

Comptes rendus / Book Reviews 415

describe a fast-driving coachman. Neither is “Hoocha,” in one of the mottoes of the book, a “Russian nickname for a Chinese coolie”: the garbled transliteration, found in another English-language source, must refer to *khodia*, a term with a rich and interesting history.

It is regrettable to have to count numerous errors and misspellings, above all in Russian words and titles, and to notice an uncertain use of transcription from the Chinese. Had the author been able or willing to use some of the Russian-language publications on Harbin and Manchuria that have been coming out in a steady stream since the 1990s, he would have found out more about the failed revolution in Harbin in 1917 (on which he touches in chap. 3), or the history of Harbin education (the subject of chap. 8). Chinese studies of Harbin history are also under-used in this work and it is, finally, unacceptable for a book published in 2010 to contain no references to research dating after 2002.

Mark Gamsa
Tel Aviv University

ENYEART, John — *The Quest for “Just and Pure Law”: Rocky Mountain Workers and American Social Democracy, 1870–1924*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2009. Pp. xiv, 311.

Of all of the fields and sub-fields of American history, U.S. labour history might be the most tangled and contentious. One reason for this is America’s self-congratulatory claims of exceptionalism, and of being a society of haves and soon-will-haves. Another reason is the confusion over the meaning of terms—socialism, radicalism, syndicalism, social democracy, cooperative commonwealth, and so on. Ideological predispositions of many labour historians also contribute to the tensions and complexities of the field. Scholars often presuppose the existence of a worker class consciousness—even a revolutionary class-consciousness—and as a result assign preconceived historical roles and lines to be read in the acting out of those roles. There is great mischief in the belief that working people should have wanted to take over the means of production—preferably violently—and that when they did not, it was because something artificial, almost contrary to nature, had interfered with their natural instincts. In sum, the ghosts of Marx and Sombart still stalk the land of the labour historians.

One of the strengths of John Enyeart’s book is that he avoids these traps; he does not overly concern himself with theories of working-class history. In a revealing sentence more than two-thirds of the way through his book he writes that his primary purpose was to discover “what workers actually wanted” (p. 200), not to frame an interpretation around what he and other historians may have wanted them to want. For the most part, he was true to his word. There are a few times when Enyeart seems really to *want* his Rocky Mountain workers to be “socialists.” How else might one explain the author’s definitions of both “social democracy” and socialism—definitions so broad that even the purely ameliorative aspects of

worker demands become at least a prerequisite to one or the other? But this is a minor point arising in large part from definitional imprecision and overload. Contemporaries were no more precise in their efforts to make sense of social democracy and socialism, and both had multiple and conflicting definitions, meaning barely any definition at all.

As Enyeart makes clear, what Rocky Mountain workers wanted was a living wage, safe work places, an eight hour day, education for their children, sewers on their streets, and a measure of respect. In Enyeart's apt phrase, they were "pragmatic radicals." By "pragmatic" Enyeart means that they were committed to working within the existing political and partisan structure of their states and localities. Rocky Mountain workers in Utah, Montana, and Colorado presented labour's demands, organized the labour vote, and kept a close eye on the politicians they had helped to elect. They understood that markets, including labour markets, were not self-regulating and did not arise out of some "natural order." Instead, they were the result of laws passed by legislatures. Workers reasoned that changing the law-makers would change the laws, which would in turn change the markets and improve workers' lives. Call that what you will—including "social democracy."

It would be hard—and meaningless—to argue against this central thesis of Enyeart's book, particularly given his assiduous research which resulted in numerous examples of the political potency of the "labour vote." Unionists had "faith that they could find justice within the confines of America's constitutional government" (p. 179); that faith, he insists, was not misguided, and "political action was working" (p. 203). "To most Rocky Mountain workers the class struggle occurred as a series of daily battles on multiple fronts" (p. 205). Enyeart's next argument, that these Rocky Mountain workers were better situated politically and more determined to use their political leverage than workers in other regions, is less convincing. It is also less important to his book. Indeed, the significant issue—and here might have been a place for Sombart and American exceptionalism—is that American workers had the vote. The working-classes of the other industrializing nations either did not or did not have it as fully as America's working people, including those conspicuously egalitarian and politically savvy sorts who lived in Enyeart's three Rocky Mountains states.

There are a few other problems with this otherwise commendable study that must be briefly noted. In particular, Enyeart includes no detailed accounting of who these Rocky Mountain workers were. How many were immigrants and from where? What political ideas did they bring with them? How important were ethnic/tribal rivalries? Enyeart deals with this last issue, but inadequately in my judgment. Even more significant, how many of his workers were Catholic? What role did Pope Leo XIII's *Rerum Novarum* (1891) have on their idea of a "living wage"? These are not insignificant matters and their absence from Enyeart's discussion detracts from what is an important and much needed book. And a final point: the book needed better editing. For example, Hewett should be Hewitt (p. 76) and the reference on page 202 to workers increasing their "wage scale to \$3.50 *an hour*" is noteworthy. But the hard work of finding

examples of “small” victories by labour and explaining how they counted at the time and how they should be counted now makes up for dozens of minor errors. This is a good and useful book and it deserves a wide readership.

David M. Emmons
University of Montana

FAUVE-CHAMOUX, Antoinette, and Ochiai, EMIKO (eds.) — *The Stem Family in Eurasian Perspective. Revisiting House Societies, 17th–20th centuries*. Bern, Peter Lang, 2009. Pp. 558.

Antoinette Fauve-Chamoux and Emiko Ochiai offer a comprehensive synthesis on inheritance practices in non-egalitarian societies in Europe and Asia where the stem family system shaped practices, strategies, and behaviours. This publication is drawn from discussions during the conferences organized within the Eurasian Project on Population and Family History where contributors concluded that family studies in Europe and Asia could not be completed without comparing families' life-cycle evolution and without using different sources and methods such as censuses, family reconstitutions, macro-structural and micro-longitudinal methods, household typology, network typology, and co-residence analysis. These approaches and methods allow researchers to consider time, family, demographic, individual and structural constraints and to discern gender-differentiated patterns and behaviours. The originality of the volume derives first from the authors' demonstration that there were similarities, as well as differences, in family systems both in Europe and Asia, as well as within Europe and within Asia. Second and most importantly, they show that the house system and the stem family form in particular did not systematically exclude female headship and heirship either in Europe or in Asia, and that women played a greater role than the existing historical literature has acknowledged.

In the extensive historiographical, methodological, and bibliographical introduction, the co-editors explain the state of current research on household structures in Europe and Asia and the evolution of the debate on the importance of the stem family system since the 1960s. The other contributors show that the stem family system in regions of Europe and Asia where the house system was and is sometimes prevalent today has conditioned household structures and inheritance practices over time, imposing the co-residence of aging parents and their single heir, his or her spouse, and their unmarried siblings and children: a three-generational cohabitation with only one married couple and unmarried siblings at each generation. These practices clearly shaped families' and individuals' histories, yet they did not exclude women.

Eight specialists on the European family also participate in the discussion. Richard Wall argues that Le Play's categorization is original because it helps to understand family practices regarding the choice of the heir, marriage strategies, inheritance practices, retirement and the destinies of non-inheriting children.