadian politics reflect the worldview of elites. A Tory elite combined business and politics, national economic growth, and a role for the state in private capital accumulation.[1] Since the Tory strain first marked political development, the political process, its structures and institutions reflect the Tory understanding of political conflict. This point of view frames nicely that of authors such as Jenson and Brodie who argue the political party is the medium through which elites structure political debate and consequently electoral politics. As such, class politics lost its impact as the dominant parties practiced consensus politics, and simply denied class conflict was meaningful.[2] They brokered a variety of cleavages such as region, religion and ethnicity, then called them Canadian politics. This left class somewhere in the nether world, so class conflict never acquired its proper political expression in Canadian institutions. Class cleavages, then, were explained more as regional, ethnic, and religious conflicts. And, of course, there is sense in this, even if class conflict was unfairly accented, since class protest did change depending upon region, ethnicity and religion.

This is why, for Winnipeg elites, the strike was an alien backed, radical led, revolution. Many of the east European strikers were revolutionaries, and the Anglo-Saxon strike leaders did challenge the political process which did not cope with class conflict. For Winnipeg businessmen and professionals, the threat was clear so they formed the Citizens' Committee of 1000 to fight Labour. Its leaders were not elected. Its relationship to political institutions was not formalized. The source of its copious funds were unknown. Yet it had the sympathy and co-operation of all three levels of government. When federal government cabinet ministers journeyed to Winnipeg to solve the conflict, Citizen Committee members met them *en route*. "I knew practically all of them personally ..." said Arthur Meighen.

> They insisted that the first essential was to make certain that there be well

> trained troops maintained at close enough range to be able, if necessity arose, to support civil power, when, as they fully expected, such civil power would be challenged by the Unions and their adherents [3]

Meighen adopted this point of view and never attempted to address the Winnipeg strikers' grievances fully. Just by virtue of a massive strike political authority was challenged. So the civic, provincial and federal governments, and their institutions, police and prisons, aligned themselves with one class against another. Another very real restraint upon Labour.

Two sides. And so there was conflict. Class conflict. The complexity of choices within these two sides must not escape us, for a variety of options existed for each. At stake was the future possibilities for a unified class movement. The employers and government had three possible choices to respond to the strike: crush it, let Labour define its own class practices, or find some compromise with some portion of Labour. By contrast, the factions within the Labour movement baffle the imagination, as does Labour's unity. Since industrial and political action were always interdependent for Labour, and given the intensity of protest against the Canadian government for its repression of civil rights, anti-democratic behaviour and a general impulse for some political change in the immediate post-war years, the political meaning of labour's industrial aspirations became accented. So within the Labour movement, very serious choices had to be made which would fix an increasingly coherent, unified class movement. The totality of these choices make up the substance of historical change. Indeed, a dialectical process of choice between alternatives permeates the strike, a reconciling of opposites, a striving for fixity in social practices and institutions which only the resolution of conflict could achieve, if only for a moment.

This chapter's purpose is to relate the meanings of Labour's choices together to explain the dramatic class solidarity at Winnipeg during the strike. The first two

fragments define the richness of Labour's choices. Since the strike was caused by collective bargaining and 'living wage' concerns, this chapter will begin here. So the meaning of these two concepts will be related to the Labour movement's socialist and trade union traditions. The differing definitions represent choice between class alternative worldviews. These political choices permeated trade unions, so the second fragment will illustrate the nature of political debate about class political alternatives within one influential Winnipeg trade union. The third fragment concerns the Labour movement's *own* democratic process. It will describe the organization of the sympathetic strike through the WTLC, an institutional frame work within which trade union and socialist factions could unite. The fourth fragment concerns the way in which ethnicity folded into class solidarity Since evidence about Ukrainian participation is scant this fragment is more of a polemic which weaves together common sense, imagination, and evidence to demonstrate the plausibility of Ukrainian *conscious* participation for *class* purposes. It is at this point that the Great War and Great War veterans draw out the contradiction within class solidarity across ethnic cleavages, yet forcefully unite the democratic traditions of the working class, the Great War's concern for democracy, and the general strike. This will be our sixth fragment. The following fragment concerns the federal government's response to the strike. Again, this is about choice, since a series of choices were imposed upon strikers, which suited the worldview of Canada's political elites. The eighth and ninth fragments concern the striker's response. Since the strike leaders entered the judicial and political processes, their response illustrates how class movements relate economic and political purposes. The resolution of the strike also fragmented Labour's unity at Winnipeg. So the last fragment will describe the different, though more determinate shape, Canadian class movements acquired. The underlying themes that unify these fragments are: the working class sense of community; democratic traditions; aspirations for economic

justice; social movements which relate economic and political purposes; and similar class experience. These fragments and themes, meanings and their relationships, the action of choice and an historical process, created an historical memory we may properly call consciousness of class. We may not, however, call this consciousness unified.

I

The strike was about two principles. the right to a living wage, and the right to bargain collectively. First: the living wage. It meant "a right to a wage adequate to maintain a reasonable standard of life, having regard to the civilization of (the) time and country."[4] Indeed, this definition was situational and empirical, so Winnipeg trade unions presented detailed cost of living figures, for housing and health care, meat and potatoes, then measured their needs against their pay scales.[5] This empirical tradition also included descriptions of living conditions which were presented to the public through Royal Commission reports, or studies by social reformers such as Woodsworth. One must read between the lines to understand the principle concern of these descriptions. Through brutal images of deprived living circumstances, the Labour movement's blunt concern for human dignity seeps onto the pages. Let Woodsworth illustrate this; below are two descriptions: one concerns the English worker's life-space, the next, that of a Polish labourer. The English worker lived in

> A small room at the back, very crowded, with double bed, small stove and table. The air was very, very bad .... father was out looking for work. The mother was out washing .... The table showed signs of breakfast - dirty granite dishes and spoons, two whiskey bottles and part of a loaf of bread from which the cat was having breakfast. The bed was like all beds in this class of home - mattress covered by an old grey blanket, two dirty looking pillows and some

> old clothes This was the children's play ground, for there was no floor space uncovered Under the bed . some cooking utensils, white wash brush, an axe, spade a dozen or so empty bottles, some clothing and a sack of bread [6]

The Polish family lived in a

> Shack - one room and lean-to Furniture - two beds, a bunk, stove, bench, two chairs, table barrel of sauerkraut Everything was dirty Two families lived here Women were dirty, unkempt, barefooted half clothed Children wore only print slips. The baby was lying in a cradle made of sacking suspended from the ceiling by ropes The supper was on the table - a bowl of warmed over potatoes for each person, part of a loaf of brown bread, a bottle of beer [7]

The condition of life was directly related to wages. So for Labour, "a 'living wage' is not a figure of speech The difference between it and a dying wage is written in the mortality tables."[8]

Labour defined that living wage through collective bargaining. What was the principle of collective bargaining? It meant "the right of the workers to negotiate with the employers *through their chosen representatives*.[9] And consequently, the recognition of the worker's trade union "was a fundamental principle, the same as a man's right to live, and could never be the subject of arbitration."[10] At Winnipeg, the strikers did not have to recite English working class tradition to claim this right. The government of Canada defined in P.C. 1743, July of 1918, the workers right to bargain collectively in the workers chosen forms of negotiation.[11] Moreover, the Prime minister signed an international accord at Versailles which guaranteed the "freedom of association for workers," and the "liberty to form any kind of legal association."[12] No one in government denied the fact that a living wage and collective bargaining were fundamental working class rights. The government, even the most anti-union, could not *de facto* outlaw associations of workers, since, by the twentieth century, this right trumped legislation; it was an unwritten part of the Constitution.

This concern for collective bargaining and a living wage was the most powerful source of working class unity because it marked notions of human dignity. Any society must allow its citizens life. Through these principles a rich plurality of meanings passed. These principles concerned the Standard of Life within the community, the spiritual development of the worker/common man, and his capacity to exercise some self-autonomy, from within unequal social relationships, and against ostensibly impersonal economic forces. These fundamental desires provided a source of unity each human being can feel, and as such, went much beyond fragmented ideological expressions.

II

At Winnipeg the meaning of collective bargaining jarred loose. The meaning of a word or concept, practice or institution, remember, is related to a context for which it has sense, a certain logic. Collective bargaining came to mean different things depending upon who defined it. So strikers were choosing between alternatives.

The strikers acted upon their agenda for social change through the logic of their class movements. Testifying to the Robson Commission, James Winning, President of the WTLC, described the general purpose behind the strike:

> I feel there is a growing desire on the part of the Worker that he should be a co-partner in industry ... they (the workers) have something more at stake .. they deserve something more than simply the opportunity to work for so much wages.[13]

Since the employers did not share this belief, the trade unions tried to impose upon them what ever definition of collective bargaining they supported, through their own

democratic process. Now the strike leaders did not eschew a political solution. Indeed, the Central Strike Committee passed a resolution which favoured legislation

> making it compulsory on employers to recognize the right of their employees to collective bargaining through the representatives of their organizations as expressed in craft unions, industrial unions, trades councils, and trades federations [14]

Once embedded in legislation, this right could fill out into the political *projet* of many class movements since, as the Striker's Defense Committee explained, workers

> want the control of industry in their own hands as soon as possible so that they can get the full product of their toil and and eliminate production for profit. But they will wait until this is accomplished by constitutional processes.[15]

Ultimately, workers aspired to some control over their lives which would be achieved through,some combination of industrial and political action.

So the question was: what did collective bargaining mean for whom? Three strains within the Labour movement projected clear alternative practices for collective bargaining: Christian and Marxist socialists and craft unions. Each defined collective bargaining differently, and related it to different systems of Labour/Capital relationships. Each choice represents a totality. And workers voted in their trade unions, and with their feet, meaning, their behaviour demonstrated their choice.

What might a living wage and collective bargaining mean to independent labour? A Labour party would bring the living wage into the political foreground since, "the state (would) assume responsibility for finding men work and providing for all their needs," such as good food, shelter, education.[16] And collective bargaining? For Woodsworth, "behind the whole question of collective bargaining and the sympathetic strike lies the democratic control of industry."[17] So democracy, self autonomy, and citizen participation would be extended to the factory floor and

institutionalized in an industrial democracy.[18]

Here, the distinction between the political and the economic began to blur, so that, the living wage and collective bargaining became politically loaded concepts. The ultimate aim of independent labour was "the complete turn over of the present economic and social system"[19] so that representative political institutions reflected the realities of human association, one of which was the work place.[20] Thus, a truly democratic society must incorporate industry into its political and economic institutions. When Woodsworth endorsed OBU principles, at Winnipeg's Victoria park, "for the industrial fight",[21] they suited well his understanding of the way social relations ought to be ordered. Now the transition to this sort of society, for Woodsworth, could not occur through a general strike. Change must occur through constitutional means: parliament, parties, elections, education.[22] Yet, "if those who harden their hearts", like Pharoh, "and refuse to let the people go," - change the rules of democracy - "the people in desperation may resort to violent methods to attain their rights."[23]

So, for independent labour, a living wage and collective bargaining fit into a clear, coherent social, economic, and political *projet* that they wished to impose upon Canadian society. This would be done in a particular way which would suit their trade union and socialist traditions, and, general Anglo-Saxon democratic traditions and constitutional procedures.

The Marxist alternative bluntly related a living wage and collective bargaining to industrial unionism. Here, industrial unions would aggressively defend the workers Standard of Life while accounting for economic and political realities. Since technological change threatened job-skills, and consequently wages, for example, industrial unions could maintain trade union power, even though craft jurisdictions crumbled.[24] Industrial unions were also a sort of political instrument

since they could enforce laws through massive strikes.[25] Indeed, the Boss routinely broke laws which defined the workers' Standard of Life, such as minimum wages, mine safety and working conditions regulations.[26] So industrial unions not only responded to economic trends, but protected legally acquired rights.

For these Marxists industrial unionism was also political. Through the OBU, the Marxist would scientifically reorganize workers into industrial unions whose proposed "system of Industrial Soviet Control by selecting representatives from industries is more efficient and of greater value than the present government."[27] Their political party did not fold into this industrial union. Its role was to stand apart and educate workers, through the existing political process, about class politics. The transition to a new socialist society; the revolution, would be through peaceful evolution made possible through "the traditions of the British working class."[28] Indeed, the British working class already "dearly bought liberties", democracy, free speech, free press, and free assembly.[29] Given the recent European experience of war, and the failure of the political system to protect its citizens, the Marxists felt the creation of "different institutions of governance" was "Imperative" if democracy would survive.[30] So, for the Marxists, collective bargaining, industrial unionism, and saving British democratic tradition were, all, intimately related.

Like independent labour, the distinction between the political and the economic blurred. Unlike independent labour, the Marxist alternative only clumsily reconciled trade unionism with politics, collective bargaining/living wage with new social institutions. Despite this problem, their industrial union message was much clearer than the labourite notion of co-ordinated industrial and political action, amongst freely associated trade unions, which in fact meant following trade unions in what ever decision they would make.

The craft unions presented a third alternative definition for collective bargaining. In the strike's context, the craft unions supported the employers and government. They accepted the view that the strike's purposes, and mechanisms for collective bargaining, challenged the political order. So for Robertson, the issue at Winnipeg was OBU syndicalism and revolution, against law and order.[31] Since the Winnipeg trade unions had taken matters into their own hands, challenged civic, provincial, and federal government authority, he felt justified in breaking the strike.[32] By June 16, Robertson forced the Contract Shop employers to accept the collective bargaining practices of the Running Trades, and CPR management policy. Why? Because the strike was *really* about wage parity between Contract and CPR shops. So if similar collective bargaining mechanisms were granted to the metal trades, it would split their federated structure into individual craft unions, and indeed, split skilled workers from the rest, that is to say, trade unionists from revolutionaries. Therefore, the international unions lined up behind the Contract Shop employers and postulated:

> being familiar with the method of collective bargaining as practiced by the organizations we represent, we endorse the policy of collective bargaining outlined by the metal trades employers in their announcement of this date, being in principle and in effect the same as that enjoyed by these organizations [33]

Collective bargaining, here, meant through individual *craft* unions. This choice corresponded with the arrest of the socialist strike leaders, meaning the removal of the other collective bargaining alternatives.[34]

The craft union alternative represented force. International union leaders in the Running Trades threatened to revoke charters, and expel members, if the union voted to join the sympathetic strike. Nevertheless, this compromise was a crucial concession. It was needed to restrain the rank and file trade unionists in the Running Trades who threatened to shut down the transcontinental railways.[35]

This alternative also meant that Labour's increasing political influence was recognized by governments. In this alternative Labour lobbied Parliament for legislation concerning trade unions, and less so, social welfare, in return for a disciplined labour force and diminished industrial conflict. For its consistent support of the government, the TLC acquired a meaningful participation within the administration of the Industrial Disputes Investigations act where labour, management and an impartial arbitrator resolved industrial conflict. This act provided a forum through which each side could present their grievances to the public to ensure strikes were settled fairly. And, this process became more of a reality since the TLC acquired more credibility as a responsible social force. Since the wartimes election and the expulsion of Labour radicals at the Quebec convention, the TLC drew closer to the government; it participated on government boards, influenced legislation, and mediated labour conflicts successfully, within industries crucial to the public interest.[36] In a word, the TLC acquired credibility within a political system which valued, and accommodated, interest groups

Though the craft union leadership presented on either/or choice to Winnipeg Labour, and thus wedged apart a complete Labour unity, much common ground existed between radical factions. Indeed, not much separated Labourite and Marxist positions. Both wanted radical change. Both supported some variant of factory democracy, state responsibility for the living wage, and a "scientifically" organized society. Each faction protested against the war. They both criticized profiteering and the abuse of civil rights. And through political alliances, they fought against the government's war-time policies as social conflict, increasingly, sharpened class cleavages. Their differences at this point were subtle. Regarding trade unions, the Labourites were reluctant to support one form of trade unionism over another, whereas, the Marxists aggressively pursued one sort of trade unionism as *the* answer to working class problems. Their notions of community also differed.

The Labourites were less willing than the Marxists to divide society into only two classes, and so, developed a more obscure, but richer view of the community as a co-operative commonwealth. For the moment, these differences were not as powerful as the solidarity which bonded them, and most all of Winnipeg's workers, together.

The radical interpretation of collective bargaining and a living wage also must be read within the scope of international events. The British Labour party conference and the Bolshevik revolution in Russia occurred at almost the same historical moment, and so, marked Canadian socialism. This was no surprise given the collage of European immigrants in Canada. J.S. Woodsworth, for example, adopted the "British way" for which socialism was the goal, the principles of which were the socialization of industry and the enforcement of a national minimum.[37] Indeed, it was the Britishness of socialism, for Woodsworth, that partly legitimized the presence of socialist movements in Canada.[38] The Bolshevik revolution, in Russia, meant peace, worker's democracy, and the over throw of an absolute dictator. It also inspired most of the world's socialists.[39] Since the British Labour party became the loyal opposition, and the Bolsheviks engineered a revolution, socialism appeared as a dramatic and concrete alternative within the scope of world history, a spirit that was "sweeping the whole earth."[40]

How does this relate to collective bargaining and a living wage? First, the concreteness of a world socialist alternative brought to earth many socialist parties founded upon 'speculative' philosophy. So socialist parties could no longer avoid industrial action. Indeed, both the British Labour party, and the Bolsheviks, were radically engaged in their national trade union movements.[41] Second, the differences between radical worldviews blurred since British socialism was still unconsummated; and no one knew what was going on in Russia, in those first few

years. There was enough vagueness so that one could read into world events what one wanted. Thus, the Marxists and independent Labour could at least sound similar. The SPC's *Federationalist*, for example, claimed "the inception of the new order in Russia is based on industrial democracy," where "the workers in Russia should be allowed to work out their own salvation according to the methods that they thought most advantageous."[42] Now this shabbily describes the Russian experience, yet, in the Canadian context, this illustrated much common ground with an independent labour point of view. Indeed, the latter principle can be related to the SPC's attempt to birth an industrial union movement, chosen by workers, for their own salvation, a principle which could be further applied to workers on strike at Winnipeg for the right to bargain "through their chosen representatives."

So world events created a forum for unity amongst radicals in Canada. Socialist parties, such as the SDP could, at one moment, enthusiastically support the British Labour party's manifesto, and, indeed, also "express its willingness to unite with the SPC on the basis of the Bolsheviki program."[43] Indeed, for Canadian socialists, such as the SDP's James Simpson,

> There are not many differences between the Bolsheviks and the British workers.... (I)t is well to recognize that the sentiment of the Russian people is at bottom that of the British working men.[44]

Furthermore, he continued, "what the British workers want is just what the Bolsheviki have attained - the nationalization of all great public institutions - such as railways and banks."[45] Two different forms of class politics blurred. So, a powerful sense of unity, amongst divisive radical groups, could grow. And furthermore, these socialists, with a renewed sense of purpose and unity, became radically engaged in trade union concerns.

The majority of rank and file trade unionists, through their own trade union democratic process, chose the option defined by the radical leadership. The WTLC

endorsed the MTC's demands. Then at a special meeting on May 13, WTLC delegates voted upon a resolution to present a sympathetic strike vote to their trade unions. Not one voice on the floor of the council dissented.[46] This vote did not mean trade unions would strike, because, where strikes were concerned, the WTLC had no control over its affiliated unions.[47] So this vote meant that only a majority vote of the trade unionists could justify an actual sympathetic strike. When the trade union delegates presented their resolutions to their trade unions, their members voted 8,667 to 645 in favour of a strike.[48] Moreover, some 15 to 25 thousand non-union workers voted with their feet and walked off the job. "The decision was entirely in their hands."[49]

Now the Robson Royal commission, after the strike, maintained the radical leadership did not represent labour's *real* sentiments.[50] Can one legitimately say the craft union leaders did? Ninety-four of Winnipegs ninety-six trade unions joined the strike: the police and typographers did not.[51] The Running Trades, who were not affiliated to the WTLC, did not as well. They did, however, sympathize with the strike's trade union purposes.[52] When the trade unionists working in the CPR yards and shops voted to join the strike, their leaders claimed they misunderstood the issues. The rank and file issued this rebuttal through their newly formed publicity committee:

> A statement appeared in last evenings "Tribune" claiming that the strike vote recently taken of men in the train and yard service at the CPR who did strike was taken under misrepresentation .... this is nothing but a glaring falsehood. They believe it was issued by Murdock, the International Union officer, for the apparent purpose of discrediting men active in the movement; and, also, for the purpose of attempting to stampede some of the men back to work. Every man who voted was acquainted with the fact that the ballot was to be used locally in a progressive strike. This is only one of the many fruitless attempts made by Murdock to gain a following by the employment of illegitimate methods.[53]

The craft union alternative was indeed not broadly supported. Despite the June 16 compromise, despite the arrest of socialist leaders, the Central Strike Committee

still refused to compromise.[54] The strike continued.

Socialist parties radically engaged the trade union movement to present workers with alternatives for social change. Due to the historical circumstances in Europe, and the the increasing *décloisonnement* of radical parties in Canada, a strong unified working class alternative acquired a Canadian reality, in urban centres such as Winnipeg. Their concerns were about democracy and social justice, which, they hoped, would encompass industrial life. This increasingly compact alternative was presented to the trade union movement who would choose courses of action through their own democratic processes. No one would argue this choice at Winnipeg locked trade unions into a socialist turn. Yet the plausibility of a socialist option was clearly in question, so that collective bargaining, and a living wage, could possibly acquire a distinctive political meaning. And this was where the socialist alternatives engaged collective bargaining and a living wage.

This class unity was political. Radical political worldviews converged so that a clear socialist alternative became possible for the trade union movement. Now this is a different sort of unity than the blunt ethical demand for a "right to live". This put into question, at this level, then, what kind of social practices and institutions workers should choose, and not the simple existence of trade unions. So this unity did not have quite the same force.

III

These alternatives for class collective action were familiar to each trade union in Winnipeg. Within trade unions men are bound "together by this one thing, that

is, the conditions of work, the hours of labour, and the rates of pay on that job."[55] Despite this narrow purpose, trade unions are not monolithic organizations since men of all political faiths may belong to the same union.[56] So when trade unionists, debate, analyze, and judge different courses of action, that which relates their trade union to other social, economic, and political questions, many points of view become engaged. The trade union dialogical tradition works like this; "On the floor of this union," said Pritchard,

> When some hair brained loose-tongued anarchist gets up and presents his views, I can get up on the floor of that union and tell him they are entirely wrong in their premises, and that all this ranting and roaring about things will not accrue with any benefit to themselves; they must get down and understand what they are talking about [57]

Political discourse permeated trade unions.

Now to grasp the relationship between craft and industrial unionism, politics and trade unions, within Winnipeg's trade union movement, we can narrow our discussion to one influential union. Where do we look and why? First, the general strike rose out of the industrial relations dispute between Contract Shops and skilled metal workers. Here, a group of American Federation of Labour affiliated craft unions formed an industrial union, the MTC, to negotiate contracts. Second, within these trade unions, different factions supported political worldviews which related trade unions to political movements. The International Association of Machinists, perhaps, best illustrates how the industrial and political issues percolated within trade unions. It was an influential supporter of collective bargaining through industrial unions[58], and also acquired a rich radical political tradition. The IAM was indeed an influential Winnipeg craft union which participated on that Metal Trades Council. So the IAM's experience will give some insight into how trade unions and radical politics, industrial and political concerns, related.

We must punctuate our discussion, here, with some explanation of the

relationship between individual craft unions and the AFL-TLC. Why? Because since the AFL-TLC became almost synonymous with business unionism, it is assumed that all craft unions shared, unequivocally, this trade union philosophy. Yet individual trade unions hold the power within the Labour movement; they choose political affiliations, trade union organization, and control the authority to strike, and not the trade union confederation.[59] And indeed, in the United States, and in Canada, much of trade union history, until the 1950's, concerns the confrontation between socialists and business unionists for the control of the trade union movement.[60] So these political squabbles were even more serious within craft unions; and this was particularly the case in the early part of the century because the Marxist socialists had not yet lost the trade union movement. These debates, therefore, within individual trade unions were meaningful because each trade union had considerable autonomy, and the socialists were influential.

"We can no longer depend upon the craft organization," claimed the IAM's Ed McGrath. "It is no longer able to meet the problems now confronting the workers; it must give way to an industrial form of organization."[61] Now this claim, for the necessity of industrial unions, points to three different sorts of industrial unionism debated within the IAM. First, the IAM favoured the creation of localized metal trades councils in which craft unions combined to increase bargaining power.[62] Trade union leaders saw the necessity of this since employers acquired more industrial power, within an era of increasing concentration of capital, especially in the transportation and steel industries.[63] Indeed, it is this sort of industrial unionism which Bercuson exhaustively studied to explain the strike. The second form, of industrial unionism, concerned the consolidation of the industrial power of disinherited skilled workers. Technological change, the mechanization of industry and the influx of semi-skilled labour into manufacturing, especially during the Great War, levelled the craftsman's skills and earning power. So industrial unionism

defended workers against two developments in industrial relations: the organization of employer's management practices and the homogenization of skills on the job. This was related to the logic of the Capitalist 'system' since both meant lower wages.

With the third industrial alternative, politics and industrial action were conflated in the OBU. When the Western Labour Conference met in March and April 1919, and formed the OBU, many delegates were from Winnipeg machinist unions - IAM locals 189, 484, 122. They participated in this discussion with other delegates from traditional craft unions such as the Blacksmiths and Moulders, Electrical Workers and Maintenance of Way, unions.[64] And this industrial union cause, most certainly, peaked the interest of Winnipeg trade unionists. In early May, some four, or five thousand trade unionists met at the Industrial Bureau to hear OBU speakers.[65] So, many Winnipeg trade unionists were willing, at least, to listen to this radical industrial union alternative.

The IAM was exposed to a rich diversity of political traditions, liberal and conservative, Labourite and Marxist, which helped define their understanding of their social, economic, and political problems. Indeed, social movements with an alternative vision of society influenced the early development of the IAM, beginning with the Knights of Labour. One of the IAM's first vice-presidents, and representative for local 235 in Winnipeg, A.W. Holmes, was also a prominent Knights of Labour leader.[66] Furthermore, machinists of the 1880's were often members of Knights local assemblies in Ontario.[67] In Winnipeg, the Knights were closely related to trade unions, one of which, the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners, was the forerunner of Winnipeg's IAM locals.[68] Moreover, the Knights helped found Winnipeg's first city wide trades union council in 1887.[69] From the earliest years, therefore, the IAM was associated with a working class social movement.

Though long since defunct by the 1920's, flecks of the Knights radical industrial-farmer *projet de société* imbued working class thinking. Take this letter to the *Western Labour News* editor:

> Back in 1883 the Knights of Labour had a platform and here was the fifth plank .... The land, including all the natural resources of wealth is the heritage of all the people .... The more this plank is considered more clearly it is seen that the thinkers and leaders in the labour movement at that day saw the tremendous importance of land and taxation as a leading factor in the condition of the working class.[70]

Since the capitalist system alienated the producing classes, farmers and Labour, from the wealth they produced, the Knights would reconstruct society upon co-operative principles which would distribute wealth fairly. Value and economic justice, here, were defined through the Knights ideological prism of the small independent producer. The agent of change was not violent strikes, but education and democracy.[71]

The IAM had concrete links to Marxist political parties such as the SPC. Many SPC members, such as Johns and Russell, rose from within the ranks of the machinist unions and participated in political life through the SPC. Some were elected to public office. Bob Russell's career illustrates the presence of Marxists in trade union elite circles, as well as the sort of political alliances the IAM had. Russell was a machinist. In Britain he was, at one time, a member of the Amalgamated Society of Engineers and the Local ILP chapter.[72] In Canada, Russell joined the IAM, became the editor of the union's journal, the *Bulletin*, then later was elected to the Winnipeg's IAM executive board, and, eventually, became the Canadian IAM secretary treasurer.[73] He was also a founder of the OBU and member of the SPC.[74] Furthermore, the Marxist point of view was most certainly diffused within the IAM. Take for example the *point d'appui* for this machinist's argument, that, the IAM ought to help found a political party, back in 1918;

> We know that we are wage slaves pure and simple. Our masters are the capitalist class, and we are forming a party to fight this class.[75]

This machinist was a delegate, chosen through his trade union's democratic process to go to the founding convention for the Canadian Labour Party. Even if the IAM's rank and file did not follow the SPC's immaculate Marxist logic of social causation, the message of class and struggle was certainly part of their trade union discourse.

The IAM was also related to the SDP. Though never related through affiliation, where union dues went directly into party political war chests, the link existed through political activists who were also IAM trade unionists. Ed McGrath, for example, once president of the WTLC, was both a member and activist in the IAM and SDP in Winnipeg.[76] This incident in Stratford Ontario, described below, suggests the nature of the IAM's informal relationship with the SDP. Arthur Skidmore was arrested in November of 1918 for possessing illegal literature. He was also an officer of the SDP, and a member of IAM local 103.[77] His union threatened to strike if the government carried out its plans to prosecute. The government conceded. Here, the IAM threatened to strike for political reasons to protect a fellow worker's rights to possess any literature expressing a political opinion. This does not mean the IAM supported the Social Democratic worldview; it does mean the IAM supported members who held controversial political views.

And what about eastern European members? Though this author has not found exact figures numbering the amount of foreigners in craft unions, this does not mean no comment is possible. Woodsworth claimed,

> The proportion of 'foreigners' 'alien enemies' (what ever that means) or otherwise - in the trades and labour unions is not large. There are few, if any, of them who are prominent leaders.[78]

But there were some. When the strike leaders and foreigners were arrested on June 16, among them was a member of the striking machinist unions, an SDP sympathizer, Great War veteran - wounded at the Somme and honorably discharged - Ukrainian, named Verenchuk.[79] So some plausible evidence, of a potential link

between the skilled tradesmen, and the east European community, does exist, slim though it is.

The precise relationship between machinists and the various Labour and Liberal parties is somewhat difficult to trace. First, Winnipeg's Labour parties continually formed, then fell apart, through out the 1890's and 1900's, depending upon whether or not the Liberal party was sympathetic to trade union issues. Second, the Labour parties were inclusive, so anyone could join. This meant that, in practice, certain Labourite personalities, such as Puttee, tried to convince trade unions, trade councils, single taxers, and middle class organizations, to affiliate. This must be compared to the Marxist approach of the SPC which also tried to win trade union support. The SPC burrowed from within in order to capture the trade union movement. So the links between the SPC and trade unions, like the IAM, can be isolated ever so concretely, where as labourism was more of a vague impulse amongst many skilled labourers. This direct link became more meaningful as labour politics became increasingly radicalized during the 1910's.

Now labourism stood upon liberal and socialist impulses. The labour parties often supported pragmatic social causes that both ideologies, at the edges, could agree upon. The Labourites did not firmly commit themselves to one ideology or another. Indeed, the Labour Representation Committee split, in 1909, when a resolution to found the party upon socialist principles was presented to the delegates.[80] At the polls, sometimes, the labour vote went Liberal, sometimes Labour, and sometimes SDP or SPC. In the 1900 federal election, Puttee won his Winnipeg seat supported by the city's working class quarter; he also lost that seat to the Liberal candidate in 1904.[81] While at Ottawa Puttee often supported liberal legislation for labour standards, just like the lib-labs did in the 1880's.[82] In the 1907 provincial election, a labour party candidate, Kempton McKim, ran against a

popular liberal reformer named Tom Johnson in West Winnipeg, a riding of predominantly skilled tradesmen.[83] McKim lost narrowly, which illustrated the split in Labour opinion. Fred Dixon, a middle class single taxer and trade union sympathizer, won Centre Winnipeg's riding, in 1915, carrying all but two polls, again illustrating the flexibility of the skilled labour vote.[84] The skilled tradesmen could vote Liberal, or Labour, depending upon whom they thought could successfully legislate favourable labour laws, protect trade unions, and so on. So the nebulous labour vote waffled between the traditional parties and a party of their own.

Trade union liberalism, however, was strained. The origin of this strain lay in the trade unionist's concept of rights. These two citations from the *Western Labour News* illustrate this:

> Political action is necessary for the workers not merely to protect their rights as trade unionists. The workers are also citizens .... (I)f Trade Unionists leave political action to landlords and Capitalists they can not expect legislation to be made in their interest.[85]

And,

> Trade unions were once illegal bodies. Your right to form trade unions was gained by political action. The powers exercised by your union are legal powers. They are secured by laws and laws are made by Parliament. The Right to combine, Right to strike, the Right to Picket ... all these rights were wrung from Parliament.[86]

At the most liberal extreme, trade unions wanted free collective bargaining; yet this presupposed government formulated the right foundations for collective bargaining. The strain is this: trade unions needed positive liberalism to secure negative rights. Co-operation and individualism, community and atomistic views of group-individual relationships came uncomfortably together.

Inside each trade union at Winnipeg, including the IAM, all the members did not speak with one voice for any one political or industrial program. As Pritchard remarked, the most forceful common bond between trade unionists was the job. This did not preclude political discourse. Indeed, many members also belonged to

political parties and contributed to efforts to bind trade unions and political parties together into a class movement. Yet the liberal strain in trade unionism dominated since individuals could associate with any political party, but a trade union, as a collective body, could not. Despite the trade union reticence to join any one party, through some sort of direct affiliation, this did not mean that trade unions ignored the issues political parties presented for public debate. Indeed, these issues imbued trade union discourse. So trade unionists were familiar with the broader context of alternatives unfolding in society.

IV

The organization and administration of the strike expressed both working class solidarity and democratic traditions. Through the Winnipeg Trades and Labour Council, some 60 trade unions and political parties converged to institutionalize a medium through which Labour could discuss all of their interests. The WTLC also organized the strike. This action of organizing, then executing, the strike, indeed, described the democratic formalism of the Labour movement, and the ethical worldview by which radical leaders would govern.

The political debates were sharper in the WTLC than the individual trade unions. The Labour council was one step removed from strictly trade union affairs concerning specific conditions, yet not completely involved with political issues as a political party. So it was a medium through which the two arms of the Labour movement could meet. Many council members, such as Bob Russell, held positions in trade unions and political parties. And, remember, as in the case of the SDP, some political parties were directly affiliated to the WTLC for their active

participation in organizing trade unions. Indeed, it was through the SDP that the east European community had some access to the Anglo-Saxon Labour movement. Rigg, for example, on several occasions helped Ukrainian workers organize protests for jobs and trade union rights.[87] He was also a member of the SDP and at one time WTLC Furthermore the WTLC acquired a tradition of co-ordinating efforts to unify working class interests through industrial or political action. Since the 1890's, the WTLC consistently participated in several attempts to form a Labour party and to organize sympathetic strikes. So many different strains within the labour movement converged within this institution, debated differences, and chose common courses of action. Indeed, this was political discourse: reconciling differences amongst those who have a fundamental common interest.

Once *declenchée* a strike must be controlled. Usually, an ordinary strike can be managed by administrators; it is almost a technical problem. But this was no ordinary strike since it went beyond each trade union. So the WTLC fell back on tradition because it had no experience with general strikes. Thus, the WTLC created a representative democracy to manage the strike.

What did this representative democracy look like? First, the WTLC commissioned a General Strike Committee to which each trade union sent three delegates.[88] GSC members participated in sub-committees, which administered certain aspects of the strike, and reported back to the general body of delegates. Those duties included, printing strike bulletins, liaison with different labour organizations and distributing social services to the community. These strike committees also made an aggressive effort to organize non-unionized labour, and indeed, some 5,000 people were recruited.[89] So representation, based upon trade unions, was not completely closed since trade unions tried to expand their base through organization drives. The GSC was also responsible for electing a Central

Strike Committee composed of 15 members. This body was an executive which interpreted and applied the general principles defined by the GSC to the situation. Five men were chosen by the GSC to be the principle negotiators and were later responsible to the CSC.[90] The GSC met daily, discussed policy with strike leaders, then communicated events and decisions to their trade union constituency. As in a representative democracy, information and decision-making flowed in both directions. So the decisions concerned all trade unionists, and an *ad hoc* institution allowed all to participate in decision-making, within the limits of representative democratic formalism.

The strike leaders, christened the 'Red Five', expressed the ideological, plurality and unity, of Winnipeg's labour movement during the strike. J. L. McBride and Ernest Robinson were respected trade unionists with long careers in their trade unions and service with the WTLC. Russell and Vietch were both members of socialist parties, the SPC and SDP respectively. And Winning was a trade unionist, president of the WTLC, and participated in the many attempts in Winnipeg to found a Labour party. No one political worldview was over-represented, though all five men were clearly politically conscious, and indeed, activists.

The strike shut everything down. Nothing happened. The silence meant economic life ground to a halt and the civic authority was challenged. Somehow social services had to continue, or, soon, people's lives would be jeopardized. The strikers had to *define* and *control* essential services such as food distribution, access to basic public utilities - water, electricity - and access to health care. The sick needed things such as elevators, street cars, and so forth.[91] Indeed, the complexities of social life, the interrelatedness of industry and social services - electricity, elevators, health care - became clear. Implicitly, the trade unions also controlled public order, and so, challenged civic authority. Since the city policemen

were unionized and voted heavily to strike, the CSC faced a thorny problem. Criminals could not be allowed to run amuck in Winnipeg: property and the citizen's personal safety had to be protected. The police had to remain on duty. And it was the strike committee that authorized the police to work, and so, put into question who controlled law and order. Labour was, clearly, in power.

The strike leaders also tried to control the community's communication media. The GSC created a press committee whose purpose was to keep ordinary strikers informed, ensure discipline and lawful behaviour, and define the issues for which everyone struck. But this was not enough. The strike leaders argued newspapers, such as the *Telegram* and *Free Press*, should be struck to protect the community's public order from wild, flammable, anti-strike rhetoric.[92] Labour now decided what sort of public discourse was in the interest of maintaining public order. To be fair, the printers stated they would not work for the Labour press, though they would volunteer their services out of sympathy.[93] The *Telegram* and *Free Press* howled. The strike leaders, for what ever reason, muzzled the right to a free press, a right for which trade unionists and socialists fought. Realizing their blunder the strike leaders relented; and so, in place of censorship, the Labour press debated the *Telegram*, *Free Press*, and the newly founded *Winnipeg Citizen*, about the strike's meaning.

The strike leaders' decision-making reflected their class perspective. At one time, the strike committee controlled the city's water supply. Reasoning that most people lived in one story homes, the strikers only allowed enough water pressure service domestic needs, up to the first floor.[94] It was probably a good laugh for strikers who knew homes in the South End generally had two stories. So some decisions expressed the logic of a strike; the necessity to restrain industry. Other decisions reflected socialist principles of economic exchange. When merchants

were allowed to sell milk and bread, the strike leaders insisted they do so at cost, not for profit.[95] Need before greed. Perhaps, the strike leaders' trade union prejudice became exposed when the CSC interfered with trade union activity. It denied an international union officer permission to meet the members of his own union.[96] So there was a distinctly different sort of logic that ordered Winnipeg's social relations, apart from the obvious consequences of the general strike.

The WTLC, and its *ad hoc* committees, formed to organize the strike, represent their working class constituency, and thus, expressed the democratic nature of working class tradition. The classness of the Winnipeg general strike hardened into institutional form. Yet all this could also be explained as an ethnic event since not one east European was on the CSC or GSC. Though many Labour alternatives were represented, they describe Anglo-Saxon class traditions, the unity of which was, indeed, a feat in itself. So it is not clear how east European immigrants could relate to Labour's cause and make it their own. It is not clear how the solidarity was class.

V

How can we know east Europeans, especially Ukrainians, participated in the strike in a meaningful way? This is a difficult question for the following reasons. The federal government suppressed the Ukrainian radical press in 1918, so that, no Ukrainian commentary about the strike, on a day by day, basis exists. This furthermore puts restrictions on Ukrainian Canadian scholarship because a press, quite simply, is the easiest raw source to study any social movement. So, perhaps, this is why much scholarship about radical Ukrainians becomes so vague *circa* 1919.

Aside from this, there are very good reasons to assume Ukrainian participation was minimal. Anglo-Saxon strike leaders were under pressure from both the Citizens' Committee, and the Great War Veteran's Association, to denounce foreign participation in the strike. Then again, the strike leaders knew they needed east European support to win the strike. So how, then, do we identify east European participation? Let us search for the plausibility of participation, lean on the logic of Ukrainian radical traditions, in the stead of concrete evidence; a sort of second best way. First, we shall put into the question the attitudes of the strike leaders and veterans toward the foreigner. Then second, fragments of evidence, and trends within the Ukrainian community, will illustrate meaningful participation, directed by a sense of purpose originating from within that community.

The WTLC would support "all efforts on the part of the authorities in their efforts to deport all the undesirable aliens in our midst."[97] This does not necessarily mean the strike leaders abandoned the east European strikers. What exactly was an "undesirable" alien anyway? Indeed, the strike leadership had a different interpretation from the Citizens' Committee, and the federal government, concerning the causal link between revolution and radical alien, since, "everything is revolutionary in their eyes (the Citizens' Committee) if it touches the profits of the rich."[98] The *Western Labour News* reminded trade unionists that it was the Boss who brought foreigners to Canada. The Boss, not the immigrant, lowered labour costs and broke strikes. Indeed, the employers had "no quarrel with the unorganized alien. The only alien they complain about are those who have had the sense enough to join the ranks of organized labour and therefore can not be used to scale down wages."[99] These morally hollow economic arguments were mixed with the ethics aspired to by the Paris Peace Conference for a world which treated immigrant workers humanely. Therefore, Winnipeg labour believed that, "foreign workmen lawfully admitted to any country, should be ensured the same treatment as

the nationals of the country."[100] Indeed, after the strike, the *Western Labour News* boldly claimed that it was the labour movement that taught citizen virtues to the immigrant.

> The Labour movement and Labour's platform, have given (the foreigner) the true inspiration of true citizenship. You talk about Canadianizing our foreign born! It is the Labour movement which is making good citizens of a free democracy out of them ...[101]

Despite the above anti-alien WTLC resolution, the strike leadership made clear their sympathy for the foreigner's problems, defined which foreigners were undesirable, and claimed to be contributing to the immigrants Canadian moral education.

Early in the strike the GWVA supported the strikers demands for collective bargaining, a living wage, and trade union recognition, but wanted to "discuss the deportation of the enemy alien."[102] The strike leaders were able to diminish this prejudice against foreigners. They defined the Citizens' Committee and federal government's attempt to foment hatred against the foreigner as a tactical move to divide Labour and break the strike. It worked. The veterans fiercely resented the Citizen's Committee's association between strikers and alien-bolsheviks since they, too, were strikers.[103] So, when the GWVA met in the Manitoba Hall to discuss events, the veterans began to ask,

> Where is the anonymous Citizen's (?) Committee? Who are they? Who is their chairman? Who elected them? ... They are rich men, of course ... They pay others to say that the principles of the strike are not those of collective bargaining and a living wage. They hire lawyers to erect a straw man over the definition of collective bargaining. They purchase a press to prove Bolshevism is the deep design of the workers. They concoct schemes about alien uprisings. They invent and design and lie "ad nauseum."[104]

For the veterans, the focus of their anger shifted from eastern European immigrants to the autocratic employer, whose nefarious class clique, anonymously it seemed, manipulated human beings.

Indeed, the strike leaders effectively argued that foreigners and veterans had much in common, as exploited workers.[105] This had not stopped veteran mobs

from assaulting east European immigrants, in the streets, or ransacking the offices of the SDP, and, exhorting employers to fire their foreign employees, throughout the fall of 1918 and Winter of 1919. So where is this sympathy across ethnic divisions? Not all veterans hated the foreigner, since, some were foreigners. These veterans used their status as returned soldiers to justify collective action, not only later during the strike, but in defense of their own ethnic institutions. When, for example, a mob of veterans threatened to destroy the Ukrainian Labour Temple, Ukrainian Canadian veterans, along with some city police, threw a protective cordon around the building.[106] During the strike, liaisons between the veterans and ethnic organizations existed, to co-ordinate actions. Strike organizers such a R.E. Bray, a prominent veteran, trade unionist, and socialist, co-operated with foreign strike organizers, such as Oscar Schoppelerie, to incorporate the immigrant community's participation in the strike.[107] They succeeded. Indeed, evidence suggests that east European immigrants participated with veterans, in marches and parades, during the late stages of the strike. Take the veteran sponsored "silent parade" of June 21 for example. When the police attacked the crowd over thirty protesters arrested were foreign, most of whom were Ukrainian; and furthermore, the two men shot dead were Ukrainian.[108] Clearly, one can not argue class solidarity between veterans and foreigners existed in any full concrete or spiritual way. Yet one can not argue the two groups were completely alienated from one another. Some veteran leaders and east European Canadian war veterans bridged the two communities.

So far the evidence only shows strike leaders and, less so, some veterans, were sympathetic to foreigner participation in the strike. What about the foreigners themselves? Did they participate? To what extent? Common sense presents a *prima facie* case for east European participation. If 30,000 workers struck, then it is more than reasonable to assume that some were east European and Ukrainian.

Some authors estimate numbers vaguely. "A few thousand" Ukrainian workers participated in a "militant" fashion.[109] Let us assume this "few" thousand is in fact only one thousand. Even so, if the Ukrainian population in Winnipeg represented 5.3 percent of the total population, of roughly 180,000, even 200,000, for sake of argument, then, surely, one thousand *workers* on strike represents astonishing solidarity and sympathy. When this common sensible reading of the numbers is stitched to the fabric of a twenty year tradition of radical political activity and industrial militancy, in Canada, it seems implausible Ukrainians would *not* participate in a conscious, organized fashion.

Ukrainian workers were familiar with protest marches, trade union recognition struggles, and industrial militancy. In May 1914, two thousand Ukrainians marched to the Legislature to protest unemployment. When the police tried to break up the demonstration, the marchers attacked them with shovels.[110] One month later, 5,000 east Europeans, again, marched to the Legislature for jobs.[111] That they marched to the Legislature is significant; it means they sought a political solution to economic grievances. Ukrainians also turned to trade union organization. When the frequency of strikes increased dramatically during the war, Ukrainians participated, despite slurs on their loyalty. In 1917, Ukrainian construction workers struck for trade union recognition in June. It was a bitter strike. Twenty-three workers were arrested some of whom were interned. They won recognition.[112] In the following year, east Europeans widely supported the 1918 general strike. "All of the men who have gone out", claimed the manager of the Manitoba Gypson Company, "are of alien nationality, many of them not naturalized."[113] So Ukrainians were well aware of trade union principles, benefits, and understood the sacrifices and risks necessary to win trade union rights. And, more, this sort of activity presumes organization, and an understanding of the logic of social protest. Protesters and strikers must know where to protest, and against whom. Great numbers of people must meet in

the same place, follow the same rule, and share a sense of purpose. Indeed, this Ukrainian behaviour just does not make sense without organization, planning and leadership.

Ethnic leadership would be important since it would give direction to the immigrant community and, enrich their capacity to follow a rule, through a Ukrainian radical political perspective. Now the leadership role of east Europeans during the strike is unfortunately an historical blank page. While most commentaries of the general strike agree the foreign population participated, historians add one caveat: no foreigners were strike leaders. And this is true. But nor did Anglo-Saxon strike leaders lead each ethnic community. Immigrant communities had their own leaders.

Where, then, were the Ukrainian strike leaders and their radical tradition? We know that USDP leaders and journalists - Popowich, Naviziwski, Kolisyk and a printer Lototsky - fled Winnipeg to Gimli Manitoba only days before the June 17th arrests.[114] While in Gimli they tried to convince Ukrainian settlers to travel to Winnipeg and join the strike.[115] Now these men were very involved in radical political activity, especially Popowich, who had been an USDP organizer in Winnipeg's North End since 1912.[116] These radicals related Marxist socialism to Ukrainian immigrant workers' problems in Winnipeg. Indeed, Popowich helped organize the 1914 marches with Rigg, the Anglo-Saxon SDP leader who later became an MLA in the following year.[117] When Ukrainian workers won their 1917 strike for trade union recognition, they passed a resolution thanking Popowich "for his help in the organization of the union, for his participation in many meetings during the strike, and for his help aiding the families of the arrested strikers.[118] Through the help of SDP activists, such as Popowich, these strikers acquired a respect and sympathy for the USDP point of view; it was this party that helped them

during a particularly bitter strike, and with which they shared a common experience. During these years, the organizational activity of these radical political activists started to bear fruit as SDP recruitment and trade union organization, amongst Ukrainians, rose. So when we consider the commitment to radical and trade union organization, coupled with rising popularity for radical causes, it is not hard to imagine activists such as Popowich and Naviziwski, and those like them, enthusiastically supporting, organizing and directing the strike from within their own community. Indeed, according to Avery, the Ukrainian Farmer-Labour Temple Association, the successor to the USDP,

> maintained the *esprit de corps* of the Slavic community and seemingly provided a most effective link with the Central Strike Committee .... it (the strike) became a life and death struggle in which any deviance from the ethnic norm was branded as traitorous.[119]

Class solidarity engaged both ethnic groups, Anglo-Saxon and Ukrainian. Indeed, the *Western Labour News* claimed employers approached foreigners with offers of employment. They wanted scabs.

> But the alien declined the tempting offers made to them and they stuck tight as a postage stamp. For the workers of Winnipeg, the barriers of colour, race and creed had been torn down and are now beyond hope of being rebuilt "Which is as it should be "[120]

Romantic enthusiasm? One could simply argue Ukrainians supported the strike because they feared the veterans; that indeed all this talk of trade union and socialist traditions mean little to the individual Ukrainian who might face the Anglo-Saxon mob.

Is an objection such as this a valid explanation for why east Europeans might support the strike? If so, it would certainly undercut the importance of Ukrainian class traditions to explain Ukrainian support since Ukrainians would have had no *choice*. If they scabbed they would be beaten. Let us examine veteran mob violence more closely. Attacks upon foreigners by veterans did not go

unchallenged. In the North End, Ukrainians organized their community's defense. Indeed, during the worst of the mob violence, squads of up to 100 Ukrainian men, with oak bludgeons, laid in wait for veteran mobs to intrude North End streets.[121] This defense culminated in a pitched street battle in which 300 men fought, until, three hours later, twelve foreigners and eight veterans were wounded.[122] Ukrainians fought back. When veterans massed in front of factories and demanded the foreigner's job, many employers refused.[123] So, many employers, indeed, stood by their foreign employees. Furthermore, during the strike the Anglo-Saxon trade unionist made it clear that they would not support the mass firing of foreigners so veterans could take their jobs.[124] Indeed, east Europeans probably took more of a risk when they joined the strike, since, if the strike was lost, employers would have less sympathy and grace for the fallen bohunk. All this does not mean fear of the veteran by immigrants was inconsequential; rather this fear is just not a good enough reason to characterize Ukrainian or east European participation as helpless passivity.

The arrest of east Europeans illustrated not only east European participation, but, the class motivations for their participation. The police raided the Ukrainian Labour Temple, and some thirty homes in the North End, where they arrested east European strike leaders and collected socialist - seditious - literature.[125] Four east European strike leaders were arrested: Charitinoff, editor of the *Robotchny Narod*; Sam Blumenberg, an SDP delegate to the WTLC; M. Almazoff, a University of Manitoba student and socialist; O. Schoppelrie, a socialist organizer.[126] All were under RNWMP surveillance for some weeks prior to their arrest.[127] Then, four days later, police arrested east European demonstrators, as mentioned above, who participated in the silent parade. The *Western Labour News* demonstrated the class nature of the east European protesters when they printed the biographies of thirteen east European strikers, nine of whom were Ukrainian: a sheetmetal worker, two

boilermakers, one carpenter, one teamster, and eight labourers.[128] Three more were unemployed: one had worked for the city, another for the CPR, and the last for Swifts.[129] So class and ethnicity, it seems, did come together since east European workers and socialist organizers participated in *class* protest, with Anglo-Canadians, for which they were arrested.

Unlike the Anglo-Canadians arrested, these immigrants faced deportation. The federal government amended the Immigration act, on June 6, so that, any person, "by word or act who sought the violent overthrow of the Canadian constitution, who was either a British or east European naturalized Canadian could be deported." This amendment passed unanimously, without debate, in only forty-five minutes. So, in forty-five minutes, the civil rights of an entire class of people were swept away.[130] Under the act, the arrested strikers faced deportation hearings, in camera, where an appointed immigration board judged guilt or innocence, without due process of law. And the class prejudice of the board members was blunt. Judge Hugh John MacDonald, for example, had

> seen to what large extent Bolsheviki ideas are held by Ruthenian, Russian and Polish people, whom we have in our midst .... it is absolutely necessary that an example should be made ... If the Government persists in the course it is now adopting the foreign element here will soon be as gentle and easily controlled as a lot of sheep.[131]

The immigrant striker, whose constitutional rights disappeared, stood naked before class and racial prejudice.

The *Western Labour News* fumed. It contrasted the innocence of east European strikers with the barbaric behaviour of the police. Take "Mike's" case:

> Poor Mike had been standing out in front of the Labour Temple on Saturday, as he had stood for many a day. When the Canadian Cossacks began to ride down the mob, Mike had taken refuge in an adjoining stable. That was his share in the riot ... His crime was that evidently he was a foreigner and easy to capture.[132]

For the *Western Labour News* "Mike" illustrated the peaceful nature of the immigrant

striker. He stood, routinely, outside the Labour Temple, presumably to follow the news of the events, as many strikers indeed did as well. The police attacked him because he was "standing there", on strike. The overtones of racial prejudice are evident, so it seems, since he was easy to identify and capture.

The *Western Labour News* measured the injustice of the amendment to the Immigration act against some immigrants' contribution to Canadian life. Below, the *Western labour News* presents the case of a Ukrainian Canadian veteran arrested during the protest.

> They send me back to Austria. They might as well put a rope around my neck. I did not need to go and fight for this country, but this is now my county ... Then they did not let my father vote. This free country? I have good job when strike started. I go out with union. I no scab. Special police scab for six dollars day ... This free country? Why no get bail? Englishmen get bail (the strike leaders). He no fight for country.[133]

Note the themes woven together here. This Ukrainian was a veteran and a trade unionist. He had a job; life was good. Then history tore down his life. The rhetorical question "this free country?", not only put into question his father's loss of voting rights, but also this striker's own personal justification for striking: he fought for democracy; he was a member of a trade union, in a free society; he struck for trade union rights. This country, for whose freedom he fought, then punished him. It arbitrarily took away his right to a jury trial, and, threatened to deport him to the country against which he fought.

Winnipeg's Labour movement stood up for the Slav strikers arrested. Through writs of *habeus corpus*, the WTLC tried to force the courts to give those immigrants arrested a fair trial.[134] The striker's defense committee, newly formed by the WTLC, initiated a campaign to publicize the plight of the foreign strikers. They were able to pressure local authorities to free the foreign strike leaders, except Schoppelrie, who was deported for different reasons. He entered Canada illegally from the United States, some three years previously.[135] The WTLC failed to secure

the release of thirty-one east European immigrants arrested during the silent parade, so that, like their march, these immigrants were silently deported without any hearings whatsoever.[136] The Labour movement tried legal action and political pressure to support east European arrested strikers. These legal procedures, which depend upon the democratic institutions, could not match the swiftness with which an arbitrary government could deport trouble makers.

When the police arrested east European strike leaders and demonstrators, Ukrainian participation met Anglo-Saxon trade union sympathy for foreigners. It fixed a key meaning for the general strike. The government withdrew the immigrants basic civil rights to crush class protest. The Anglo-Saxon trade union movement rallied to their support and charged, "it is not the foreigners who are on trial these days. British justice is on trial."[137] Indeed, cried the *Western Labour News'* editorialist, "the Englishman for the first time felt ashamed of himself and his country."[138] For the labour movement British democracy and civil rights had to apply to all workers. That Anglo-Saxon trade unionists would stand up for foreigners, for this reason, was, indeed, a powerful message.

VI

The Winnipeg strikers consciously interrelated the meaning of the Great War, British democracy, and working-class traditions. Indeed, the strikers demands for justice and fairness can not be separated from the experience of the Great War, its massive human sacrifice for democracy, and expectations for human freedom. All these vague yearnings for justice and fairness sketch the emotional intensity of the

strikers.

How can we know this? First, the class movements described, here, acquired their own analytic to explain the logic of social forces. This is the academic part of working class traditions. But class movements were also evangelical, in the sense that, they tried to convert people to their faith. So underneath the political and economic analytic, rhetoric, imagery and metaphor creep, creep into a man's emotions so he can feel, in a personal way, the rightness of an otherwise dry explanation of the human condition. And so, the language of the strikers mixed Great War metaphor with class analytic to brew potent human emotions.

The strike leaders explained the two principles, for which trade unions struck, in terms readily understandable to the Great War veteran. They associated the living wage, which describes the Standard of Life, with the standard of life in the trenches.

> Well the soldier damned the politicians while they tried to "carry on" with a Ross rifle, (a poorly manufactured rifle which symbolized for the soldier profiteering at home at the expense of soldiers lives) jamming rifles while men fall all around don't make contented soldiers. He cursed as he choked in trying to swallow his ironsides soldier's meats. He inwardly fumed to see his (dollar) 1.10 a day melt against the sudden 'rise in prices'. He ground his teeth while he read his wife's letters telling him how she tried so hard to make ends meet of her small and ever smaller 'allowance'. It did not take him long to think of the Hun in Canada.[139]

The message was clear. Politicians and profiteers exploited the soldiers' families when they pushed up the cost of living. They even endangered the soldiers' lives when they supplied shoddy weaponry so as to cut costs, and increase profits. Capitalism was not just exploitative social relationships or forces of production; it was Hunnish.

Collective bargaining was associated with the soldier's direct approach for protecting freedom. For the returned men the justification for the sympathetic strike, and the way to protect Labour's rights, made sense through the prism of their

war experience. Take the *Western Labour News'* 'Sapper Jones' who failed to see,

> if our going to France was in 'law and order' and was praise worthy why it was unconstitutional to hit straight from the shoulder again where we see nothing unjust or unreasonable in the demands of the strikers. Therefore, I say boys 'over the top' again if need be, for the emancipation of Labour.[140]

Here, the constitutional freedoms fought for in France, and Labour's right to collective bargain through representatives of the worker's own choice, are implicitly associated. Indeed, these were rights - a living wage and collective bargaining - for which Labour was ready to 'go over the top'. The soldiers were ready to emancipate Labour as they emancipated the French and Belgians from the Hun.

The meaning of the strike's purposes for soldiers and workers reach beyond any precise determinate expression. The strike was emotional. So this conflict vibrated through their war and class experience; working men could feel the injustice. Let us turn to poetry to bracket this emotional pulse. After all, it is often the task of a good poet, so it seems, to communicate the meaning of human experience through symbol, metaphor, and image, that otherwise expressed, might slip by us between the footnotes and data tables. Feel this poem from the *Western Labour News*.

The Profiteer drank blood like a leech
Down the wind and down the day
Truth that nevermore can die
O, that shameful tale to tell
Children's, children yet to be
Hollow heart and thirst of hell,
Kith and kin to treachery!
Ye who bought and ye who bled,
Ye who sleep where poppies blow.
In your grass curtained bed,
Tell me, did ye make to know
Know, that while the bugle, call
Found you your country's need
there were those who measured all
By their sovereignty of greed?
Know, that while among the slain
Anguish set your spirits free
There were those, whose lust of gain
Vanquished love of Liberty?
Know the double price you paid

See you reached the shining goal
That the caisiff undismayed.
Still might plant his crafty soul?
Father's toil through endless fears;
Mother's struggle faint and frail;
Children mingle joy with tears;
Must the bitterness prevail?
Give us strength to fight the fight;
Wit to meet the wily foe;
Faith that wrong must yield to right;
Hope through shadows looming low,
Tame, dark, hate and sullen mood,
Touch with grace our hasty speech;
Gird with manly hardihood,
Bind us brothers each to each
Guide where doubt would lead astray;
Lead where courage seems to wane;
Let us see through breaking day
Fair Humanity again.
By each throbbing heart now cold;
By each loved face pale in death
Hear us Thou who went of old
Carpenter of Nazareth.[141]

The metre, seven feet to the line, hard consonants marking time, beats quickly. They are soldiers, who sacrificed much for Liberty, yet suffer under the legacy of the profiteer. From righteous sacrifice, a common bond formed, from which these men might fight the wily foe. And, throughout the poem, the religious imagery of suffering and sacrifice beats to its last seven syllables - Car-pen-ter-of-Naz-a-reth.

Connect this poem to the religious symbolism, used by Ivens before 5,000 people, to explain the righteousness of the strike. "Jesus was a carpenter's son", he said, "not a lawyer, financier or iron master", all of whom were "the same class of men ... who had crucified Christ."[142] The religious metaphor seems to relate the suffering of workers to Christianity's profound symbol of the community's suffering, expressed in the crucifixion. Since this suffering is collective, and therefore social, it relates to the class movement's concern for social justice. Here military meets religious imagery; relentless sacrifice was necessary, and so was a personal commitment, from each individual, if labour would be able to stand against those who would crucify Labour. It, indeed, required the same courage with which the

veteran stood against the Hun, who would have crucified British democracy. Both were the same because both were about salvation. This is powerful stuff.

Through language, the Labour movement could associate the meaning of one context to another. Indeed, the Winnipeg strike propagandists almost created a new analytical method to explain social phenomenon. Below, this editorialist, for the *Western Labour News*, explained the reasons for fighting the strike by associating them with the meaning of the Great War. His word choice related two contexts, which have nothing in common, by ascribing to each a similar meaning.

> *Germanism* was the menace that would crush the world, therefore self-protection called for Canada to enter the war in the capacity of a *sympathetic* supporter. No one doubts that it was justifiable .... The method of the employer yesterday and today was that of *autocracy*. It is my business, the worker has nothing to do with it. I refuse to let him organize but I shall organize to my heart's content. I will not negotiate wage scales with him. It's my business. I'll pay just what I like so long as I can get the men. Everlastingly it is the "I" never the "we" so naturally the workers have united and the fight is on. The sympathetic strike is necessary today .... (T)he sympathetic strike will spread and spread until the principles are gained and victory won.[143]

The *autocracy* of the Boss, the open shop and the market system for buying labour, were no different than the Kaiser's oppression through his nation-state. *Sympathy*, here, means workers must unify to secure democracy and freedom, at the job site, just as nations must band together against Germanism, and its autocratic monarch. Now these Labour leaders knew well that, prior the the out break of the war, Germany had a constitutional monarchy within which one of the world's most powerful, and democratic, social democratic movements existed. This analysis had nothing to do with reasons for going to war; rather, it was about explaining to soldiers the reasons for the strike. So the underlying message was that the strike was about democracy and freedom against autocracy and slavery; against an ideology called *Germanism*.

The emotional impact of the strike on strikers, especially after their leaders

were arrested, indeed, does not make sense without an understanding of Labour's wartime experience. It seems clear that labour's concern for civil rights and democracy, trade union rights and political freedom, all converged once the strike leaders were arrested. Below we quote extensively from the *Western Labour News*.

> The strikers will add a fourth demand - The Freeing of Political Prisoners. The men in Stoney mountain penitentiary are not there primarily for their personal utterances or acts. They are there because they have voiced the DEMANDS OF THE WORKERS, needs and aspirations of the workers and have endevoured to organize the growing sentiment of revolt. Yet - REVOLT - revolt against a privileged group that has managed to gain control, not only over the financial and industrial systems of Canada, but also over the machinery or government. The common people must regain the right to control the affairs of the country.
>
> Under wartime legislation and perhaps in part by the exigencies of war, the government has suppressed freedom of the press, freedom of speech, freedom of assembly and association and adopted convenient but dangerous expedient which has become known as Government by Orders-in-Council. It would seem that this wartime government has become accustomed to arbitrary action and is attempting to carry it over into peace times.
>
> During the war, it was a crime to criticize the government - we are not quite sure whether or not that enactment has been repealed. Nor are we worrying very much about the matter. The time has come to criticize the government.
>
> Our comrades in Stoney Mountain have been guilty of this and hence have committed the unpardonable sin. They are charged, we are told, with conspiracy and sedition. It is a fine way to get rid of political opponents. But do the authorities imagine the workers will abandon these men to their fate. We think we interpret aright the sentiment of workers when we say that there will be no strike settlement till our comrades are free.[144]

The government withdrew fundamental civil and constitutional rights through orders-in-council. It made a criminal offense of the right to criticize government, organize and associate in certain trade unions and political parties. When the strike leaders were arrested they became political prisoners, just like those persecuted during the war, for defending Labour's rights. Indeed, the language of this emotional denunciation of government relates the strike directly to Labour's wartime grievances since, "a fourth demand" to settle the strike included the "freeing of political prisoners."

How do we know this rhetoric reflects real concern for democracy, civil rights,

and economic justice, and indeed, is not just substanceless rhetorical froth? Because their behaviour expressed their beliefs. Throughout the six weeks, strikers met in city parks, street corners, and "open spaces" by the tens, hundreds and thousands. They heard speakers discuss the events of the day; they discussed articles in the *Western Labour News* penned by 'Constitutionalist' and 'Democratus', 'Fairplay' and 'Homophilo'.[145] Indeed, the strike leaders found it difficult to provide enough speakers, so many were invited from other provinces, as was Bill Pritchard from British Columbia.[146] Several huge meetings were held at Victoria park, which strikers renamed Liberty park.[147] Later, some 8,000 people heard Pritchard relate the Magna Carta, which "meant liberty and justice", to the great unfulfilled promises of British tradition to working class people.[148] The conspiracy of the unelected, unidentified members of the Citizens' Committee, was compared to the democracy of workers who "stood for open discussion and decision by ballot."[149] The strikers then marched with their demands. Parades regularly occurred, especially those sponsored by veterans, who sported signs such as 'Britons shall never be slaves', and 'Down With the Profiteers', 'We Stand For 35,000 against 1000', and 'We Fought the Hun Over There - We Fight The Hun Everywhere'.[150]

The striker's behaviour expressed key political concepts in a working class way. The right to associate and express an opinion, freely, occurred on street corners, in parks, during parades. The signs sported in parades, the content of speeches, and indeed the purpose of the strike itself, all expressed British democracy, trade union demands, and war grievances. They were all the substance of working class traditions which embodied aspirations for democracy and economic justice.

Foremost, it was the discipline of the strikers that marked the substance of the strike rhetoric. Thousands met, mobilized, and marched without violence to person

or property; this sort of discipline is no mean feat for large groups of human beings. "Perhaps the most startling feature of the strike", wrote Bercuson "was that this policy - orderliness - was rigidly adhered to throughout the entire six weeks of the strike; not a single instance of violence was initiated by the strikers."[151] This is significant given the nature of the situation. Winnipeg society broke down in a fashion never before experienced. Without the clear functioning of public institutions and structures, tradition was all that was left to hold society together. If it did not, Canadian army battalions would kill people. So the extreme orderliness meant that the strikers understood the purpose of their actions, and followed well marked and shared rules. There was no violence and no chaos, because, workers had tradition to fall back on, a tradition which allowed them to act as responsible citizens, despite unfamiliar situations.

If there ever was a threat of revolution - the change of government through brute force - it was from returned soldiers. The veterans, however, who supported the strike, expressed the orderliness and democratic nature of the strikers. Certainly, the soldiers felt they deserved fair treatment on the job by virtue of their service and sacrifice for the cause of democracy. As it became clear government would not support the strikers demands, the veterans formed their own soldier parliaments, elected their own representatives and prepared to petition Parliament.[152] On May 31, 10,000 people, led by veterans, then marched on Parliament to present their demands to the provincial government. They wanted the strikers' demands defined in legislation to force employers to recognize trade unions. "The legislative chamber was packed and thousands stood outside."[153] It was hot inside. The veterans were aggressive and confident, and the Premier was clearly intimidated. But what happened? The Premier said, no, then told the veterans to protest at city hall. The soldiers just went away. The soldiers organized themselves upon the democratic principles and traditions for which they fought,

then presented their grievances to Parliament in an orderly, if unusual, way.

The strike leadership successfully co-opted many veterans to their cause. They made their aspirations intelligible by associating the democratic purposes of the strike with the Great War. The behaviour of the trade unions marked their authentic concern for democracy. They meticulously followed their own democratic formalism. They *voted* to support the strike, then imposed upon themselves a civic orderliness. This starkly contrasted with the Citizens' Committee's behaviour. It was not elected. It contributed to the upset of the city's civic order when the unionized police force of 240 officers was fired and then replaced by some 2,000 special policemen.[154] Incidents of violence rose, and indeed, the strike leadership argued some special policemen were the authors of crime.[155] So for many veterans, it was clear which side stood for British democratic traditions. Labour defined its rights to a living wage and collective bargaining within the scope of British democratic tradition, then behaved according to those traditions when they struck. Thus, a simple association between the meaning of the Great War, and the meaning of the strike, was possible.

VII

How did government define and respond to the issues raised by the general strike? In the June 2 House of Commons debate on the strike, the Prime minister defined its political import. Perhaps it was the context of the debate itself that allowed the issues to become clear to the Prime minister, especially given the extreme views of the Liberal leader of the opposition, D.D. Mackenzie, who clearly did not grasp the nature of the situation. Mackenzie proposed a court be created to

control the right to strike which would, of course, return labour relations to bad old days when strikes were a criminal offense.[156] This suggestion was just plain silly. The right to strike, for "the labouring men of Canada," Borden responded, (was) "a right which they prize as the Magna Carta of their liberties ...."[157], and, "any such proposal would not only be impracticable but dangerous."[158] And, he recognized the disastrous political consequences if Parliament could not grasp the trade unionists' most basic aspirations embodied in the strike.

> It would become one of the greatest mistakes that this Parliament could make to drive into what one might call the extreme wing of the labour party in Canada men who have as a whole been fair and reasonable in their attitude to the question (of the right to strike).[159]

The prime minister jumbled together three issues: collective bargaining, the nature of strikes, and their political import. The federal government never addressed the first issue through *legislation* which related collective bargaining to trade union recognition. Indeed, no legal mechanism, which formalized trade union certification, existed until the second world war. The government construed trade union recognition to be a private matter, and this, as we shall see, is significant to the definition of class politics. The government was concerned about strikes, especially those which challenged political authority. So, in a sense, it was government which struck a political meaning to the general strike. The government attempted to define what was, and was not, political about industrial relations.

Meighen knew the meaning of collective bargaining was ajar. "The conception of collective bargaining defined by the employer was too narrow since it assumed a contract between the employer and each individual worker was rightful." At the opposite extreme the definition espoused by the Metal Trades Council, "was so wide as to be impracticable and dangerous to the cause of Labour itself."[160] And this is how Meighen reasoned the wrongfulness of Labour's tactical advances against the

Contract Shops.

> Now what I am arguing is that the sympathetic strike almost necessarily involves the violation of contracts. A union itself is based upon the principle of collective bargaining. A union can not effect its purpose unless it can bargain as a union and make its engagement with an employer or combination of employers. In a word, one of the principal functions of a union is to make an engagement on behalf of its constituents with the employer concerned. If having made any such engagement it is to be free to break it by reason of the quarrels of others, then of what value is the engagement?[161]

Meighen implicitly makes clear assumptions about the nature of labour combinations that suit a liberal view of social relations. He assumes workers are like economic man, a rational actor, situated in a society based upon contractual relations, within which, he can maximize opportunities for himself, rather than a view that trade unionism is a "way of life". Thus, the chief public virtue is to honour one's contracts, not trade union solidarity. Collective bargaining is a *private* contract, and so, more sanctified than the general principles of trade unionism.

This was the meaning Meighen imposed upon collective bargaining. And a definition of this sort did exist within the Labour movement. So with senator Robertson, and some craft union leaders, Meighen imposed a particular business union definition of collective bargaining upon Contract Shop employers. This ascribed a meaning to collective bargaining, within the scope of private affairs between individuals, somewhere outside the proper political discourse about the community's common good. "Collective bargaining is sound," said Meighen, "but a unit must be found towards which the principle of collective bargaining is to apply and beyond which it must not go."[162] He disengaged collective bargaining from political aspirations.

Beyond which it must not go. Where exactly was that?

> I say it is proved by the example of Winnipeg and indeed follows from the very logic of the situation, that a general strike to succeed, or, indeed, to continue, must result in the usurpation of governmental authority on the part of those controlling the strike.[163]

Experience defined what sort of strike was political. Regardless of original intentions, a sympathetic general strike is revolutionary since public order becomes controlled by trade unions.

It is no accident that the politician sent to break the strike, Meighen, was the Minister of Justice, the definer of crime. The general strike threatened the political order, but the aspirations of trade unionists were legitimate. So some compromise position offered to the trade union movement was necessary, yet the strike had to be broken.

The answer lay in the Citizens' Committee's definition of the strike's causes, as a radical led, alien supported, revolution. First, under Meighen's auspices, the Immigration act was amended to allow the deportation of unnaturalized immigrants who participated in illegal associations. Then second, after the the strike, the illegality of a sympathetic general strike was clarified. The criminal code was amended to define unlawful associations, "as those whose purpose was to bring about any government, industrial, or economic change in Canada through force or violence."[164] Moreover, the officers of such an organization, and those in possession of its literature, were liable to prison terms of up to 20 years.[165]

The full force of political institutions could now be used to break the strike and still provide Labour with an option. When, remember, the government's negotiators, along with individual craft unions, presented the MTC with its offer of collective bargaining agreements, at almost the same moment, the police arrested radical strike leaders and east European immigrants. These arrests clearly marked the sort of class practices and politics acceptable to the government. Not one leader arrested was involved in the craft union movement, or was solely a trade union official. Yet SPC leaders and OBU organizers, Russell and Queen, and SDP leader A.A. Heaps, all radical politicians and trade union activists, were arrested.

Four east Europeans, all involved in socialist politics - Charitinoff, Almazoff, Blumenberg, and Schoppelrie - were also gaoled.[166] The message was clear. Radical class politics and trade unionism was not only illegal and unacceptable, they were un-Canadian.

In the aftermath of the strike, the provincial government created a Royal Commission to inquire into the strike's causes. Its commissioner, Robson, tried to explain to middle class Canadians why, "the great mass of workers intelligent and loyal to British institutions ... acquiesced in all that was said and done."[167] "The Strike," concluded Robson, "was purely the work of pronounced socialist agitators (whose) chief following was the Russian and Austrian ...."[168] The radical leaders burrowed their way into labour councils, fanned legitimate trade union concerns into a radical sort of combustion through an hysterical press, and consequently duped loyal, intelligent British trade unionists. Most of all, however, Robson concluded Labour's economic grievances were justified, yet it was impersonal market forces, beyond anyone's control, that caused economic problems. So labour's concerns were legitimate, but the industrial-unintentionally-political solution was not.

Now these claims, save the economic arguments, were not supported by any substantial empirical evidence. They accord nicely, if unintentionally, with the unsupported explanations of the strike espoused by the Citizen's Committee. So it was not necessary to prove the radical and alien connection since one prejudice confirmed another. What this explanation did do, however, was attempt to fix a meaning to the strike. The report defines as legitimate a certain sort of trade unionism divorced from radical politics and radical aliens. In a word, the Royal Commission fixed a meaning to the strike through causal explanation. The *real* causes were economic and the radical fanning of discontent epiphenomenal. So, what this report really meant to say is that trade unionism, and its economic

concerns, were legitimate, but its political expression in class politics, and especially class conflict; was not.

So how ought one approach the "Labour problem" and provide labour an alternative to participate in the community? The gist of Robson's solution was this:

> It is from the highest public stand point, essential that those among the labouring classes who are subjects by birth should receive every recognition and encouragement and that they should be assured of opportunity equal and in fact greater than is enjoyed by those of other lands.[169]

Vague is it not? Given the context of the report's criticisms and recommendations, this must be read through liberal spectacles where the community must ensure individuals opportunities, without disrupting the realities of economic laws and practices, structures and institutions. This meant that, when distribution of wealth is unfair, and indeed verified by economic indices, so that proof clearly exists, meaning that, "capital does not provide enough to assure labour a contented existence", then, "the government might find it necessary to step in and let the state do these things at the expense of Capital."[170] And, when there is industrial conflict, the state ought to provide mechanisms, with some degree of impartiality, through which Labour and Capital may reconcile economic conflict about dividing the wealth both create. This Robson called a "Joint Council of Industry" which loosely accorded to the principles of the federal government's Industrial Disputes Investigation act.[171]

Robson's conclusions illustrate how the resolution of conflict becomes a technical problem for an impartial state, which, now, reconciles competing social interests. The object is "to advance the welfare of the state."[172] Politics becomes depoliticized. No where does this report suggest government ought to enhance the capacity of trade unions to organize. Why? Because they are class mechanisms for reconciling the distribution of wealth, quite apart from the state. To help trade unions organize is to engage in class politics, whereas to help the individual, is not.

To diffuse the political import of trade unions, the disengaged impartial state, not the class biased trade union, must ensure social opportunities and protect economic rights and privileges. So the purpose of traditional politics must be to disengage the political expression from movements with fundamental economic grievances.

This became the *projet* for the traditional political parties, especially the Liberals. The Liberal party elected Mackenzie-King as its leader, a colourless ex-bureaucrat, political technician, and labour specialist. King warned Capitalists, in the pages of *Industry and Humanity*, there would be severe and violent confrontations with Labour, if they did not adopt a more conciliatory attitude. The general strike provided opportunity for such a man. "It is possible" wrote King only days after the June 21 riot, "that the labour unrest of the West may cause some of the Party to be disposed towards my leadership ...."[173] King's task would be to co-opt political movements based upon economic grievances, through the party system, where competing interests may be brokered.[174] Yet it was not with labour that this sort of political battle would occur. It was the Progressives who first argued, from a commanding position within Canadian political institutions, that Canadian politics and institutions reflected and furthered the self-interest of an elite class. King's task was to avoid politics based on class.

> To experiment with class in matters of government is to invite the unknown. The Liberal party ... offers a means to escape from both extremes, neither of which is in the national interest.[175]

The Liberal party hoped to disengage class from politics to broker the common good of the entire community. Perhaps it is here that Meighen's understanding of the meaning of collective bargaining, and King's understanding of class conflict, are the same. Both define economic interests as private matters which only tear the community apart if structured into the community's political life.

Once arrested, the strike leaders entered the judicial process. This would provide a forum through which the democratic traditions of trade unionists and socialists stood before the courts who indicted the strike leaders with seditious crimes against the Constitution. Here, the foundation upon which Winnipeg Labour justified the sympathetic strike became accented since the Judiciary - a body by nature concerned with law - put Labour's interpretation of its Constitutional rights into question. So, one underlying element of the strike - democracy and civil rights - stepped squarely into the foreground apart from the strike's economic purposes.

Two minor strike leaders, Dixon and Pritchard, conducted their own defense and illustrated the strikes broadening significance. Dixon was charged with seditious libel for his role as editor of the strike bulletin. Pritchard was charged with sedition since he advocated OBU trade unionism and revolutionary socialism. With rigorous logical precision, Dixon based his defense upon civil rights, trade union rights and their constitutional significance. Since Pritchard was only briefly involved in the strike, and only as a public speaker, he believed his indictment was a general attack on trade unionism and socialism. He broadly defined working class movements and related them to British constitutional traditions. So the manner in which democracy and civil rights related to working class social practices and institutions was put into question. And, indeed, this judicial process had much political import. The trial, and hence the issues, remained in the public space for almost one year, so Winnipeg workers had much time to reflect on the trial, and consequently, the strike's significance.

Dixon related his own right to express a political opinion, the legality of the strike, and the meaning of collective bargaining to the British subject's civil rights.

It was a simple, powerful defense. Dixon rebutted the Crown's argument that his remarks at the Walker theatre meeting, and in the *Western Labour News*, after the June 17 arrests, represented seditious libel. Dixon simply stated, "we hold in British countries that we are free to criticize the government."[176] Furthermore, constitutional democracy meant the freedom to express an idea for public debate and argument, "so long as we advance our ideas by constitutional means ... without resorting to force."[177]

Force. This was the key to the Crown's argument that the general strike was seditious. So Dixon, too, was guilty, not of expressing a political opinion, but, of *seditious libel*. Here, Dixon used common sense, not legal reasoning, to assert the strikes legality. If the strike itself was illegal why were not the trade union leaders, indeed those who initiated the strike, such as Winning and McBride, in the prisoner's dock. Why was not the OBU banned as an illegal association? Where was the legislation prohibiting sympathetic strikes?[178]

Against the Crown's empty arguments, Dixon struck back with the worker's right to freely associate in organizations of the their own choice, craft and industrial unions, trade union federations and councils.[179] Dixon subtley related the right of workers to organize and the right to express a political opinion. "Workers" he argued, "must be given an intelligent interest in industry and share in the profits."[180] Though this statement appears innocuous enough it has political import. Why? Because it was easily relatable to the political question raised by the Labour party who presented an alternative vision of social, economic, and political relationships. Collective bargaining could be one means to assert Labour's raised expectations for control over industrial life.

Pritchard directed a daring defense. He did not submit one piece of evidence; instead he re-interpreted the Crown's evidence. This had two purposes: to make

clear two social movements, trade unionism and socialism, and the intimacy with which they embraced constitutional tradition; and illustrate the Crown's ignorance of the meaning of trade unionism and socialism which they drew from Marxist literature.[181] And, indeed, the Crown interpreted the meaning of Marxist literature in a literal sense, much like the fundamentalist Christian did the Old Testament: the dictator of the proletariat and the bloody revolution, Nebuchadnezzar and the sacking of Jerusalem. Pritchard would show the court that trade unionism and socialism could not be abstracted from national traditions. So Pritchard related his own defense, trade unionism and socialism, to British constitutional traditions. Democracy. Civil rights.

Through out his defense, Pritchard illustrated the way in which trade unions and socialist parties, in themselves, expressed the British constitution. Workers freely associated in trade unions where workers debated economic and political issues. Through political parties, socialists presented their ideas to the electorate where ballots, in a political process, decided conflict. Indeed, within trade unions and socialist parties, political and industrial issues were debated critically, where, "if fact was opposed to fact ... truth will come to light out of that most pitiless of contests, the contest of opinion."[182] So trade unionists and socialists expressed the Constitution in their social practices and institutions. They freely associated, expressed political opinions, criticized those opinions and arbitrated political conflict democratically.

Not only did trade unionists and socialists order their own affairs according to British democratic traditions, they realized their class institutions and class evangelism could not exist outside a community without democratic institutions, free speech and free association.[183] Indeed trade unionists were forced to enter politics to protect these rights; to protect exactly this sort of society, as a minimum course

of action.[184] Thus, trade unions and socialists had a responsibility to protect democracy. And Prichard then began to argue "the war has proven that the modern form of popular government does not fulfill the office for which it was created."[185] He reasoned that political decision-making fell from the democratic process, and the party system, into the hands of a few experts and political bosses which made government "every whit as autocratic as government by the German emperor."[186] He cited many incidents where the government restricted civil rights through orders-in-council. His meaning was clear; the government used undemocratic means to abuse Constitutional rights. So Pritchard, and his socialist movement, hoped to preserve the spirit of democracy, through a change in institutions, in a process of peaceful evolution: not violent revolution.

Pritchard believed the trade union and socialist movements would preserve, not usurp the Constitution. This is why Pritchard felt forced to defend his role during the strike in this way. "I am placed in the position," he said, "to defend the history of two movements ... I have to explain to the Court the History of The Trade Union Movement and the Socialist Movement."[187] He had to explain his rights, his movement, his interpretation of the British Constitution, to a Court which could not fathom British rights in quite that working class way.

Dixon and Pritchard represented the extremes of Labour's political differences. These differences were significant. Nevertheless, the common-ground between them was very powerful since both shared a faith in the British constitution, its democratic traditions, and its enshrinement of civil rights. It was this constitution that made possible the expression of their political worldviews. And this became the issue during the trials: the strike leaders acted well within the bounds of the Constitution when they initiated a general strike or expressed any political opinion. Indeed, all workers could unite at this fundamental level. Their

leaders regardless of political differences, went to jail for their beliefs, not for any crime, and were about to be persecuted by those very individuals and institutions, judges and judiciary, which claimed to uphold and represent the Constitution. Both Dixon and Prichard would claim the Constitution was on trial not them. As far as Labour was concerned, the men on trial were innocent. So the situation appeared as such: the men on trial sacrificed their liberty so that the working class could be united, then politically resurrected, and thus judge the judges. Indeed, when another strike leader, Bob Russell, was convicted of sedition a man in the courtroom exploded, "Jesus Christ was a martyr and so is Bob Russell."[188]

IX

The nature of the general strike changed the day after the strike leaders were arrested. As far as labour was concerned the Constitution, as it applied to working men, was in jeopardy.

> ... to lay violent hands upon apparently peaceable and well conducted citizens is a different thing altogether. That touches the personal liberty of the subject. Here then is where the strike touches every citizen. An invasion of personal liberty and freedom of speech will lead sooner or later either to the establishment of tyranny or to the counter irritant of rebellion.[189]

The federal government used all its resources, military and police, legislation and judiciary, to crush the trade unions, whose leaders believed their actions were constitutionally held rights. Once the industrial battle was lost, labour cocked its political arm to strike back. "They have asked for the Constitution. The Constitution they shall have!"[190]

Labour fell back upon two British working class traditions. First, the labour leadership appealed to class solidarity in order to support a question of

Constitutional rights, something which crossed ideological differences. Second, labour changed from industrial to political means to defend itself. Since class movements were a totality of interrelated economic and political social practices and institutions, Labour knew what to do as this situation at Winnipeg changed. Despite this cry for unity, the strike leaders still had to account for the strike's failure. So the trade union movement, and its political leadership, became deeply divided concerning the renewed direction their class movement ought to engage.

Labour leaders turned quickly to politics. Through education and propaganda the labour leadership diffused arguments for political action quickly and clearly. So, for the next year, the *Western Labour News* explained the relationship between industrial and political action, trade unions and political parties. Industrial unions and political parties must help each other argued the *News*. Political parties must acquire political power to distribute social wealth; industrial unions must both protect workers, and educate them about working class theories of society, economics, and politics.[191] Here, continued the *Western Labour News*, trade unions and labour political parties were the "two blades of a pair of scissors" which enabled trade unionists to "protect themselves as citizens (and) to promote the happiness and welfare of their families."[192] While the *Western Labour News* described class politics, leaders such as J.S. Woodsworth, W.D. Bayley, and others, formed committees which toured Manitoban communities to spread this notion of a class movement.[193] So once industrial conflict failed, labour brought class conflict to the political process in a more determined fashion, just as they always had in the past.

The civic elections which followed the strike marked, again, class conflict and solidarity in Winnipeg. The issues concerned the general strike. For the WTLC the election issues were clear cut;

> The question is not of men but of policy, and the council stands pledged to support the restoration of what labour has regarded as its inalienable right *viz.*

free association and affiliation.[194]

Around this issue Winnipeg Labour and socialists were solidly united. So the city's international unions, and the heretic, OBU, combined to support the labour slate of candidates. This selection of candidates and the presentation of a political platform were jointly supported by the ILP, SPC, and SDP thus illustrating the political unity around such a basic issue.[195] S.J. Farmer, single taxer and anti-conscriptionist, contested the mayoralty as the ILP nominee with Dixon as campaign manager.[196] Labour's traditional platform, which endorsed public ownership of public utilities, tax reform, and so on, was enriched with a political solution to some of the strikes consequences. A labour civic government promised to reinstate public employees fired during the strike and return their right to organize.[197] The local labour movement was politically unified behind issues fundamental to their existence as a movement.

The results were close. Farmer lost, but by only 3,000 votes. Seven Labour city councillors were elected, and consequently, Labour evenly divided the 14 possible seats between themselves and the Citizens' Committee candidates.[198] Class divided city council and politics. This class solidarity seems to have crossed ethnic divisions as well. The Anglo-Saxon Labour candidates in the North End wards severely beat their east European opponents.[199] So the foreign vote clearly chose Labour to represent them. This civic election, then, marked class solidarity and consciousness.

The provincial general election of 1920 was clearly about the strike. Manitoba's Labour and socialist parties again created a coalition to refight the strike.[200] In the Winnipeg constituencies, the jailed strike leaders were resurrected to challenge the government's condemnation of innocent Labour, and indeed, won 42.5 percent of the vote and returned three of the jailed candidates - Armstrong,

Queen, and Ivens.[201] Russell lost to Tupper, but only after 37 recounts.[202] Outside Winnipeg every Labour candidate won.[203] For Labour, eleven elected MLA's vindicated the strike's legitimacy through the democratic process, a higher form of judgment than the courts. Since the Norris administration was defeated, despite having the country's best record for industrial legislation,[204] the election's message was clear:

> Any government which attempts to throttle free men in Canada or elsewhere will fall of its own weight and be fortunate if it does not bring crashing in ruin the structure with which clumsy hands it seeks to buttress.[205]

This political unity did not last after the 1920 general election. The primary source of unity was perhaps best expressed by this OBU machinist:

> The fact of being in different organizations (does not) in any way relieve us of our obligations to the brothers now in the clutches of the law .... we are united and undividable in demanding justice for labour and fair and impartial treatment for our leaders.[206]

But once the strike leaders were tried, jailed and elected to the legislature, labour's unity fell apart. Indeed, labour's unity was strained since the very first month after the strike's collapse. The trade union movement became sharply divided, which, consequently, split Labour's political arm.

The OBU and the international unions fought to control the city's trade union movement. The OBU's strategy was simple; it hoped to swallow the WTLC, and its affiliated trade unions, whole, from within, through trade union democratic processes.[207] The acid test for an OBU coup would occur in the struggle for the WTLC. R.A. Rigg, Social Democrat and socialist ex-MLA, led the international union defense of the WTLC. An uproarious WTLC constitutional debate, on July 29, which petitioned the WTLC to give its charter and property to the OBU, succeeded. The next day Rigg declared the previous meeting illegal, and indeed its conduct did not exactly follow WTLC procedures; he seized the charter, expelled

the OBU, and ordered the banks not to honour the transactions signed by Ivens and Veitch.[208] Similar situations occurred in many individual international unions, where, in most cases, the charters were successfully defended.[209] The OBU failed. It is important to note, here, that those leaders who defended the international unions were neither dogmatic business unionists, nor pawns of the national TLC office. Many were socialists like Rigg. So the trade union movement was seriously divided.

The consequence was dual unionism. This meant OBU and international union organizers competed for members and collective bargaining contracts. Again, and again, employers and government sided with the International unions. To the employers, it did not matter which trade union acquired the most members; they honoured agreements and mediated shop floor conflict with the international unions.[210] The premier, T.C. Norris, also shut out the OBU from representation on Labour tribunals such as the newly created Joint Council of Industry.[211] Both the employers and government could not reconcile their differences with the OBU's trade union philosophy. After all, they had defeated one big union and its sympathetic strike just months before. Indeed, the OBU itself had great difficulty explaining at what point a routine disagreement with employers would escalate into a sympathetic strike. Even so, the OBU could not force employers to recognize it as the worker's bargaining agent since any threat of strikes, let alone sympathetic strikes, was empty. Despite these weaknesses, the OBU continued to gain steadily, so that, by January 1920, it claimed 9,000 members, three-fourths of Winnipeg's trade union movement.[212]

Soon, the war within the trade union movement split the Dominion Labour Party caucus in the provincial legislature. The principle upon which the DLP's unity rested was socialism, so the party's ultimate purpose was "the transformation of

capitalist property into social property with production for use instead of profit."[213] The radical socialist element within the DLP and the OBU feared that the affiliation of international unions would undermine the party's socialist commitment. Indeed, the OBU expressed its determination to smash the Labour party, if it caved into craftunion demands, and therefore, did "not run true to *the* class struggle."[214] But as far as the moderates were concerned, the DLP became more concerned with "propaganda" than "beneficial legislation."[215] The trade unions wanted a trade union party. Consequently, the Parliamentary caucus split between the DLP, which allowed any trade union to affiliate, and the ILP, which supported the industrial unionists in the OBU.[216] Although the party's ultimate purpose, socialism, unified the original DLP members, they could not agree upon the sort of class movement, based upon a political party/trade union movement alliance, necessary to achieve that purpose.

When the Labour MLA's contributed to the minority government's resignation in 1922 the Labour party and trade unions split. The government fell just before supply measures were voted upon and favourable labour legislation could be proclaimed. The WTLC was furious. It criticized the Labour MLA's for basing their political judgment upon ideological differences at the expense of practical legislative gains. Therefore, the WTLC held a nominating convention to elect candidates who would support, in the next election, legislative programs arranged by committees which were responsible to the trade unions. The trade unions wanted to provide the electorate with a strictly trade union political alternative. In the election that followed, they lost. The ILP, however, maintained its Winnipeg seats. The economic and political wings of the Labour movement became estranged.

After the strike's collapse Labour judged the constitutionality of the government's behaviour through the electoral process. Labour stood squarely

behind the arrested strike leaders. From this defense of democracy and civil rights the Labour movement fashioned a temporary political unity. Then it dissipated. Since mass sympathetic strikes proved disastrous, Labour had to reformulate its thinking and decide what to do next. Its political and industrial unity collapsed as the different solutions surfaced.

X

The fragments of the strike, and the general themes which underscore them, spun webs of significance within which Winnipeg strikers chose a course of action. The meaning of collective bargaining and a living wage during the general strike touched working class historical traditions and the meaning of the Great War for workers. So the full force of working class aspirations for democracy and economic justice fell upon the strikers' demands for trade union rights. The process of choice, through which trade unions chose the institution and tactic, industrial union and general strike, to win collective bargaining rights, expressed the totality of the community's class movement. Indeed, their human action - its success and failure - defined their consciousness of class and nature of their class movement, albeit, in the end, divided.

The strike was not about employers recognizing this or that method of collective bargaining; it was about a right for workers to *choose* their own collective bargaining mechanisms and forms of trade unions. The issue, structured as such, connected collective bargaining and a living wage to working class aspirations marked by historical tradition and expressed through working class democratic processes. At one level, collective bargaining became a powerful source of unity for

working people since it represented vague impulses for democracy and economic justice. These impulses were more powerful than the second level of class unity within which specific class institutions, trade unions and political parties, tried to fix a more determinate, universal meaning to a class movement.

The living wage meant quality of life. It was a social concept which related economic security to human happiness, both physical and spiritual. Queerly enough, it also defined the community's suffering since it provided a standard against which actual living conditions were measured. The living wage marked for Englishmen and Ukrainians alike, some social responsibility, some minimum claim to exist in society, some claim upon the political order which dates as far back as the Middle Ages. Since wages are a social thing, both Ukrainian and English Canadian immigrants, in their separated communities, shared similar standards of life, similar suffering. Workers remember, do not negotiate different wages with their employer; they receive the same wage, and so, share similar experiences trying to balance life-budgets. Workers knew they were deprived. The war brought great wealth which a prosperous Winnipeg middle and upper class acquired, a wealth workers could see. This dissatisfaction with the division of wealth was expressed with symbols all working men could recognize such as Iven's association between Christ's suffering, the profiteer's sinful greed and the innocent worker/soldier's sacrifice for democracy, through industrial production and combat, during the war. The living wage, and the question of fairness it provoked, formed a powerful, blunt source of class unity.

Collective bargaining meant control over one's economic life. This social practice grew from within the traditions of the craftsman, dating from the Middle Ages, where skills were one's property and source of economic freedom. When industry alienated the craftsman from his property, in the 19th century, he combined

to protect his labour. Here, an Englishman's rights strung labourers together like beads since men of equal status had an equal right to determine collective decisions. And this mirrored the democratic elements of the English Constitution. So political traditions, and aspirations for economic justice, became fused in this social practice.

How does this relate to Ukrainian workers who do not have centuries old craft and trade union traditions? Since peasant communities had considerable experience with strikes against the lord, they acquired social practices of collective protest grounded in the fierce community solidarity of the *Sich*. Through radical political parties and social movements, peasants acquired notions democracy and economic freedom. Some radical parties helped peasants organize trade unions, and so, integrated them into class movements whose *projet* was economic and political emancipation. At Winnipeg, therefore. Ukrainian workers could recognize the fundamental purpose of collective bargaining: economic freedom for the community of workers.

Upon these blunt foundations three class worldviews tried to fix an increasingly precise meaning to one class movement. This was a complex process since these class movements were so divided by political ideology and trade union practices. This meant that class solidarity had to be fashioned at two levels. First, the fissiparous elements of the trade union movement, and socialist movement, sought to unify their separate differences. Second, both labour politicians and trade union leaders strove to join both movements into one class movement for political and economic freedom. Two Marxist parties and Christian socialists, together with sympathetic trade union leaders, directed a general strike for collective bargaining purposes. All agreed collective bargaining was a right through which the worker should secure his economic freedom: and this, in institutions of the worker's choice.

If successful, the workers' control over jobs and trade union institutions would suit the Marxists, Christian socialist and trade union movements' broader goals for political action. Indeed, the entire movement would change dramatically.

The radical alternative acquired its power from trade union democracy. Each trade union understood, debated, and chose this alternative. Indeed, the trade unions had access to the radical class perspective through some relationship with radical parties. Socialists and political activists were also trade union members and indeed trade union leaders. Through the city wide labour council, the trade union leadership was certainly acquainted with the broader expectations of a successful strike. It was indeed the focus of their discussion and voting. So the dialogical tradition, within working class movements, was consciously engaged since trade unionists and socialists debated alternatives, judged their merits, and democratically chose alternatives which would shape their movement's future.

Since so many facets of the Labour movement joined, this unity provided a clear either/or alternative to all workers to support a common cause. Only the conservative elements within the international unions did not find space within this unity. They feared for the existence of their craft union institutions. This made the situation appear to be a choice between radical and conservative alternatives; the moderates seemed drawn to the flame like moths. Any successful strike, however, need not have resulted in a radical, uncompromising socialist movement in Canada. Indeed, if they had succeeded, the trade union and socialist movements would have projected a real, tangible alternative to Canadian workers. For this unity to continue, it would have had to depend upon those working class democratic traditions, and the political skills of labour leaders to compromise amongst themselves, that which made the strike possible in the first place. They would have an option to define their movement through their own class democratic traditions

and challenge the traditional political parties' definition of Canadian politics.

Now the aspirations of Winnipeg strikers for collective bargaining and a living wage must be understood within the context of the Great War experience and the development of socialism as a world force. What relates these two contexts? Democracy and economic justice. Throughout the war the Labour movement severely criticized the government for abusing democratic and civil rights, and conscripting men before wealth. Meanwhile, the government argued the purpose of the war was to protect democratic societies from autocracy. Furthermore, claimed the government, the wartime pressures created a paradox in which unfortunate undemocratic decisions were necessary to protect democracy. Once the war was over, the strikers turned this wartime rhetoric against the government. They demanded their interpretation of democracy. These claims for social change acquired more force since a workers revolution occurred in Russia, and the British labour party projected socialism into their national agenda for political change. So, one consequence of the war, in very influential and powerful nations, was realistic working class alternatives for social change. Indeed, the reality of a democracy suited to working class needs seemed to be on the lip of history, just like the socialist prophecy foretold. And by comparison to world events, the claims of Winnipeg trade unionists for free choice of bargaining institutions, derived from trade union democratic processes, seemed more than reasonable.

The Ukrainians could relate to the purposes of the general strike, sentiments of being persecuted during the war, and the messianic working class visions inspired by larger world events. Even though east Europeans, in general, did not lead the trade union or socialist movements in Winnipeg, some were part of it. Through socialist parties, such as the SPC and SDP, and sometimes through the trade unions, ethnic communities were linked to the Anglo-Saxon Labour movement.

The Great War, for many Ukrainian immigrants, put into question their expectations for a promised land of democracy and freedom in British North America. Their personal experience told them Canadian democracy had a strong autocratic spine similar to Old Country governments. The Russian revolution had a dramatic impact upon the Ukrainian community since a socialist movement had toppled an autocratic government which had symbolized Ukrainian enslavement. These sentiments fused Ukrainian community solidarity behind the strike's purposes since trade unionists and socialists associated their movement with broader causes.

Once the Winnipeg workers demonstrated their choice, the federal government, in conjunction with the employers, Citizen's Committee of 1000, and the craft unions, crushed the strike. They imposed a choice upon the Labour movement. Labour did not have the right to impose general trade union principles through general strikes upon the community. Why? Because they broke the sanctity of private contracts and challenged the government's control of public order, both of which were higher principles than trade union solidarity. So strikes must concern narrowly defined trade union issues. Trade union certification and collective bargaining agreements must remain private contractual matters to be solved between employees and employers. So, indeed, the trade union's coming-into-existence still depended upon whether or not the employer was beaten in a strike, rather than a democratic process by which employees freely chose trade unions to represent their interests. This meant that brute power, not democracy, decided social conflict. But most of all, it was thought, the community's economic discord must not become fused with social movements which might bring such a conflict into the nation's political institutions. The political and industrial wings of the class movement were severed.

Soon after the strikers were beaten, Labour's unity collapsed. What did the

strikers learn from their experience during the general strike? Any general strike whose purpose was any combination of social, economic or political changes would fail disastrously. Since this strategy failed Trade unionists and socialist had to decide what to do next.

Labour became bitterly divided. The OBU and international unions fought desperately for the city's trade union membership, and so, further divided the trade union movement into industrial and craft union factions. This trade union division unravelled the political alliances between labour political parties for whom industrial and craft unionism had specific meaning for the potentiality of any unified class movement. The Labourites ceased to trust the radical's industrial union *projet* which contained, genetically, a potential means to directly challenge Canadian social, economic, and political institutions. Why? The consequence was broken trade unions. Trade unions had two better alternatives in their view: first, they could pressure government to legislate favourable laws, and second, affiliate to one sympathetic labour party with moderate views. Amongst radicals, their experience only confirmed their prejudice toward capitalism and its inability to reconcile its logic with democracy. So the radicals redoubled their efforts to co-opt the trade union movement into a class movement whose purpose was some transition to socialism. Despite these increasingly bitter divisions, the Labour movement still solidly supported the civil rights of their arrested strike leaders and reaffirmed the democratic impulses of their movement. This fundamental unity was enough to sustain political unity until the provincial election in mid-summer 1920. This was the same fundamental source of unity which marked their collective bargaining *projet* of the summer before.

Though the strike failed it sharpened class consciousness. How? Let this extensive quotation below explain. The key theme is that education, both practical

and theoretical, mediated through human action, generates consciousness of class.

> "Well the strike has been worthwhile" said a street car conductor, "if only for the chance it gave us to hear lectures. I think I didn't miss a single day. It was worth the money we lost in wages."
>
> Only those who were in close touch with the strike realize the extent of all the educational work which was carried on. Each organization had its meeting - often daily. There were not enough halls. Reports were presented, policies discussed, weak-kneed members instructed and strengthened - what a drill in co-operative democratic action. Frequently special lectures were brought in to explain the principles of trades unionism and the lectures were afterwards discussed by groups which met on every street corner.
>
> The union meetings were supplemented by public meetings held daily in parks all over the city. The daily papers, apparently not grasping the significance of the situation could only say there seemed a mania for meetings. These meetings while intended primarily to maintain the morale of strikers soon became almost entirely educational in type. From the working class stand point it was an unparalleled opportunity for radical propaganda work. The workers had nothing to do but listen. There was a strange mass psychology characteristic of the old time revival meeting. Economic truths were driven home by illustrations drawn from the actual daily experiences of the strikers.
>
> Then in addition there was the daily Strike Bulletin - read from the beginning to end - every article in it. These articles re-inforced and put in convenient form for discussion and memory many of the teachings given from the platforms.
>
> "The strike has been worth ten years of ordinary working class education, "said one of our old leaders.
>
> Of course it has been expensive. Many have sacrificed much. Many are still without a job. There is a certain amount of "soreness". That is inevitable. But the worker has always had to pay for his education, and generally he is game.
>
> This six week course in economics and social theory has but served to whet the appetite. Already plans are being discussed looking to the establishment of a People's University. Why not?[217]

It is the action of class conflict, the practice of class protest, the formation of class institutions, that marked Winnipeg class consciousness. The fragments of the strikers' behaviour lay enmeshed within the immediate context of the Great War, and deep historical tradition, so that, they all created a complex fragmented whole. And here are the finely spun webs of significance, increasingly, and endlessly, intricate: a vote for the strike in one's trade union and a parade in the park; crusading veterans and Labour's criticisms of wartime government; aspirations for democracy and economic justice; and working class social movements expressed in trade unions and political parties; collective bargaining and a living wage.

FOOTNOTES: CHAPTER FOUR

[1]Norman Penner, **The Canadian Left: A Critical Analysis,** (Scarborough: Prentice-Hall, 1977), pp. 15-23.

[2]J.M. Brodie and J. Jenson, **Crisis, Challenge, & Change: Party and Class in Canada,** (Toronto: Metheun, 1980), ch. 1.

[3]Roger Graham, **Arthur Meighen,** vol. 2., (Toronto: Clarke, Irwin & Company, 1965), p. 237.

[4]Norman Penner ed., **Winnipeg 1919,** (Toronto: James Lewis and Samuel, 1973), p. 40.

[5]Ibid., pp. 31-40.

[6]J.S. Woodsworth, **My Neighbor,** (Toronto: University of Toronto press, 1972), p. 68.

[7]Ibid., p. 70.

[8]"A Plea for a Living Wage," **Western Labour News,** Special Strike Edition No. 32., June 23, 1919, p. 2.

[9]"Collective Bargaining," **Western Labour News,** Special Strike Edition No. 16., June 4, 1919, p. 3.

[10]"Manitoba Government Interviewed by Running Trades," **Western Labour News,** Special Strike Edition No. 6., May 23, 1919, p. 3.

[11]"Parliamentary Debate on Industrial Unrest in Canada," **Labour Gazette,** vol. xix (June 1919): 789.

[12]F.J. Dixon, **Dixon's Address to the Jury: An argument for Liberty of Opinion,** (Winnipeg: Wallingford press, 1920), p. 49.

[13] **Royal Commission to enquire into and report on the causes and effects of the General Strike which recently existed in the city of Winnipeg for a period of six weeks, including the methods of calling and carrying on such strike.** Report of H.A. Robson, K.C. Commissioner, 1919. (Henceforth cited as Robson Commission), p. 8.

[14]Penner, **Winnipeg,** p. 65.

[15]Ibid., p. 45.

[16]J.S. Woodsworth, **The King v. J.S. Woodsworth,** (Winnipeg: The Defense Committee, 1920), pp. 12-3.

[17]Ibid., p. 9.

[18]J.S. Woodsworth, **Reconstruction: From the Viewpoint of Labour**, (Winnipeg: Hecla press, 1919), pp. 3-4.

[19]Ibid., p. 3.

[20]Ibid., p. 14.

[21]Penner, **Winnipeg**, p. 148.

[22]Woodsworth, **Reconstruction**, pp. 4-5.

[23]Ibid., p. 4.

[24]William Pritchard, **W.A. Pritchard's Address to the Jury**, (Winnipeg: Wallingford press), p. 89.

[25]Ibid., p. 101.

[26]Ibid.

[27]Penner, **Winnipeg**, p. 28.

[28]Pritchard, **Address**, p. 72

[29]Ibid., p. 80.

[30]Ibid., p. 129.

[31]James Foy, "Gideon Robertson Conservative Minister of Labour 1917-21," (M.A. Thesis University of Ottawa, 1972), p. 98.

[32]Ibid., pp. 100-1.

[33]Iron Masters and International Officers of the Running Trades, "Definition of Collective Bargaining June 16 1919," **Peel Bibliography**, no. 2687.

[34]Penner, **Winnipeg**, p. 159.

[35]Bercuson, **Confrontation**, pp. 161-2.

[36]Foy, "Robertson," p. 100.

[37]Penner, **Canadian Left**, pp. 58-9.

[38]Woodsworth, **King v. Woodsworth**, pp. 11-12.

[39] Martin Robin, **Radical Politics and Canadian Labour 1880-1930**, (Kingston: Queens University press, 1968), p. 145.

[40]Penner, **Canadian Left**, p. 59.

[41]Ibid., pp. 55-6.

[42]A.R. McCormack, **Reformers, Rebels and Revolutionaries: The Western**

Canadian Radical Movement 1899-1919, (Toronto: University of Toronto press, 1977), pp. 155-6, quoting **British Columbia Federationist**, January 24, 1919.

[43]Penner, **Canadian Left**, p. 58.

[44]Ibid., p. 59.

[45]Ibid.

[46]Penner, **Winnipeg**, p. 42.

[47]Ibid., p. 41.

[48]Ibid., p. 43. The Defense Committee notes several thousand votes came in after this list was compiled which did not unbalance the overwhelming support for the strike illustrated above.

[49]Ibid.

[50]Robson Commission, p. 10.

[51]David Bercuson, **Confrontation at Winnipeg**, (Montréal: McGill-Queens University press, 1974), p. 116.

[52]Ibid.

[53]Penner, **Winnipeg**, p. 153.

[54]Ibid., p. 154.

[55]Pritichard, **Address**, p. 57.

[56]Ibid.

[57]Ibid., p. 57.

[58]Harold Logan, **Trade Unions in Canada: Their Development and Functioning**, (Toronto: MacMillan, 1948), p. 129.

[59]See David Kwavnick. **Organized Labour and Pressure Politics.** Montreal: McGill-Queens University press, 1972.

[60]See Irving Abella. **Nationalism, Communism and Canadian Labour: The C.I.O., the Communist Party and the Canadian Congress of Labour, 1934-1956.** Toronto: University of Toronto press, 1973.

[61]Edward McGrath, "Are We Progressing," **The Bulletin**, May 1914, p. 8.

[62]Logan, **Trade Unions**, p. 129.

[63]See Bryan Palmer, **Working Class Experience**, (Toronto: Butterworth, 1983), pp. 136-144.

[64] **Western Labour News**, Supplement, April 5, 1919, p. 1.

[65]"4,000 Workers Hear Cassidy Talk on the O.B.U.," **Western Labour News**, May 9, 1919, pp. 1,5.

[66]Eugene Forsey, **Trade Unions in Canada: 1812-1902**, (Toronto: University of Toronto press, 1982), p. 245.

[67]See Gregory Kealey and Bryan Palmer. **Dreaming of What Might Be: The Knights of Labour in Ontario, 1800-1900**. New York: Cambridge University press, 1982.

[68]Robin, **Radical**, p. 21.

[69]Ibid.

[70]"Our Letter Box," **Western Labour News**, January 2, 1920, p.4.

[71]See Palmer and Kealey, **Dreaming**.

[72]Bercuson, **Confrontation**, p. 54.

[73]Ibid., pp. 54-5.

[74]Ibid.

[75]Robin, **Radical**, p. 143, quoting **The Labour News**, April 5, 1918.

[76]McCormack, **Radicals**, p. 94.

[77]"The Persecution of Arthur Skidmore," **Western Labour News**, January 17, 1919, pp. 1,5.

[78]J.S. Woodsworth, "Open Letter from J.S. Woodsworth," **Western Labour News**, Special Strike Edition No, 23., June 12, 1919, p. 4.

[79]Homophilo, "Reflections on the Strike," **Western Labour News**, July 3, 1919, p. 2; Fairplay, "Lest We Forget," **Western Labour News**, July 3, 1919, p. 2, and Penner, **Winnipeg**, p. 158.

[80]Robin, **Radical**, p. 109.

[81]McCormack, **Reformers**, p. 81.

[82]See McCormack, **Reformers**; and Bernard Ostry, "Conservatives, Liberals and Labour in the 1880's," **Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science** 27 (May 1961): 141-161.

[83]McCormack, **Reformers**, p. 88.

[84]Ibid., p. 90.

[85]"Canadian Workers Learn a lesson," **Western Labour News**, April 23, 1920, p. 2.

[86]Ibid.

[87]Peter Melnycky, "A Political History of the Ukrainian Community in Manitoba 1899-1922," (M.A. Thesis, University of Manitoba, 1979), p. 203.

[88]Penner, **Winnipeg**, p. 46.

[89]Bercuson, **Confrontation**, p. 120.

[90]Penner, **Winnipeg**, p. 47.

[91]Bercuson, **Confrontation**, pp. 120-1.

[92]David Bercuson and Kenneth McNaught, **The Winnipeg General Strike 1919**, (Don Mills: Longman, 1974), p. 53.

[93]Penner, **Winnipeg**, p. 47.

[94]Bercuson and McNaught, **Winnipeg**, p. 54.

[95]"Food Committee and its Work," **Western Labour News**, Special Strike Edition No. 1 May 17, 1919, p. 2.

[96]Bercuson, **Confrontation**, p. 120.

[97]Morris Mott, "The Foreign Peril: Nativism in Winnipeg 1916-1923," (M.A. Thesis, University of Manitoba, 1970), p. 29.

[98]"The Rubicon," **Western Labour News**, May 31, 1919, p. 2.

[99]"4,000 Workers Hear Cassidy," pp. 1,5.

[100]Penner, **Winnipeg**, p. 40.

[101]David Blyth, "The Political Pot," **Western Labour News**, December 5, 1919, p. 3.

[102]Penner, **Winnipeg**, p. 53

[103]Ibid., p. 94.

[104]Ibid., pp. 113-4.

[105]Donald Avery, **Dangerous Foreigners: European immigrant workers and labour radicalism in Canada 1896-1933**, (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1979), p. 84.

[106]Melnycky, "Ukrainian Community," p. 222.

[107]Avery, **Dangerous**, p. 84.

[108]Ibid., p. 85.

[109]Melnycky, "Ukrainian Community," p. 232.

[110]Ibid., pp. 202-3.

[111]Ibid.

[112]Donald Avery, "The Radical Alien and the Winnipeg General Strike of 1919," in Carl Berger and Ramsay Cook eds., **The West and the Nation,** (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1976), pp. 214-5.

[113]Ibid., p. 215.

[114]Orest Martynowich and Nadia Kazymymyra, "Political Activity in Western Canada," in Manoly Lupul ed., **A Heritage in Transition,** (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1982), pp. 106-7.

[115]Ibid.

[116]Avery, **Dangerous,** p. 61.

[117]Melnycky, "Ukrainian Community," pp. 202-3.

[118]Avery, "Radical Alien," p. 215.

[119]Ibid., p. 225.

[120]Penner, **Winnipeg,** p. 78.

[121]Melnycky, "Ukrainian Community," p. 222.

[122]Ibid., p. 224.

[123]Ibid., pp. 220-1, 225.

[124]Bercuson and McNaught, **Winnipeg,** p. 52.

[125]Melnycky, "Ukrainian Community," p. 231.

[126]Penner, **Winnipeg,** p. 158.

[127]Avery, **Dangerous,** p. 85.

[128]"Defense Committee Reports," **Western Labour News,** August 27, 1919, pp. 1, 4.

[129]Greg Kealey, "1919: The Canadian Labour Revolt," **Labour/Le Travailleur** 13 (Spring 1984): 40.

[130]Bercuson, **Confrontation,** p. 163.

[131]Donald Avery, "Continental European Immigrant Workers in Canada 1896-1933: From 'Stalwart Peasants' to Radical Proletariat," **Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology,** 12(1) 1975: 64, quoting Meighen Papers, 002537, Hugh John MacDonald to Meighen, 3 July 1919.

[132]"British Justice on Trial," **Western Labour News,** July 5, 1919, p. 13.

[133]Ibid.

[134]Melnycky, "Ukrainian Community," p. 232.

[135]Avery, "Radical Alien," p. 224.

[136]Ibid.

[137]"British Justice on Trial," p. 3.

[138]Ibid.

[139]Penner, **Winnipeg**, p. 93.

[140]Returned Man, "Truth Incarcerated," **Western Labour News**, Special Strike Edition No. 32., June 23, 1919, p. 3.

[141]James Mabon, "The Profiteer Drank Blood Like a Leech," **Western Labour News**, Special Strike Edition No. 3., May 20, 1919, p. 2.

[142]Penner, **Winnipeg**, p. 70.

[143]"War and Strikes," **Western Labour News**, Special Strike Edition No. 19., June 7, 1919, p. 2.

[144]"A Fourth Demand," **Western Labour News**, Special Strike Edition No. 28., June 18, 1919, p. 1

[145]Penner, **Winnipeg**, p. 73.

[146]Ibid.

[147]Ibid., p. 147.

[148]Ibid., p. 150.

[149]Ibid.

[150]Ibid., p. 115.

[151]Bercuson and McNaught, **Winnipeg**, p. 50.

[152]Penner, **Winnipeg**, p. 87.

[153]Ibid.

[154]Ibid., p. 127.

[155]Ibid., pp. 36-40.

[156]Henry Borden, ed., **Robert Laird Borden: His Memoirs**, (Toronto: MacMillan, 1938), p. 974.

[157]"Parliamentary Debate on Industrial Unrest in Canada," **Labour Gazette**, vol. 19, 1919, (Ottawa: King's Printer, 1920), p. 709.

[158]Borden, **Borden**, p. 709.

[159]"Parliamentary Debate," p. 709.

[160]Ibid., p. 708.

[161]Graham, **Meighen**, p. 241.

[162]Ibid., p. 240.

[163]Ibid., p. 241.

[164]Ibid., pp. 242-3.

[165]Ibid.

[166]Penner, **Winnipeg**, p. 158.

[167]Robson Commission, p. 10.

[168]Ibid.

[169]Ibid., p. 30.

[170]Ibid., p. 27.

[171]Ibid., p. 20.

[172]Ibid., p. 29.

[173]Penner, **Winnipeg**, p. xxii, quoting F.A. McGregor, **The Fall and Rise of Mackenzie-King: 1911-1919**, p. 335.

[174]Brodie and Jenson, **Crisis**, chs. 4,5.

[175]Ibid., p. 107, quoting Campaign Speech, London Ontario in 1920.

[176]Dixon, **Address**, p. 26.

[177]Ibid., p. 26.

[178]Ibid., p. 18.

[179]Ibid.

[180]Ibid., p. 28.

[181]Pritchard, **Address**, p. 13

[182]Ibid., p. 13.

[183]Ibid., p. 53.

[184]Ibid., pp. 80, 101.

[185]Ibid., p. 126.

[186]Ibid.

[187]Ibid., p. 10.

[188]J. Castell-Hopkins, "Echoes of the Winnipeg Strike: The Sedition Trial," **Canadian Annual Review of Public Affairs 1919**, (Toronto: Canadian Annual Review, 1920), p. 483.

[189]Constitutionalist, "The Law in a Nutshell," **Western Labour News**, Special Strike Edition No. 31, June 21, 1919, p. 3.

[190]"The Beginning of the End," **Western Labour News**, Special Strike Edition No. 28, June 18, 1919, p. 3.

[191]A.P. Chew, "Industrial Action Useless With our Political," **Western Labour News**, July 25, 1919, p. 3.

[192]"Canadian Workers Learn a Lesson," **Western Labour News**, April 23, 1920, p. 2.

[193]Robin, **Radical**, p. 203.

[194]E. Robinson, "Position of the Trades and Labour Council," **Western Labour News**, November 28, 1919, p. 1.

[195]Robin, **Radical**, pp. 204-5.

[196]Ibid., p. 203.

[197]"Labour's Civic Campaign Opened," **Western Labour News**, October 24, 1919, p. 1.

[198]"Results of the Civic Election," **Western Labor News**, December 5, 1919, p. 1.

[199]Ibid.

[200]Robin, **Radical**, p. 205.

[201]Ibid., p. 207.

[202]Ibid.

[203]Robin, **Radical**, p. 207.

[204]Ibid., p. 208, quoting **Western Labour News**, January 21, 1921.

[205]Ibid., quoting **Canadian Forum**, vol. 1 (October 1920): 3.

[206]David Bercuson, **Fools and Wisemen: The Rise and Fall of the One Big Union**, (Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1978), p. 163, quoting **One Big Union Bulletin**, September 6, 1919.

[207]Ibid., pp. 148, 153.

[208]Ibid., p. 148.

[209]Ibid., p. 153.

[210]Ibid., p. 152.

[211]Ibid.

[212]Ibid., p. 153.

[213]Robin, **Radical**, p. 204, quoting **Manitoba Free Press**, April 12, 1920.

[214]Ibid., p. 211, quoting **One Big Union Bulletin**, October 2, 1920. (Italics are mine.)

[215]Ibid., p. 216.

[216]Ibid., p. 213.

[217]"Six Weeks College for 35,000 Wage-Earners," **Western Labour News**, July 7, 1919, p. 2.

Conclusion

One question traps all the literature about the general strike. Was the strike *either* a distorted industrial dispute, *or* really revolution? Even though this question dominates the literature, few authors actually cry revolution. Even communist authors do not impute revolutionary intent to the strikers' motives. Indeed, the strike either had significance for the development of the communist party, or marked the contradictions in capitalist structures.[1] The literature which does argue revolution is discredited. It distorted facts and waxed hysterical. Take Castell-Hopkins' account of the strike for example. O.B.U. extremists deliberately attempted to seize the government of Winnipeg.[2] During the June 21st rioting, the RNWM policemen were "literally surrounded" by "yelling, shooting, throwing aliens" most of whom were vicious 'Big' Austrians.[3] For the Striker's Defense Committee, the strike concerned trade union principles: the right to bargain collectively in trade unions freely chosen by workers. Robson defined the middle ground. He discovered both radical and trade union purposes, but they were second order causes inasmuchas the real cause was indeed economic. Consequently, the trade union grievances were a natural, logical extension of the cause. Its radical expression was not natural since it related to the wrongheaded views of militant socialists and immigrants with foreign un-Canadian cultures. This second order causal strain, combined with intense industrial conflict, distorted the trade unionists normally cool attitude toward radical movements. The literature follows these first few interpretations of the strike.

Amongst Canadian historians, D.C. Masters and David Bercuson wrote the two authoritative interpretations of the general strike. Since both concluded the strike concerned trade union, not revolutionary causes, the debate's focus shifted. Was the strike significant for *either* Canadian politics *or* Canadian industrial relations. Masters set the general strike within the political context of the Great War and Western Labour radicalism so as to explain the rise of western Canadian protest movements which fused economic grievances with political change.[4] So the strike is important for its political significance, especially the evolution of Canadian socialism *à la* CCF. Bercuson argues that Masters drew political conclusions from economic causes which, implicitly, meant that Masters argued socialist ideas caused the strike as much as, or more than, economic forces. Indeed, Masters never showed how collective bargaining was politically significant. Bercuson simplifies this confusion by relating cause to significance so that the strike had significance for trade unionism and labour management relations, more so than political attitudes of trade unionists. Indeed, "*all* of Canadian labour history must be explored as an example of the ongoing struggle for economic power."[5] So the strike's significance was for *either* trade unions *or* political parties and not for the way the two *relate* within a class movement.

This literature narrows the strike to an either/or situation at two levels. It was either a strike or a revolution; its significance was for either industrial relations or politics, socialist political parties or trade unions. Bercuson can explain the logic of trade union grievances. Masters can explain the political grievances of socialists. Neither can incorporate the point of view of the other, nor explain why many different socialist and trade union traditions could converge, nor account for the role of east European support. If these problems in the literature can be drawn together, then, perhaps, a clearer explanation for the massive support from approximately 30,000 strikers, of varied skill and ethnic backgrounds, is possible.

An argument of this sort must clearly relate the political and economic significance of the strike.

Since both Masters and Bercuson ground their analysis in causal arguments, their interpretations of the strike are open to methodological and philosophical criticism. Both narrow the strike's significance to its cause. Without some network, a worldview, ordering the logic of social forces, causal explanations lack sense. Since Masters and Bercuson focus upon the cause, that which makes explanation adequate, that underlying worldview in fact remains obscured, and so, limits their explanation for the strike. An interpretive explanation attempts to clarify the totality of the strikers' worldview from which causal arguments may be fashioned. So it puts into question the meaning of social phenomenon. The superiority of this approach may be measured by our ability to answer questions Masters and Bercuson can not.

The general strike was a class phenomenon. This means that the strike reflected a working-class-like totality of interdependent social, economic, and political relationships, from which our interpretive method took its cue. So this thesis related a particular social phenomenon to its context of meaning from which *both* acquired sense. The strikers' behaviour was related to their working class historical traditions which imbued their thought processes, social practices and institutions. So the strikers could recognize the significance of the strike for them and act upon their own understanding of the issues.

Anglo-Saxon and east European workers both had class traditions. From their European experience, both Englishmen and Ukrainians acquired notions of democracy and civil rights which, when fused to demands for economic justice, marked the characteristics of their class movements. Through education and practical action, in trade unions and political clubs, benefit associations and reading

circles, class social practices imbued the community's knowledge. Indeed, their social practices and institutions became increasingly determinate, fixed into trade unions and political parties. These two institutions strove to unite economic and political forces into an emancipatory social movement for which freedom, from oppressive social relations, defined their ultimate purpose.

Now the class movements, in each ethnic community, related trade union and political purposes differently. For the Englishman, the trade union was the keystone of working class organization since it provided immediate and practical benefits to workers. It preceded the organization of distinctly working class political parties by almost eighty years. Indeed, the trade unions organized the British Labour party. For the Ukrainians, the socialist party first provided for the practical needs of workers, preceded the organization of Ukrainian trade unions by almost forty years, and indeed, created the trade union movement in Galicia. So each ethnic group weighted the importance of trade unions and political parties differently, within the larger scope of the movement itself.

The class solidarity during the strike had two distinct levels. A humid mood for some social change hung in the post-war air. The values for which many great nations fought for in Europe starkly contrasted with the oppressive measures the Canadian government used to still social criticism and isolate certain immigrant groups. When the economy expanded enormously, to support the war effort, the increasingly distorted distribution of wealth strained Canadian social relationships. This sense of being exploited, queerly justified by government as necessary for the existence of democracy, had also strained working class faith in Canadian democracy. Since socialist political parties and the trade union movement became increasingly unified into one political force, workers had an alternative to which they could turn, for which democracy was defined in class ways.

The worker's right to bargain collectively, his right to chose his own representative institutions, his right to a living wage, struck to the core of working class movements. This sentiment for working class rights made it possible for the manifold class movements to unify behind one cause. Working class leaders sought to unify the political and trade union movements without success for many years. The political parties fought about radical, rebellious, or revolutionary purposes. The trade unions bitterly fought about both their role in politics and the merits of craft and industrial unionism. So class movements in Canada were complexly related, bitterly divided, and often plain incomprehensible.

Nineteen nineteen was different. Through the trade union movement's own democratic procedures, radical leaders built a consensus around the tactic of the general strike to win a vaguely defined right to bargain collectively through institutions of the worker's own choice. This was no mean feat. First radical leaders had to agree amongst themselves, then convince trade unionists to join in an effort to impose this purpose upon employers. The radicals had much to gain. If successful, this would ensure the participation of political activists in the trade union movement.

Working class understandings of democracy drew the two levels of class solidarity together. Since both Englishmen and Ukrainians had class traditions, which fixed democratic aspirations in their community knowledge, they could recognize the socialist's general criticisms of social relations and the logic of the strike's purpose. Collective bargaining provided an alternative most everyone could understand. Since the meaning of collective bargaining was imprecise; since the political opportunities were clear; different people with different views, concerning the logic of class movements, could read into the strike's purpose their own concern. The strike was indeed a combined effort; it mobilized the organizational

resources of both trade unions and political parties. So the strike was neither just an industrial dispute, nor a revolution. It was something in between. It was part of a process within which trade union and socialist activists, by acting upon a common purpose, strove for an increasingly unified social movement.

The strike failed. This failure altered the way trade unions and political parties related and, in the process, projected more precise models for Canadian class movements.

Trade union leaders were still willing to engage in political action, but with two caveats. They would not risk their institutions in any gambit for political change; their political support depended upon the realistic chances of a parliamentary socialist party to win power.[6] This proviso for political support was not new, just clearer. The craft union leaders returned to their customary reticence toward socialist politics. The industrial union movement differed significantly since militant communists were also indispensable trade union leaders. Even so the craft and industrial union movements both would not support political demands with strikes.

Extreme radical alternatives disappeared. When the general strike failed syndicalism failed, which meant that working class activists no longer supported any *one* institution which embodied both political and industrial purposes. The iconoclastic Marxist party, which rejected trade unionism for its lack of ideological purity, also disappeared. So any future Canadian Marxist movement had to make practical contributions to the trade union movement. Indeed, the range of working class alternatives narrowed.

The pre-1920 radical and revolutionary parties formed two working class political alternatives, by the early thirties. Indeed, the differences of opinion, which divided the socialists, were the same: how socialism should win political power;

how political parties and the trade union movement should relate. The left wings of the SDP and the SPC, along with other tiny revolutionary parties, joined the Communist Party of Canada for whom no compromise with Canadian political institutions was possible.[7] The communists aggressively organized their own trade unions, or, fought to control existing ones, upon the assumption that those class institutions would train workers in revolutionary philosophy and methods. The right wings of the SDP and SPC, along with other community groups, eventually formed the CCF, for which parliamentary politics was the legitimate means to arbitrate the transition toward socialism.[8] This labour party courted trade union affiliation so that the party could tap trade union financial and organizational resources for political, meaning parliamentary, purposes. Since the trade unions jealously guarded their autonomy, the labour party was extremely careful not to interfere in trade union affairs. So class politics became increasingly unified as the fratricidal class political alternatives narrowed to two.

Ethnicity influenced the choice between these two alternatives. The Ukrainian Marxists brought their well organized community to the CPC, where, along with other Slavic social organizations, they represented roughly ninety percent of its membership.[9] The ILP, and later the CCF, attracted most Anglo-Saxon socialists, bringing together Marxists and Christian socialist leaders such as Pritchard, Russell, Queen and Farmer, Dixon, Woodsworth. Both ethnic groups fell back upon familiar class traditions when confronted by choice. The Ukrainians identified with their political party which centralized social and cultural services.[10] The English returned to solid trade unionism, something independent from, but related to, a social democratic political party. Though both ethnic groups could recognize class social phenomena, each interpreted it differently.

The general strike and class traditions also marked civic, provincial and

national politics. Both communists and social democrats participated extensively in Winnipeg's city council, school boards, and so on, meaning that class political cleavages shaped municipal politics.[11] In civic politics many Ukrainian communists contested elections, with Wasyl Kolisnyk becoming the first communist city councillor in 1926.[12] In provincial politics, the CCF eventually disinherited the communist party so that the genealogy of Manitoba socialism passed through the ILP, to the CCF, then, so far, culminated in the NDP. As ethnic differences faded after three generations, the CCF-NDP acquired the political support of Canadians of east European descent, especially those in the North End, so that a broad based class movement placed the NDP in power in 1969.[13] Yet tradition lingers on. Joseph Zuken, a communist party candidate for mayor in 1979, placed second, albeit distantly.[14] The presence of a socialist alternative in national politics ensured the drift toward liberal democracy.[15] Indeed, pressured from the left, the Liberal party implemented social welfare policies, legislated trade union rights, and created economic instruments to regulate a mixed economy. This class political alternative also marked a Canadian ethical worldview for which certain policies, such as socialized health, access to university education, and trade union activity, are simply rightful. So indeed, individual rights do not trump the community's responsibility to provide basic Standards of Life.

Through interpretive analysis, our empirical inquiry has theoretical import for Canadian social inquiry. Indeed, this must be so if theory and practice relate *within* interpretation, our hermeneutic circle. Since Canadian historical experience and Canadian historiography must be intimately related, some remarks leading toward a uniquely Canadian historiography are warranted. We rejected Marxist social historiography, remember, for its inadequate understanding of culture. It conceived of culture as a causal force juxtaposed against another force, "not-culture", usually economic or some social structure. An anthropological notion of culture, following

Clifford Geertz, became our alternative. Another American, Louis Hartz, used culture to explain social phenomenon, and so doing, created a distinct North American historiography. Since this historiography and interpretive social science both concern culture, both can enrich Canadian social inquiry.

Hartz's fragment thesis grounded American social explanation in immigration. European colonists brought certain visions of the well ordered community, certain assumptions about human nature, from which they drew principles to create their own new society. This founding *projet*, however, was but a fragment of the fuller European historical process. So founding principles in the new world were indeed only part of political debate in the old, some expression of social change, driven by internal European social forces. As such, Hartz's explanation is teleological. The logic of the American colonists' liberal political philosophy was a sort of genetic code which shaped American social practices and institutions. There is powerful simplicity here since Hartz essentially argues immigrants came with a plan, a romantic vision of the good life, and vast virgin geography upon which to build.[16]

Hartz's interpretation of the American Liberal tradition inspired a method of historical inquiry to explain the founding of new societies. The point of departure and point of social congealment, together, in the colony, sealed the ideological fate of new nations. The interior unfolding of the European fragment permanently fixed political alternatives. "A part detaches itself from the whole, the whole fails to renew itself and the part develops without inhibition."[17] It is always something less than Europe, yet in a sense more since it is also the vessel of European dreams. This fragment process makes verification possible since American historical development may be compared to the fuller European historical process.[18] It is true that Hartz claims American experience can check European experience, but this claim is surely thin. Since Americans lacked feudal social relations, Europeans may

compare their historical experience to the American, to better understand historical change.[19] In the balance of this exchange, though, American historiography clearly has much more to gain. Hartz does have a more convincing means to verify his arguments: his explanation sifts through history for new categories which explain social phenomena other historians can not.[20] From his historiography Hartz also implicitly predicts social trends, namely, the inability of American politicians to check their irrational fear of communism. This is indeed a dangerous pathology since the United States is a modern 'superpower' amongst nations.

The Hartzian voice is relevant to the dialogue about Canadian working class historiography since it speaks of tradition and socialism. Indeed, Hartz tried to explain the weakness of socialism in North America, despite the outstanding success of American capitalism as a way of life, something which dramatically contradicted Marxian political economy. Canadian students of Hartz followed suit. Canada, however, was different since socialism persistently continued to exist. For Gad Horowitz[21] and Norman Penner[22] the Canadian socialist idea had two firm fragment roots, both of which restore a more complete expression of European historical forces, in the Canadian context. Canada has a Tory tradition, so some organic conception of the polity, hierarchically ordered, survived. This tradition, combined with those of English working class immigrants, *circa* 1900, engrained a permanent socialist strain in Canadian political culture. So class politics flourished.

Hartz is methodologically flawed. This flaw differs from those described in the culture debate, described in the first chapter, since culture for Hartz is not one variable amongst many others, complexly related to some explanatory system. Indeed, Hartz does not appeal to an explanation outside the historical process, as the social sciences might, for whom ahistorical models slot and slab facts. Hartz interprets American history from within, appealing to European experience for a

more complete understanding of the American Liberal tradition. So for Hartz, political tradition becomes a totalizing concept that englobes the entire historical process.

The 'Idea', for Hartz, drives history. Since the causal force is assumed, Hartz need only unfold the logic of Lockean liberalism, with broad brush strokes, to define the range of American political alternatives. Through sleight of hand, however, Hartz avoids explanations for social change since he claims to interpret American political *thought*. Some ten years after his *Liberal Tradition in America*, Hartz's *interpretation* became a *model* which now explained the political development of other European colonial societies.[23] So now, if others would be able to follow Hartz, the evolution of societies had to be clarified. Explanation of social change, therefore, could not be avoided. But Hartz had created a closed mechanical-like system, with a series of imperatives such as the point of departure, congealment and so forth, which defined the impossibilities of certain political alternatives. Without some notion of political change Hartzian historiography left only broad, descriptive, unchangeable generalizations about North American society. These generalizations are indeed the oak trees of that famous parable which stood uncompromisingly in the face of a fierce wind, a fierce cultural world wind.

In Hartz's weakness there is also strength. Hartz wanted to explain the freakish McCarthy hystéria through historical exegesis. Here social science provides little explanatory force since a McCarthyite attitude would be only an objective observable attitude explaining an observable event, namely, the persecution of socialists. Since Hartz simply ignored vexing questions about causal historical forces, he freely focused upon North American nation building for which immigration and tradition were crucial. Since there was a particular contemporary

purpose, the broad generalizations about the liberal tradition in America acquired powerful explanatory force, a reason for an irrational fear of socialism. So Hartz's work is indeed a cue to good social explanation, but not exactly in the way Hartz and his students marked down in the *Founding of New Societies*. For a finer grained understanding of North American social phenomena, study immigration, tradition and a situation for which they are relevant.

Through interpretive social science, Hartz's use of tradition can acquire powerful explanatory force. Interpretation, remember, both constitutes man's pre-conscious social world, and is, itself, an activity by which man clarifies the significance of phenomena, for himself. Causal explanation need not impair interpretive social science since it, too, is ultimately embedded in some tradition. Since man is always in a situation where he must act, tradition is always engaged in some social phenomenon. This is also a self-formative process, so it is indeed a process of social change.

Since Canada is an immigrant country, immigrant traditions, immigrant social practices, and immigrant institutions form a starting point. Though points of departure and congealment fasten the fragment thesis into deterministic shards of social analysis, if reduced to the status of rules of thumb, they provide useful guides to relate immigrant traditions with alternatives for social development. Like an onion skin, several layered immigrant traditions define the context of Canadian politics, so a uniquely Canadian social inquiry must peal back these interpretations built upon interpretations, built upon interpretations. And so on.

So, then, how does one interpret? The logic of the explanation is proper to the situation and traditions through which the phenomenon acquires significance. Since any tradition is seldom logically consistent, it contains different, often contradictory, impulses so that all of one tradition is not necessarily relevant to each

situation. So how does one find a reference point? Existing interpretations provide guide-posts. Some interpretations are those of participants, others are found in literature reconstructing events, still others remain embedded within the preunderstood elements of tradition which unconsciously shape our assumptions about human action. Ultimately, however, there is no *exact* method, so the interpreter must trust his own judgment, a zig-zag through the brain, to grasp the meaning of particular phenomenon. This is why social inquiry is an *art*.

Buried in the literature upon the general strike lay observations which, indeed, project an alternative explanation. Masters, remember, did not relate the significance of specific strike issues to the larger political context of western Canadian protest movements. The strike, he concluded, was an "effort to secure the principle of collective bargaining."[24] Earlier, however, he also noted that by two weeks into the strike "no one knew precisely what was meant by collective bargaining."[25] Draw these two remarks together under Bercuson's assertion that the strike leaders transformed the trade union issues into questions of principle.[26] So trade unionists claimed a *right*. This may be related to the political grievances of the socialists who fought for civil and political liberties, one of which was the freedom to define one's own working class institutions democratically. This indeed tapped larger Anglo-Saxon working class Rights traditions. So here, perhaps, is our first inkling of the strike's significance for both politics and industrial relations.

The reason class and ethnicity could converge within a process of class formation is that each ethnic group could recognize the significance of the strike. Englishmen and Ukrainians both had class social practices and institutions. Both had class movements. Since class movements relate political and economic aspirations into one interrelated alternative for social change, the general strike's issues had political *and* economic significance. So the English accent upon trade

unions, and the Ukrainian penchant for socialist political parties, could converge. Now the specific issues, collective bargaining and a living wage, relate to English and Ukrainian working class traditions which fused democratic traditions with aspirations for political and economic emancipation. These traditions indeed shaped their communities' knowledge and communities' solidarity. The Great War put into question the nature of Canadian democracy and the fairness of the distribution of economic wealth. Social relations became strained, and so, projected to the fore-consciousness of Canadian society radical alternatives. An otherwise routine industrial relations conflict, then, developed into an opportunity to unify the Canadian left into a meaningful political alternative. The conflicting strains between different working class social practices and institutions, trade unions and political parties, fastened together a fragmented unity so that thirty to thirty-five thousand workers could find common cause.

This argument's validity lay in its ability to answer questions the literature can not. First, this argument pushed beyond interpretations which query whether or not the general strike was a revolution or an industrial conflict, significant for politics or industrial relations. If we understand the strike within the context of class movements then the strike is neither revolution nor strike. It is indeed part of a process through which a social movement fixed social practices and institutions with both political and economic significance. Second, this argument explained why east European immigrants supported the strike and why radical socialist leaders provided a serious alternative to Winnipeg workers. This argument gathered its explanatory force by relating Winnipeg's class solidarity to working class traditions. Since these class traditions combined democratic political traditions and aspirations for economic justice, our interpretation further related the strikers' solidarity and the strike's issues to the Great War and Canadian politics. Since our method stressed the practical activity of social philosophy, our empirical analysis had theoretical

import for Canadian social inquiry. Consequently, we suggested an enrichment of a uniquely North American historiography for which immigration and tradition are fundamental working concepts. Furthermore, this study has done its best to remain within the traditions studied so as to make these traditions increasingly clear *from within*.

[1]Ivan Avakumovic, **The Communist Party in Canada: A History,** (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1975), pp. 14-15.

[2]J. Castell-Hopkins, "Echoes of the Winnipeg Strike: The Sedition Trial," **Canadian Annual Review of Public Affairs 1919,** (Toronto: Canadian Annual Review, 1920), pp. 460-1.

[3]Ibid., p. 475.

[4]D.C. Masters, **The Winnipeg General Strike,** (Toronto: University of Toronto press, 1950), ch. 1, pp. 113-27, p. x.

[5]David Bercuson and Kenneth McNaught, **The Winnipeg General Strike: 1919,** (Don Mills: Longman, 1974), p. 123. Italics are mine.

[6]See Gad Horowitz, **Canadian Labour in Politics.** Toronto: University of Toronto press, 1968.

[7]Ian Angus, **Canadian Bolsheviks: The Early Years of the Communist Party of Canada,** (Montreal: Vanguard Publications, 1981), p. 65.

[8]Ibid., ch. 4, especially pp. 64-5, and Norman Penner, **The Canadian Left: A Critical Analysis,** (Scarborough: Prentice-Hall, 1977), chs. 2-3.

[9]Donald Avery, "Ethnic Loyalties and the Proletarian Revolution: A Case Study of Communist Political Activity in Winnipeg, 1923-1936," in Jorgen Dahlie and Tissa Fernando, eds., **Ethnicity, Power and Politics in Canada,** (Agincourt: Methuen, 1981), p. 68.

[10]Ibid., pp. 20-1.

[11]See J.E. Rae, "The Politics of Conscience: Winnipeg After the Strike," **Historical Papers,** 1971, pp. 276-288.

[12]Orest Martynowich, "The Ukrainian Socialist Movement in Canada; 1900-1918 (II)," **Journal of Ukrainian Graduate Studies** no. 1 vol. 1 (Spring 1977): 31.

[13]T. Peterson, "Ethnic and Class Politics in Manitoba," in Martin Robin, ed., **Canadian Provincial Politics: The Party Systems of the Ten Provinces,** (Scarborough: Prentice-Hall, 1972), p. 110.

[14]Avery, "Proletarian Revolution," p. 89.

[15]Penner, **Canadian Left,** pp. 250-260.

[16]Louis Hartz, **The Liberal Tradition in America: An Interpretation of American Political Thought Since the Revolution,** (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1955), ch. 1.

[17]Louis Hartz et al., The Founding of New Societies, (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1964), p. 9.

[18]Hartz, Liberal, p. 24.

[19]Ibid.

[20]Ibid., p. 28.

[21]Horowitz, Canadian Labour, ch. 1.

[22]Penner, Canadian Left, ch. 2.

[23]Hartz, Founding, ch. 1.

[24]Masters, Winnipeg, p. 134.

[25]Ibid., p. 110.

[26]David Bercuson, Confrontation at Winnipeg, (Montreal: McGill-Queens University press, 1974), p. 181.

Bibliography: Primary Sources.

Texts

Dixon, F.J.. **Dixon's Address to the Jury: An Argument for Liberty of Opinion.** Winnipeg: Israelite press, 1920.

Pritchard, W.A.. **W.A. Pritchard's Address to the Jury.** Winnipeg: Wallingford press, 1920.

Trueman, W.H.. **The Russell Trial and Labour's Rights.** Winnipeg: Wallingford press, 1920.

Woodsworth, J.S.. **The King vs J.S. Woodsworth.** Winnipeg: Wallingford press, 1920.

_____. **My Neighbor.** Toronto: University of Toronto press, 1972.

_____. **Reconstruction: From the Viewpoint of Labour.** Winnipeg: Hecla press, 1919.

_____. **Strangers Within Our Gates; or Coming Canadians.** Toronto: University of Toronto press, 1972.

Newspapers

The Bulletin, (International Association of Machinists) Winnipeg, (1914).

The Western Labour News, Winnipeg, (1918-20).

The Winnipeg Citizen, Winnipeg, (1919).

The Winnipeg Free Press, Winnipeg, (1919).

The Voice, Winnipeg, (1897-1918).

Pamphlets

One Big Union, **Manifesto of the One Big Union.** Vancouver: One Big Union, 1919.

Socialist Party of Canada, **Alien Labour.** Winnipeg: Socialist Party of Canada, 1919.

Socialist Party of Canada, **Causes of Industrial Unrest.** Winnipeg: Socialist Party of Canada, 1919.

One Big Union. **The Origin of the One Big Union: A Verbatim Report of the**

Calgary Conference, 1919. Winnipeg: One Big Union, 1919.

Definition of Collective Bargaining June 16, 1919 by Iron Masters and International Officers of the Running Trades, **Peel Bibliography**, no. 2687.

Bibliography: Government Documents

Canada, Department of Labour, **Annual Report on Labour Organization, 1911-20.**

Canada, Department of Labour, **Labour Gazette, 1919-20.**

Canada, Parliament, **Sessions Papers no. 28 (Commons) 1920** "The Report of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police," 10 George V.

Manitoba, **Royal Commission to enquire into and report upon the causes and effects of the General Strike which recently existed in the City of Winnipeg for a period of six weeks, including the methods of calling and carrying on such strike.** 1919.

Bibliography: Articles

Artibise Alan, "Divided City: The Immigrant in Winnipeg Society 1874-1921," in Stetler G.S. and A.F.J. Artibise,eds., **The Canadian City: Essays in Urban and Social History.** Ottawa: Carleton University press, 1984.

Avery Donald, "Continental European Immigrant Workers in Canada 1896-1933: From 'Stalwart Peasants' to Radical Proletariat," **Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology,** 12(1) 1975: 53-64.

_____, "Ethnic Loyalties and the Proletarian Revolution: A Case Study of Communist Political Activity in Winnipeg, 1926-1936," in Jorgen Dahlie and Tissa Fernando,eds., **Ethnicity, Power & Politics.** Toronto: Agincourt: Metheun, 1981.

_____, "Ethnic and Class Tensions in Canada 1918-1920: Anglo-Canadian and the Alien Worker," in Francis Swyripa and John Herd Thompson, eds., **Loyalties in Conflict: Ukrainians in Canada During the Great War.** Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1983.

_____, "The Radical Alien and the Winnipeg General Strike of 1919," in Carl Berger and Ramsay Cook, eds., **The West and the Nation.** Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1976.

Bercuson David, "Labour Radicalism and the Western Industrial Frontier 1897-1919," in W.P. Ward and R.A.J. McDonald, eds., **British Columbia: Historical Readings.** Vancouver: Douglas and McIntyre, 1981.

_____, "Through the Looking Glass of Culture," **Labour/Le Travailleur** 7 (Spring 1981): 95-112.

Bilinsky Yaroslav, "Mykhaylo Drahomanov, Ivan Franko, and the Relations between the Dnieper Ukraine and Galicia in the Last Quarter of the 19th Century," in **Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the United States** vol. III. 1959, nos. 1-2: 1542-64.

Forbes H.D., "Hartz-Horowitz at Twenty: Nationalism, Toryism and Socialism in Canada and the United States," **Canadian Journal of Political Science** xx:2 (June 1987): 287-315.

Friesen Gerald, "'Yours in Revolt': Regionalism, Socialism and the Western Canadian Labour Movement," **Labour/Le Travailleur** 1 (1976): 139-157.

Haczynski Leo, "Two Contributions to the Problem of Galicia," **East European Quarterly,** vol. iv. (March 1970) no. 1: 94-104.

Heron Craig, "Labourism and the Canadian Working Class," **Labour/Le Travailleur** 13 (Spring 1984): 45-76.

Himka J.P., "Background to Emigration: Ukrainians of Galicia and Bukovyna, 1848-1914," in Manoly Lupul, ed., **A Heritage in Transition.** Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1982.

_____, "Serfdom in Galicia," **Journal of Ukrainian Studies** 17 (Winter 1984): 3-28.

Hobsbawm Eric, "Peasants and Politics," **Journal of Peasant Studies** I (1973): 3-22.

Horak Stephen, "The Shevchenko Scientific Society (1873-1973)," **East European Quarterly** vol. vii (Fall 1973) No. 3: 249-264.

Inglis K.S., "The Labour Church Movement," **International Review of Social History** vol. III: 445-508.

Iorwerth Prothero, "William Benbow and the Concept of the 'General Strike'," **Past and Present** No. 63 (May 1974): 132-171.

Kazmymyra Nadia, "Aspects of Ukrainian Opinion in Manitoba During World War I," in Martin Kovacs, ed., **Ethnic Canadians.** Regina: Plains Research Center, 1978.

Kealey Greg and Bryan Palmer, "The Bonds of Unity: The Knights of Labour in Ontario," **Social History** xiv (Nov. 1981): 369-411.

_____, "Labour and Working Class History in Canada: The Prospects in the 1980's," **Labour/Le Travailleur** 7 (Spring 1981): 66-94.

_____ "1919: The Canadian Labour Revolt" **Labour/Le Travailleur** 13 (Spring 1984): 11-44.

Laine E.W., "Finnish Canadian Radicalism and Canadian Politics: The First Forty Years, 1900-1940," in Jorgen Dahlie and Tissa Fernando,eds., **Ethnicity,**

Power & Politics in Canada. Agincourt: Methuen, 1981.

Logan H.A., "Rise and Decline of the One Big Union in Canada," **Journal of Political Economy.** vol. 36 (April 1928) number 2: 240-279.

Martynowich Orest and Nadia Kazymymyra, "Political Activity in Western Canada, 1896-1923," in Manoly Lupul, ed., **A Heritage in Transition.** Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1982.

_____, "The Ukrainian Socialist Movement in Canada 1900-1918," **Journal of Ukrainian Graduate Studies** vol. 1 (Fall 1976): 27-44.

_____, "The Ukrainian Socialist Movement in Canada; 1900-1918 (II)," **Journal of Ukrainian Graduate Studies** no. 1 vol. 1 (Spring 1977): 22-31.

McCormack A.R.M., "Cloth Caps and Jobs: Ethnicity of English Immigrants in Canada, 1900-1914," in Jorgen Dahlie and Tissa Fernando, eds., **Ethnicity, Power & Politics in Canada.** Agincourt: Methuen, 1981.

_____, "Industrial Workers of the World in Western Canada 1897-1914," in Jorgen Dahlie and Tissa Fernando,eds., **Ethnicity, Power & Politics in Canada.** Agincourt: Methuen,1981.

McKay Ian, "Historians, Anthropology, and the Concept of Culture," **Labour/Le Travailleur,** 8/9 (Autumn/Spring 1981/2): 185-241.

McNaught Kenneth, "E.P. Thompson vs Harold Logan: Writing about Labour and the Left in the 1970's;" **Canadian Historical Review** lxii 2 (1981): 141-168.

Mealing Stanley, "The Concept of Social Class and the Interpretation of Canadian History," **Canadian Historical Review** 46 (Sept. 1965): 201-218.

Melnyky Peter, "The Internment of Ukrainians in Canada," in F. Swyripa and John Herd Thompson, eds., **Loyalties in Conflict: Ukrainians in Canada During the Great War.** Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1983.

Mills Allen, "Co-operation and Community in the Thought of J.S. Woodsworth," **Labour/Le Travailleur** 14 (Fall 1984): 103-122.

_____, "Single Tax, Socialism and the Independent Labour Party of Manitoba: The Political Ideas of F.J. Dixon and S.J. Farmer," **Labour/Le Travailleur** 5 (Spring 1980): 33-56.

Montgomery David, "Immigrants, Industrial Unions, and Social Reconstruction in the United States 1916 - 1923," **Labour/Le Travailleur** 13 (Spring 1984): 101-13.

Ostry Bernard, "Conservatives, Liberals and Labour in the 1870's," **Canadian Historical Review** 41 (June 1960): 93-127.

_____, "Conservatives, Liberals and Labour in the 1880's," **Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science** 27 (May 1961): 141-161.

Palmer Bryan, "Classifying Culture," **Labour/Le Travailleur** vols. 8/9

(Autumn/Spring 1981/2): 153-183.

_____, "Most Uncommon Common Men: Craft and Culture in Historical Perspective," **Labour/Le Travailleur**, 1 (1976): 4-31.

_____, "Working Class Canada: Recent Historical Writing," **Queen's Quarterly** (79-80): 594-616.

"Parliamentary Debate on Industrial Unrest in Canada," **Labour Gazette** vol. 19 (1919) Ottawa: King's Printer, 1920.

Peterson Larry, "The One Big Union in International Perspective: Revolutionary Industrial Unionism, 1900-1925," **Labour/Le Travailleur**, 7 (Spring 1981): 41-66.

_____, "Revolutionary Socialism and Industrial Unrest in the Era of the Winnipeg General Strike: The Origins of Communist Labour Unionism in Europe and North America," **Labour/Le Travaileur** 13 (Spring 1984): 115-131.

Peterson T., "Ethnic and Class Politics in Manitoba," in Martin Robin, ed., **Canadian Provincial Politics: The Party Systems of the Ten Provinces.** Scarborough: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Rae, J.E., "The Politics of Conscience: Winnipeg After the Strike," **Historical Papers**, (1971): 276-288.

Roberts Barbara, "Shovelling Out the 'Mutinous': Political Deportation from Canada Before 1936," **Labour/Le Travail**, 18 (Fall 1986): 77-110.

Ricoeur Paul, "The Model of the Text: Meaningful Action Considered as a Text," **Social Research** (Autumn 1971): 529-562.

Rudnytsky Ivan, "The Ukrainians in Galicia Under Austrian Rule," **Austrian History Yearbook** III Part 2 (1967): 394-429.

Scott Stanley, "A Profusion of Issues: Immigrant Labour, the World War and the Cominco Strike of 1917," **Labour/Le Travailleur** 2 (1977): 54-28.

Smith Timothy, "Lay Initiative in the Religious Life of American Immigrants 1880-1950," in Tamara Harenen, ed., **Anonymous Americans: Explorations into Nineteenth - Century Social History.** Englewood: Prentice - Hall, 1971.

Solchanyk Roman, "Revolutionary Marxism in Galicia Before 1918," **East European Quarterly**, vol x (Spring 1976) no. 1: 35-41.

Stedmanjones Gareth, "Working-Class Culture and Working-Class Politics in London 1870-1900: Notes on the Remaking of a Working-Class," **Journal of Social History** vol. 7 no. 4: 460-508.

Swyripa Francis, "The Ukrainian Image: Loyal Citizen or Disloyal Alien," in F. Swyripa and John Herd Thompson, eds., **Loyalties in Conflict: Ukrainians in Canada During the Great War.** Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1983.

Taylor Charles, "Interpretation and the Sciences of Man," in Charles Taylor, **Philosophy and the Human Sciences: Philosophical Papers 2.** New York: Cambridge University press, 1985.

_____, "Neutrality in Political Science," in Alan Ryan, ed., **The Philosophy of Social Explanation.** Oxford: Oxford University press, 1973.

Thompson E.P., "Homage to Tom Maguire," in Asa Briggs and John Saville, eds., **Essays in Labour History.** London: MacMillan, 1960.

_____, "The Moral Economy of the English Crowd in the Eighteenth Century," **Past and Present** No. 5 (February 1971): 76-136.

Thompson John Herd, "The Enemy Alien and the Canadian General Election of 1917," in F. Swyripa and John Herd Thompson eds. **Loyalties in Conflict: Ukrainians in Canada During the Great War.** Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1983.

Watt F.W., "The National Policy, the Workingman, and Proletarian Ideas in Victorian Canada," **Canadian Historical Review** (40 March): 1-26.

Woycenko Ol'Ha, "Community Organizations," in Manoly Lupul, ed., **A Heritage in Transition.** Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1982.

Yeo Eileen, "Christianity in Chartist Struggle, 1838-1842," **Past and Present** No. 91 (May 1974): 109-139.

Yeo Stephen, "A New Life: The Religion of Socialism in Britain 1883 - 1896," **History Workshop** 4 (Autumn 1977): 5-56.

Yuzyck Paul, "Religious Life," in Manoly Lupul ed. **A Heritage in Transition.** Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1982.

Bibliography: Books

Abella, Irving. **Nationalism, Communism and Canadian Labour: The C.I.O., the Communist Party and the Canadian Canadian Congress of Labour, 1934-1956.** Toronto: University of Toronto press, 1973.

Angus, Ian. **Canadian Bolsheviks: The Early Years of the Communist Party of Canada.** Montreal: Vanguard Publications, 1981.

Artibise, Alan. **Winnipeg: A Social History of Urban Growth 1874-1914.** Montreal: McGill-Queens University press, 1975.

Aspinal, Arthur. **The Early English Trade Unions.** London: Batchworth press, 1949.

Avakumovic, Ivan. **The Communist Party in Canada: A History.** Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1975.

Avery, Donald. **Dangerous Foreigners: European immigrant workers and labour radicalism in Canada 1896-1933.** Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1979.

Bell, David, and Tepperman, Lorne. **The Roots of Disunity: A Look at Canadian Political Culture.** Toronto: McCelland and Stewart, 1979.

Bercuson, David. **Confrontation at Winnipeg.** Montreal: McGill-Queens University press, 1974.

_____. **Fools and Wisemen: The Rise and Fall of the One Big Union.** Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1978.

_____, and McNaught, Kenneth.. **The Winnipeg General Strike: 1919.** Don Mills: Longman, 1974.

Bernstein, Richard. **Beyond Objectivism and Relativism: Science, Hermeneutics and Praxis.** Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania press, 1983.

_____. **The Restructuring of Social and Political Theory** Oxford: Blackwell, 1976.

Borden, Henry., ed. vol. 2 **Robert Laird Borden: His Memoirs.** Toronto: MacMillan, 1938.

Briggs, Asa, and Saville, John., eds. **Essays in Labour History.** London: Macmillan, 1960.

Briggs, Asa., ed. **Chartist Studies.** New York: St. Martins Press, 1967.

Brodie, J.M., and Jenson, Jane. **Crisis, Challenge & Change: Party and Class in Canada.** Toronto: Metheun, 1980.

Brown, Robert, and Cook, Ramsay. **A Nation Transformed.** Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1974.

Castell-Hopkins, J.. **Canadian Annual Review of Public Affairs 1919.** Toronto: Canadian Annual Review, 1920.

Forsey, Eugene. **Trade Unions in Canada, 1812-1902.** Toronto: University of Toronto press, 1982.

Fraser, W. Hamish. **Trade Unions and Society: The Struggle for Acceptance 1850-1880.** London: George Allen & Unwin, 1974.

Gadamer, H.G.. **Truth and Method.** New York: Crossroad, 1975.

Geertz, Clifford. **Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays by Clifford Geertz.** New York: Basic Books, 1973.

_____. **Local Knowledge: Further Essays in Interpretive Anthropology.** New York: Basic Books, 1983.

Graham, Roger. **Arthur Meighen.** vol. 2. Toronto: Clarke, Irwin & Company, 1965.

Gutman, Herbert: **Work, Culture and Society in Industrializing America.** New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1976.

Hartz, Louis., et al.. **The Founding of New Societies.** New York: Harcourt Brace, 1964.

_____. **The Liberal Tradition in America: An Interpretation of American Political Thought Since the Revolution.** New York: Harcourt Brace and World, 1955.

Heidegger, Martin. **Being and Time.** Trans. John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson. New York: Harper and Row, 1962.

Henry, Ann. **Lulu Street.** Toronto: Playwrights Co-op, 1972.

Himka, J.P.. **Socialism in Galicia: The Emergence of Polish Social Democracy and Ukrainian Radicalism (1860-1890).** Cambridge: Harvard University press, 1983.

Hobsbawm, E.J. and T. Ranger., eds. **The Invention of Tradition.** London: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

_____. **Labouring Men: Studies in the History of Labour.** New York: Basic Books, 1964.

Hopkins Eric. **A Social History of the English Working Classes 1815-1945.** London: Edward Arnold, 1979.

Horowitz, G.. **Canadian Labour in Politics.** Toronto: University of Toronto press, 1968.

Hunt, E.H.. **The British Labour Movement 1815-1914.** Atlantic Highlands: Humanities Press, 1981.

Kealey, Gregory and Palmer, Bryan. **Dreaming of What Might Be: The Knights of Labour in Ontario, 1800-1900.** New York: Cambridge University press, 1982.

_____., et al. **Primary Sources in Canadian Working Class History 1860-1930.** Kitchener: Dumont press, 1973.

Kubijovyč, Volodymyr., ed. 2 vols. **Ukraine: A Concise Encyclopedia,** vol. 1. Toronto: University of Toronto press, 1963.

Kwavnick, David. **Organized Labour and Pressure Politics.** Montreal: McGill-Queens University press, 1972.

Logan, Harold. **Trade Unions in Canada: Their Development and Functioning.** Toronto: Macmillan, 1948.

Lupul, Manoly., ed. **A Heritage in Transition.** Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1982.

Masters, D.C.. **The Winnipeg General Strike.** Toronto: University of Toronto

press, 1950.

McCormack, A.R.M.. **Reformers, Rebels and Revolutionaries: The Western Canadian Radical Movement 1899-1919.** Toronto: University of Toronto press, 1977.

Morton, A.L. and Tate, George. **The British Labour Movement 1770-1920: A History.** London: Lawrence & Wishart 1956.

Paine, Thomas. **The Rights of Man.** Middlesex: Penguin books, 1984.

Palmer, Bryan. **A Culture in Conflict: Skilled Workers and Industrial Capitalism in Hamilton Ontario 1860-1914.** Montreal: McGill-Queens University press, 1981.

_____. **Working Class Experience.** Toronto: Butterworth, 1983.

Panitch, Leo., ed. **The Canadian State: Political Economy and Political Power.** Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1977.

Pelling, Henry. **A History of British Trade Unionism.** London: St. Martin's Press, 1966.

_____. **Popular Politics and Society in Late Victorian Britain.** London: Macmillan, 1968.

Penner, Norman. **The Canadian Left.** Scarborough: Prentice-Hall, 1977.

_____., ed. **Winnipeg 1919.** Toronto: James Lewis and Samuel, 1973.

Robin, M.. **Radical Politics and Canadian Labour 1880-1930.** Kingston: Queens University press, 1968.

Shevchenko, Taras. **Song Out of Darkness.** trans. and ed., V. Swoboda. London: Mitre press, 1961.

Taylor, Charles. **Human Agency and Language: Philosophical Papers 1.** New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

_____, **Philosophy and the Human Sciences: Philosophical Papers 2.** New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

Thompson, E.P.. **The Making of the English Working Class.** Markham: Penguin Books, 1982.

Thompson, John Herd. **The Harvests of War.** Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1978.

Webb, Sidney and Beatrice. **The History of Trade Unionism.** New York: Augustus M. Kelley, 1965.

_____. **Industrial Democracy.** New York: Augustus M. Kelley, 1965.

Wiseman, Nelson. **Social Democracy in Manitoba: A History of the CCF-NDP.**

Winnipeg: University of Manitoba press, 1983.

Bibliography: Unpublished Works

Chisick Ernie, "The Development of Winnipeg's Early Socialist Movement 1900-1915," Master's of Arts Thesis, University of Manitoba. 1972.

Foy James, "Gideon Robertson Conservative Minister of Labour 1917-1921," Master's of Arts Thesis, University of Ottawa, 1970.

Johnson Albert E., "The Strikes in Winnipeg in May 1918; the Prelude to 1919?," Master's of Arts Thesis, University of Manitoba, 1978.

Melnyky Peter, "A Political History of the Ukrainian Community in Manitoba 1899-1922," Master's of Arts Thesis, University of Manitoba, 1972.

Mott Morris, "The Foreign Peril: Nativism in Winnipeg 1916-1923," Master's of Arts Thesis, University of Manitoba, 1970.

Appendix

May 1. After three months of negotiations with the Winnipeg Builders' Exchange, all the unions grouped together under the Building Trades Council go on strike.

May 2. A strike is called by the Metal Trades Council of workers at three of the main metal-contracting shops.

May 6. Building Trades Council and Metal Trades Council inform Winnipeg Trades and Labour Council of refusal of the employers to bargain with them. TLC unanimously decides to poll all affiliated unions on a general sympathetic strike.

May 13. Report of strike vote: 8,667 for 645 against. A general Strike Committee of 300 is set up, made up of 3 delegates from each union. An executive Central Strike Committee of 15 is to be elected later.

May 15. - General strike commences at 11 a.m. Within two hours the whole productive life of the city grinds to a halt as thousands of unorganized workers join the union members in walking off their jobs.

- A mass meeting of the three main organizations of returned soldiers declares full support to the strike.

May 16. Winnipeg Citizens' Committee of 1,000 is announced. Its aim is to fight the strike.

May 17. The Strike Committee asks for a meeting with city council to discuss maintenance of essential services. At this meeting officers of dairies suggest that the Strike Committee issue work authorization cards to permit milk deliveries and some other services to continue.

May 22. Hon. Arthur Meighen, acting minister of Justice, and Senator Gideon Robertson, minister of Labour, arrive by train in Winnipeg, accompanied by several prominent members of the Citizens' Committee who joined them in Fort William. They engage in a busy round of discussions but ignore the Strike Committee.

May 25. - Senator Robertson issues an ultimatum to the postal employees, giving them until 10 a.m. the following day to return to work and sigh an undertaking to sever all connections with the Winnipeg Trades and Labour Council, on pain of dismissal.

- Provincial and civic governments issue similar ultimatums, the provincial order being directed mainly at telephone girls because the telephone system is provincially owned, and they are therefore employees of the government.

- Mass meeting of 5,000 strikers in Victoria Park rejects all ultimatums.

May 30. City police are given twenty-four hours to sign a contract that

prohibits membership in any union whatever. The police refuse, at the same time pledging to uphold law and order.

June 1. Ten thousand returned soldiers march to provincial legislative building to express their solidarity with the strike, demand provincial legislation to enforce collective bargaining and call upon the premier to withdraw his ultimatum to the telephone girls. After meeting the premier, they march to city hall and present similar demands.

June 3. Winnipeg daily papers begin carrying ads sponsored by the Citizens' Committee calling for the deportation of "aliens" who support the strike.

June 6. Government in Ottawa introduces amendments to Immigration Act permitting deportation without trial of anyone not born in Canada who is accused of sedition.

June 8. J.S. Woodsworth returns to Winnipeg after a number of years as a longshoreman in Vancouver, and addresses a meeting of 10,000 under auspices of the Labour Church.

June 9. Entire police force is dismissed for refusing to sign the undertaking demanded of them, and Citizens' Committee begins recruitment of "specials."

June 16. Metal-trades employers publish what they consider to be a compromise proposal to settle the strike. That very evening, however, and into the early hours of the next day, the RNWMP carries out a series of raids on labour halls and on homes of strike leaders, arresting ten people and transporting them to the Stony Mountain penitentiary twenty miles north of Winnipeg.

June 18. Announcement made that the arrested leaders would be held for deportation proceedings in line with the new Immigration Act and that bail would therefore be refused.

June 21. - As a result of a storm of protest from all over the country, bail is granted six of the ten prisoners.
- Silent parade called to protest the arrest of the strike leaders is attacked by special police and RNWMP using baseball bats and small-arms fire. One man is killed and thirty others injured.

June 23. Woodsworth arrested for taking over as editor of the *Western Labour News*, the strikers' voice, since its regular editor, W. Ivens, was arrested among the first ten.

June 25. - Fred J. Dixon, Labour member of the provincial legislature, takes over as editor and he, too, is arrested.
- The Strike Committee announces that the strike is to be terminated and calls upon labour to get ready for the next round of the struggle - in the political arena - to send a large group of labour representatives to all levels of government.

June 26. The Winnipeg General Sympathetic Strike is over at 11 a.m.

Source: Norman Penner, **Winnipeg 1919**, (Toronto: James Lewis and Samuel, 1973), pp. xxv-xxvii.