

H. C. PENTLAND AND WORKING CLASS STUDIES

Gregory S. Kealey

Clare Pentland may well have written his own best obituary in 1972 when he noted "the unusual combination of respect and neglect" which Gustavus Myers' *History of Canadian Wealth* had received. He went on to award Myers an accolade that better described himself: "A historian's historian — his work valued by Canada's most knowledgeable scholars, academic and otherwise."¹

After any intellectual's death, the scholarly autopsy of a life's work is a discomfiting examination for us all. Always disconcerting for the survivors, the consideration becomes vastly more complicated when the subject's career mirrors the commentator's own intellectual interests and political predilections.

The task transcends easy eulogy, it rapidly evolves into a search for intellectual roots which, in this case, leads inexorably to an exploration of the Canadian academic environment of the 1940's and 1950's.

H. Clare Pentland was a scholar whose work I have always greatly admired but whom I only met on two occasions — once casually at the Learned's in 1974 and more recently at a 1977 Winnipeg seminar. I suspect that many readers will share my memory of the quest in the mid to late 1960's for critical writings in the Canadian historical and political economy traditions — an all-too-often futile hunt. There were, however, a few underground classics of an unassimilated radical tradition. The two which influenced me (and other historians of the Canadian working class) the most were Pentland's unpublished 1960 Toronto Ph.D. thesis, "Labour and the Development of Industrial Capitalism in Canada", and Frank Watt's "Radicalism and English Canadian Literature Since Confederation".² What remains most striking about both theses are their complete and brilliant idiosyncrasy. Pentland's evident interest in class analysis and especially in the development of the Canadian working class stands out from its Toronto political economy heritage as fully as does Watt's consideration of radicalism in Canadian literature.³

Although Pentland's work stands apart starkly from the Toronto political economy tradition, there are no clear explanations for this in his intellectual biography. Born in Justice, Manitoba in 1914, Pentland attended the Brandon campus of the University of Manitoba and received his honours B.A. in

GREGORY S. KEALEY

economics from Manitoba in 1940.⁴ After receiving his M.A. from the University of Oregon, Pentland registered in the School of Graduate Studies at the University of Toronto. In the academic years 1946 through 1948 he studied economic history (H.A. Innis), economic theory (G.A. Elliott), labour economics (H.A. Logan), sociology (S.D. Clark), and industrial relations (F. Toombs). In 1949 he accepted a position in the economics department at the University of Manitoba where he taught for the rest of his life. Pentland's dissertation, defended in 1960, which had been described originally in 1946 as "The History of Labour in Canada to 1867" and then narrowed to "The Irish Labourer on the Canadian Canals and Railroads, 1830-1860", was broadened again in its final form to "Labour and the Development of Industrial Capitalism in Canada".

The value of Pentland's work is located in its break with other existing North American schools of labour studies. Not only did his work depart significantly from the predominant staples interpretation of Canadian economic history by focusing on the development of industrial capitalism in Canada, but it also showed no affiliation with the predominant modes of labour studies. The American Common's school tradition imported to Canada partially through the later (non-academic) successes of Willy King but also by the Chicago-trained Harold Logan had little impact on Pentland's work. Indeed one can think of almost no relationship whatsoever between the Pentland approach first demonstrated in his 1948 "The Lachine Strike of 1843" and the institutional approach of Logan's *Trade Unions in Canada*, published ironically that same year.⁵ By the same token, Pentland showed no interest in the emerging industrial relations field developing largely in the United States in conjunction with welfare capitalism.

"The Lachine Strike", Pentland's first publication, contained the seeds of much of his later work. Anthologized as late as 1974, this article today remains not only our best over all account of the role of Irish labourers, but also represents a pioneering effort in a style of cultural analysis in ethnic studies which has only recently become popular. In addition, Pentland gave notice of his forthcoming breakthrough analysis of the genesis of industrial capitalism in Canada, for here he describes the 1840's as "a decade of transition, marking the rise of wage-labour on a large scale, and of a milieu that would forge labour into a self-conscious force."⁶ Perhaps even more important, it is in this article that Pentland develops the intellectual project which he consistently pursued thereafter — the rescuing of Canadian workers from the margins of history:

Historians have paid considerable attention to the English capital that made possible Canada's canal and railway building, in the eighteen-forties and fifties, and some

WORKING CLASS STUDIES

attention too, to the Scottish contractors who supervised the work. But there has been almost complete neglect of the real builders of Canadian public works, the thousands of labouring men, mainly Irish, who toiled with pick and shovel.⁷

By placing the Irish labourer at the center of his account, Pentland almost totally broke with both the Canadian historiographic and political economy traditions. Moreover he not only allowed the labourer to stride into the middle of the historical stage but he gave him a speaking part — the labourers here speak for themselves through their letters to other labourers as well as through the historian's careful reconstruction of their behaviour, not through the lens of the biased, class and race prejudiced observers, but rather through a sharply focused analysis of their Irish cultural heritage and their encounter with the Canadian environment.

Where did Pentland find his intellectual inspiration for such work? He appears to have turned to the English Marxist tradition of historical writing. Although his debts are at best made only partially clear, a decision which undoubtedly owed more to the academic climate of cold war Canada than to any lack of gratitude on his part, there is much evidence both in his citations and in the nature of his arguments to show his familiarity with the economic history of Maurice Dobb and with the labour studies of various British communist scholars. Indeed these citations run through not only his early historical work, but are present again and again even in the later, more general reflections on the nature of the Canadian industrial relations system.

Pentland, however, added another component to the English scholarship, namely American economic history which in the post-second world war period was enjoying a lively renaissance as scholars turned to the pre-Civil War period to consider the role of the state in the development of the U.S. economy. Studies such as Hartz on Pennsylvania and the Handlins on Massachusetts stimulated Pentland to consider the North American path to industrial capitalism which stood at some variance with the classic British transformation.⁸ Thus Pentland's work was, from the beginning, built from a broad comparative base. He linked this to an impressive research skill which led him to utilize the Public Archives of Canada with considerable creativity. His work in pre-confederation government collections turned up nuggets of real value in sources which had previously yielded only political and constitutional dross.

Nevertheless, Pentland must have been a rather lonely scholar in the late 1940's and especially throughout the 1950's. His two very-important articles on "The Lachine Strike" and on "The Role of Capital in Canadian Economic Development Before 1875" were followed by almost ten years of silence.⁹ This

GREGORY S. KEALEY

quiet was broken only by the necessity to respond to Hugh Aitken's critique of Pentland's estimates of levels of capital imports and by occasional pieces on contemporary labour relations.¹⁰ The pressure to complete his thesis led to his next important article which in many ways summarizes its core argument. His "The Development of a Capitalistic Labour Market in Canada" (1959) is perhaps his seminal contribution to Canadian working class studies and constitutes a perfect companion piece for his earlier discussion of capital formation.¹¹

These two essays considered together fully elaborate an alternative view to the pervasive staples version of Canadian economic development. Here the outlines of the transformation to an industrial capitalist society sketched in "The Lachine Strike" are fully drawn. Here Pentland argues persuasively that "about the middle of the nineteenth century the Province of Canada was transformed from a raw, staple-producing area to a rounded, integrated economy that might be called metropolitan"¹² and further that the canals and railways "by integrating the Canadian market, opened the way for Canadian manufacturers to conquer it."¹³ Although not written in an explicitly Marxist framework, it is obvious that these two essays pursue the crucial questions in any Marxist understanding of the genesis of industrial capitalism: the nature of the capital accumulation which allows Mr. Moneybags to seek labour in the marketplace; and the process by which workers are forced to enter that same marketplace with nothing but their labour power to offer in return for their sustenance.

"Labour and the Development of Industrial Capitalism in Canada" extends the analysis of those essays. Here Pentland has room to explain more fully the scope of his undertaking:

In primitive societies (and also, ideally in socialist societies) the potential labour force consists of all the members of society, and the methods of production are those that these members conceive to yield the greatest mutual benefit ... production in all other societies is complicated by the division of these societies into a ruling class, which organizes the labour force in its own interest, and the ruled or working group whose satisfactions are a matter of expediency and consistency with the demands of the rulers.¹⁴

His study traces the evolution of European society in Canada "up to the flowering of full industrial capitalism". This involves a discussion of changes in the organization of labour from various forms of forced labour (slavery, in-

WORKING CLASS STUDIES

denture, convict and military) through what he terms "feudal" (paternalistic, pre-industrial) to the emergence, "shortly after 1850", of a "capitalistic labour market and a well-developed capitalistic economy".¹⁵

This discussion is so broad and his insights are so rich about early Canadian social and economic history that it is impossible to comment on them all. Let it simply be noted that the discussion ranges from the labour of native people in the fur trade, through the failure of slavery in New France, to an intensive consideration of labour at the St. Maurice Forges. He then considers immigration to the Canadas in the first half of the nineteenth century chronicling the cultural backgrounds of the American, English, Scottish and especially the Protestant and Catholic Irish. The Irish, however, receive the most attention. The discussion begins with Ireland as the colony "in which the English learned the art of subjecting other peoples".¹⁶ There follows an extended consideration of the cultural attributes of the Ulster and Southern Irish migrants which traces their deep-rooted conflict which they carried to Canada. The chapter closes with an extended Appendix on the Orange Order in central Canada which places the order fully in its working class context. This represents a particularly valuable example of Pentland's constant ability to transcend the usually narrow confines of either economic or labour history. Instead his sensitivity to social and cultural factors allows him to generate intriguing synthetic comments on all aspects of Canadian life. Thus:

Orangeism and the moderate political conservatism which it built, represented the artisan well at a time when capitalism had not advanced enough to subordinate all other divisions to the one between capitalist and proletarian. In that time, the conservatism of the workingman was a fixed point of Canadian politics and the Orange Order was its typical form of organization.¹⁷

The final two chapters of this brilliant thesis contain the most important contributions. "The Transformation of Canada's Economic Structure" and "The Transformation of Canadians" provide the first and perhaps still, the fullest account of Canada's industrial revolution — an economic transformation of the mid-nineteenth century:

A paramount fact about Canada is that it did develop a national economy of an industrial type in the-nineteenth century. The Canada that existed up until 1820 needs to be described ... in terms of staple production ... But this

GREGORY S. KEALEY

language will not do to describe the Canada of 1870: what is required for that is the terminology of advanced industrial societies.¹⁸

Pentland's analysis of Canadian industrialization shows far more concern for ideas, policies and the role of the state than for the actual process of economic transformation from handicraft through manufacture to modern industry. Indeed his study focuses on the debates surrounding tariff policy and pinpoints two amazing men, Robert Baldwin Sullivan and Isaac Buchanan, as key figures in the politics of Canada's industrial revolution. Predictably Pentland also examined labour's role in the great policy debates of mid-century:

While there was a real national policy from 1850 until 1880, both manufacturers and their workmen believed that their livelihood depended upon protection, and that protection was always in danger from railroads and merchants. In consequence, employers and employees relied on each other for marked consideration.¹⁹

Although overplaying the extent to which this led to a lessening of class conflict, Pentland develops the above insight into its political corollary:

What labour gave in return was ... consistent support for protection and the Conservative Party. The wage-earners — not least through the Orange Order in Canada West — were a dependable and not insignificant partner in MacDonald's coalitions.²⁰

Here again we can see Pentland's understanding that labour is an active social force that demands continual historical consideration. Labour's political role did not await the arrival of socialism.

His "Transformation of Canadians" examines "the moral conditions of economic growth", in Karl Helleiner's phrase.²¹ Here, again developing insights which were very evident in British Marxist historiography, he concerns himself with the process by which pre-industrial labour ("slothful, immediate, anarchic and irregular in work habits, and too easily seduced by noneconomic goals and means to goals") was transformed into "suitable material for a modern society".²² In suggesting the terms on which he would pursue this question, he wrote with a penetrating realization of the complexity of historical transformation:

WORKING CLASS STUDIES

To make the material [labour] suitable required a complex and unknowable educative process ...Nor was the means to success capable of reduction to a precise dose of new discipline and new ambition that could be injected, once for all, like a coin in a machine. Success was attained rather by an indistinct and never-completed process of interacting stimulation and response. Human transformation was bound to be partial, and mostly unplanned, because men were remaking themselves without much comprehension or consciousness of it, because deliberate changes sent out other ripples of subtle, unrecognized adjustments to preserve the tension and balance of existence, and because the inanimate machinery of production to which man had to fit himself could only itself be transformed bit by bit and year by year. The nature and extent of the changes in the ways men regarded themselves, conducted themselves, and dealt with each other, have therefore to be indicated rather than expounded; and the direction of causation suspected rather than proved.²³

One wishes all social scientists were as sensitive and as humble before the reality of the past.

In describing man's "remaking", Pentland was concerned with the new "spirit of capitalism," a new cosmos, "built around concepts like progress, 'science', and invention."²⁴ He drew his readers' attention to education and to temperance — topics which only recently in Canada have begun to be placed firmly in a social history framework. After an innovative discussion of the role of mechanics' institutes and of patents, he turned to "the new labour relations" of industrial capitalism. Here he recognized the crucial division of the working class into the skilled and the unskilled. The artisan, whose strength he recognized, was "the key man who held the new technology in his hands and brain, and it was nowhere else." Anticipating the recent historiography of work process, Pentland asserted clearly, "Only the craftsmen knew how the work should be done."²⁵ It was the unskilled, however, who interested him most. Returning to the subject of his first article, he again examined the Irish labourers in the Canadas. They could not depend on their skill, of course, but neither were they passive:

The final arbiter of the disputes was not abstract right but

GREGORY S. KEALEY

physical force, the power of the massed labourers to do violence against the similar power of the troops that employers were able to call to their assistance.²⁶

After a long discussion of strike activity among canal labourers and of the state role in providing military assistance and later in devising new modes of police activity, Pentland concludes that by the 1850's, Irish labourers had learned "to be increasingly judicious in their use of violence" and now "acted less like tribesmen, and more like a nationality, or class."²⁷ In summary, then:

The Irish contributed much: they did the heavy work, and built the canals and railways, and made the well-supplied market in common labour that supported industrial capitalism. They taught much: that there was not, after all, an atomistic labour market; that beyond a certain point of exploitation labourers would combine and revolt; that it was sometimes necessary to negotiate terms rather than dictate them. They learned much: that the rules of capitalism allow some discussion of wages, but none of employment; that unity, to be very effective, had to encompass all labourers; that life in a capitalistic society demanded a more calculating, more informed and more disciplined behaviour than they had been used to.²⁸

Pentland's thesis represents a remarkable excursion through the Canadian past — a trip all the more amazing for its quite unique point of origin and for the places where he takes us. If Pentland can be considered to be a part of the Toronto political economy school at all, as Daniel Drache has recently claimed, then it should be only for the penetrating insights generated by the interdisciplinary method that we associate with political economy. To describe his work only as some derivative part of the Innisian tradition is simultaneously to distort and to belittle it.²⁹

In the 1960's Pentland's work appears to have focused on European economic history where he tried to apply some of his insights about "feudal" labour relations, which he had developed in the Canadian context, to Europe. Put simply, Pentland argued that the elaborate system of law and custom surrounding the nature of labour relations built up in the Middle Ages was based on a "perennial shortage of labour".³⁰ In 1965 Pentland attended the third International Conference of Economic History in Munich and delivered a paper on "Population and Labour Growth in Britain in the Eighteenth

WORKING CLASS STUDIES

Century". Based on very recent demographic work, Pentland argued strongly that "English population growth in the eighteenth century was a response to economic conditions."³¹ Debating simultaneously with those who saw demography as independent of the economy and with those who equated surplus population directly with economic growth, Pentland appears to have received a good reception. Certainly E.J. Hobsbawm was impressed and he cites Pentland's argument in *Industry and Empire*.³²

Also in the 1960's, as the Canadian political climate began to quicken and dissent gained an audience again, Pentland began to make a few tentative, political interventions. Articles on guaranteed full employment, foreign ownership, the role of labour in Canadian economic planning, and the Freedman Report appeared in various journals.³³ His political perspective was always critical and he seemed as happy to penetrate social democratic myth-making regarding the possibilities of full employment with the N.D.P. as to attack foreign ownership since "an economic colony will also be a political colony and Canada's frequent subservience to the United States follows largely from our status as an economic subsidiary."³⁴ While welcoming the Freedman Report as establishing a "great social principle", Pentland sensed, correctly, that the gains would be difficult for labour to hold and to spread beyond the railways. In his commendation of Freedman, however, Pentland encapsulated very well his view of the role of the Canadian courts in labour relations:

It is not only that most judges move in a circle dominated by employer attitudes, but that the law which they enunciate makes these attitudes their "natural" ones. And, except possibly in the highest court, they are expected to hew to precedent and dispense order, rather than justice, so that courts may march more or less in step, that lawyers may give their clients reasonable forecasts of what the courts will decide and that they will not be too often over-hauled at a cost to unhappy petitioners and their own reputations. The judges best equipped for their work, then, are those with so little imagination that a disposition different from the traditional one does not occur to them, and with so little sensitivity that they feel no qualms about the injustices they have wrought.³⁵

It was also in the climate of the late 1960's and early 1970's that Pentland came to play two additional roles: one as a consultant in labour relations to both the Manitoba and federal governments and second, to a limited extent, as

GREGORY S. KEALEY

a newly recognized pioneer of the study of the Canadian working class movement. The former role led to various reports for the Manitoba government and his "Study of the Changing Social, Economic and Political Background of the Canadian System of Industrial Relations" for the 1968 federal Task Force on Labour Relations.³⁶ The second led him to assessments of the Winnipeg General Strike on its fiftieth anniversary, to an overall consideration of the western Canadian labour movement, and to review essays on the republication of Gustavus Myers' *History of Canadian Wealth* and Gary Teeple's New Left collection of essays on *Capitalism and the National Question in Canada*.³⁷

On rereading this work, Pentland's important contribution to the recent resurgence of interest in the western Canadian labour movement is especially apparent. Again, due partially to the inaccessibility of much of his work, his role in defining many of the issues in this literature has been somewhat obscured. Yet his 1969 article on the Winnipeg General Strike, "one of the great class confrontations of capitalist history", anticipates much of the more recent literature.³⁸ For example, consider Pentland's conclusions about Winnipeg:

The confusion of ideology and tactics, indeed goes to the heart of the General Strike. Contrary to what the strikers imagined, a general strike (in itself) does not bring the capitalists to their knees; it only makes them close ranks and fight like jungle beasts for their class interests.³⁹

Meighen and the Tory government understood this and acted accordingly. Thus "if western labour was far too militantly class-conscious from an employer's point of view, it was not nearly class-conscious enough from a syndicalist and Marxist point of view."⁴⁰ This failure resulted in the crushing of the strike which Pentland correctly viewed as a major defeat for Canadian labour. Although Pentland's analysis is couched throughout in language alien to David Bercuson's recent, *Confrontation at Winnipeg*, the congruence of their arguments is clear.⁴¹

Equally, Pentland's unpublished, 1973 "The Western Canadian Labour Movement, 1897-1919" which he delivered at the Toronto Learned's in 1974, prefigures much of the very recent literature on "western labour exceptionalism". His account, like his successors', suffers from an over-emphasis on the distinctiveness of Western radicalism. This over-emphasis flows partially from the contemporary strength of western regional sentiment — a sentiment that Pentland's work displayed consistently in the 1960's and 1970's — and partially from the frequently articulated sentiments of the western radical leaders themselves. They firmly believed they were distinct from workers

WORKING CLASS STUDIES

unfortunate enough to labour east of the Manitoba-Ontario border. It is not surprising, then, to find historians countenancing these claims. Yet the great danger in the comparative method is that it demands equivalent knowledge about both sides of the equation and neither Pentland, nor more recently, Bercuson and McCormack have sufficiently studied labour in the industrial heartland or in the East.⁴² To identify all of eastern labour with Tom Moore and Gideon Robertson is an error that the western radical leaders began to recognize themselves in 1919, as Gerry Friesen has recently argued.⁴³ My argument with Pentland here, however, only demonstrates his importance to the field, and the consensus of western labour historians lies with his argument at the moment.

If Pentland's Manitoba loyalties were evident in his writings on western labour, his Canadian nationalism also emerges strongly in his last essays. Actually the strength of this nationalism contrasts somewhat with his earlier work. For example, in his response to Aitken's critique of his analysis of early capital accumulation, Pentland argued:

Most merchants eschewed fixed investment not from blindness, but as creatures of a commercial system. That they were not more like American merchants is a consequence rather than a cause of differences in economic structure. It is seldom useful to explain the flow of capital in terms of patriotism or its lack, though it is useful to explain patriotism in terms of the flow of capital.⁴⁴

Moreover in his thesis Pentland had spent considerable time demonstrating the similar role the Canadian and American states had played in nineteenth century economic development. Yet his analysis of Gustavus Myers' *History of Canadian Wealth* moved in the opposite direction. There he criticized Myers for "regarding Canada as a junior and retarded copy of the United States" and emphasized as one major difference the role of the Canadian state with its "pragmatic", "interventionist tradition". The Canadian bourgeoisie also had acted differently, although his example suggests a difference in degree only:

When Canadians were deliberately dishonest, they — unlike American promoters — were apt to be ridden by guilt and impelled to confine their venality to what their consciences could half-justify, rather than all that could be got.⁴⁵

GREGORY S. KEALEY

His stronger nationalism was also slightly evident in his review of Teeple's *Capitalism and the National Question*. He greeted this book generously as "an important addition to our historical resources, marking the debut of a new generation of Marxist scholars."⁴⁶ His general encouragement did not prevent him, however, from pointing out that often in the collection "the application of Marxist tools is rather limited and awkward."⁴⁷ Here he gave most consideration to Tom Naylor's controversial overview of Canadian economic history. After depicting Naylor as fitting his "image of the young Karl Marx", Pentland contented himself with a summary of the argument which implies criticism but never offers it directly. His summary position is aggravating and perhaps slightly paternalistic:

This is stimulating stuff. The dogmatism and far-fetched generalizations are exasperating, but must be balanced against the promise that when this author gets his welter of ideas sorted out, and has chiselled them into congruence with the historical evidence his contribution to scholarship can be very great.⁴⁸

I wish Pentland had addressed Naylor's work more systematically for there can be little question that the Pentland thesis (and Stanley Ryerson's elaboration of it in *Unequal Union*) provide a rather distinct, opposite view of Canada's nineteenth century industrial capitalist development.⁴⁹

The entire debate on the nature of Canadian industrialization has recently heated up considerably. Naylor's article and his subsequent two volume *History of Canadian Business* have generated much controversy.⁵⁰ It seems rather ironic, however, that Pentland's work is now receiving its due as it gets dragged into the controversy. Ironic not only because his views are often typified as "Ryersonian", despite the heavy debt of gratitude which Ryerson pays to Pentland's prior work, but also because he is drawn into the debate simply to have his views dismissed before the altar of Innis.⁵¹ Thus, Mel Watkins, while recognizing that "We must enquire into the formation of the working class ... a critical matter neglected by Innis and thus far by Naylor,"⁵² still warns us that Pentland "veered more to a Ryersonian than Naylorian view of industrialization, so we need to be on our guard."⁵³ It appears that it never occurs to Watkins that it is precisely Pentland's careful inquiry "into the formation of the working class" which inspires his so-called "Ryersonian" view of Canadian economic development. This "critical matter" is indeed crucial and Watkin's meanderings on a "dependent" working class after 1902 fails to speak to the previous sixty years of working class development in Canada.

WORKING CLASS STUDIES

Watkins, like Drache, only pays lip service to the importance of Pentland's work while in effect, dismissing its most important insights.³⁴ On the other hand recent work in nineteenth century working class history and in social reconstitution has certainly tended to support Pentland's view of industrialization.³⁵

The various controversies which now swirl around Pentland's work would no doubt delight him since they suggest an intellectual and political environment which has finally caught up with the impact, insight and import of his writing. I cannot help but wonder, however, if he too would not appreciate some of the irony of these debates. Unlike Gustavus Myers, at least his work will not have to wait fifty years for recognition.

History
Dalhousie University

Notes

1. H.C. Pentland, "How the wealth was won," *Canadian Forum*, 52, September, 1972, 6-9.
2. Both unpublished University of Toronto, Ph.D. theses — Watt's completed in 1958, Pentland's in 1961.
3. Information as recorded in Judy Mills and Irene Dombra, comps., *University of Toronto Doctoral Theses, 1897-1967*, Toronto: 1968. In 1958, Watt's was only the fifth Toronto English Ph.D. on any aspect of Canadian letters.
4. This limited biographical information is drawn from conversations with W.T. Easterbrook, S.D. Clark and C.B. Macpherson. The University of Toronto political economy department also kindly allowed me to consult Pentland's student file.
5. H.C. Pentland, "The Lachine Strike of 1843," *Canadian Historical Review*, 1948, 255-277; Harold Logan, *Trade Unions in Canada*, Toronto: 1948. For brief discussions of the origins of labour studies in Canada see R.G. Hann, *et al.*, "Introduction," *Primary Sources in Canadian Working Class History*, Kitchener: 1973, and Russell G. Hann and Gregory S. Kealey, "Documenting Working Class History: North American Traditions and New Approaches," *Archivaria*, 4, 1977, 92-114.
6. Pentland, "Lachine Strike," 277.
7. *Ibid.*, 255.
8. See Oscar and Mary Handlin, *Commonwealth: A Study of the Role of Governments in the*

GREGORY S. KEALEY

- American Economy: Massachusetts, 1774-1861*, New York: 1947, and Louis Hartz, *Economic Policy and Democratic Thought: Pennsylvania, 1776-1860*, Cambridge: 1948. For a useful discussion of this literature see Robert Lively, "The American System: A Review Article," *Business History Review*, 29, 1955, 81-96.
9. H.C. Pentland, "The Role of Capital in Canadian Economic Development Before 1875," *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science*, 16, 1950, 457-474.
 10. H.C. Pentland, "Further Observations on Canadian Development," *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science*, 19, 1953, 403-410.
 11. H.C. Pentland, "The Development of a Capitalistic Labour Market in Canada," *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science*, 25, 1959, 450-461.
 12. Pentland, "The Role of Capital", 457.
 13. *Ibid.*, 463.
 14. Pentland, "Labour and Industrial Capitalism", 1-2.
 15. *Ibid.*, 4. Pentland's use of "feudal" is unique. What he means by it is the "labour organization that preceded the free labour market of industrial capitalism, that was not slavery, nor a putting-out system, nor the share system of early capitalist commerce." (64) Thus it is a name he uses for a pre-industrial *but* capitalist form of labour organization and should not be confused with classic European feudalism.
 16. *Ibid.*, 208.
 17. *Ibid.*, 259.
 18. *Ibid.*, 283.
 19. *Ibid.*, 357-8.
 20. *Ibid.*
 21. *Ibid.*, 384.
 22. *Ibid.*
 23. *Ibid.*, 385.
 24. *Ibid.*, 392.
 25. *Ibid.*, 402-3.
 26. *Ibid.*, 406.
 27. *Ibid.*, 421-2.
 28. *Ibid.*, 424-5.
 29. See Daniel Drache, "Rediscovering Canadian Political Economy," *Journal of Canadian Studies*, 11, 3, August 1976, 3-18. In this essay Drache describes Pentland as a "Post-Innisian" "in whose writing we find an elaboration of the Innis model in terms of super-

WORKING CLASS STUDIES

- structural relations." (3) Later he does describe Pentland's thesis an "underground classic" (18) and credits him with "the first substantial Canadian investigation of the working class and the development of the modern industrial relations system." (11)
30. H.C. Pentland, "Feudal Europe: An Economy of Labour Scarcity", *Culture*, 21, 1960, 280-307 at 282.
 31. H.C. Pentland, "Population and Labour Growth in Britain in the Eighteenth Century", in D.C. Eversley, ed., *Third International Conference of Economic History, Munich 1965*, vol. 4, Paris: 1972, 157-189 at 179.
 32. E.J. Hobsbawm, *Industry and Empire*, Harmondsworth, 1969, 44, 55.
 33. H.C. Pentland, "Guaranteed Full Employment: A critique of the New Democratic Party Program," *Canadian Dimension*, November-December 1964, 11-14; "Are Co-operatives the Answer to Foreign Ownership", *Canadian Dimension*, July 1965, 15, 25; "The Role of Labour in Economic Planning for Canada", *Journal of Liberal Thought*, 2, 2, Spring 1966, 85-96; "The Freedman Report", *Canadian Personnel and Industrial Relations Journal*, 13, 1966, 10-24.
 34. H.C. Pentland, "Foreign Ownership", 15.
 35. H.C. Pentland, "The Freedman Report", 10-12.
 36. H.C. Pentland, "Change in the Manitoba Economy" in *Automation and the Individual: Proceedings of the Manitoba Conference on Technological Change*, Winnipeg: 1968.
 37. H.C. Pentland, "Fifty Years After," *Canadian Dimension*, 6, 2, July 1969, 14-17; "How the Wealth was Won," *Canadian Forum*, 52, September 1972, 6-9; "Marx and the Canadian Question," *Canadian Forum*, 54, January 1974, 26-28; "The Western Canadian Labour Movement, 1897-1919", unpublished paper delivered at Canadian Economics Association meetings, Toronto: 1974.
 38. Pentland, "Fifty Years After", 14.
 39. *Ibid.*, 16.
 40. *Ibid.*
 41. David Bercuson, *Confrontation at Winnipeg*, Montreal: 1974, *passim*.
 42. See Ross McCormack, *Reformers, Rebels and Revolutionaries: The Western Canadian Radical Movement, 1899-1919*, Toronto: 1977 and David Bercuson, *Fools and Wise Men: The Rise and Fall of the One Big Union*, Toronto: 1978.
 43. Gerald Friesen, "'Yours in Revolt': Regionalism, Socialism and the Western Canadian Labour Movement", *Labour*, 1, 1976, 139-157.
 44. Pentland, "Further Observations", 409.
 45. Pentland, "How the Wealth was Won", *passim*.
 46. Pentland, "Marx and the Canadian Question", 26.
 47. *Ibid.*, 28.

GREGORY S. KEALEY

48. *Ibid.*, 27.
 49. See Stanley Ryerson, *Unequal Union*, Toronto: 1967 and Ryerson's review of Naylor, "Who's Looking After Business?" *This Magazine* 10, 5 and 6, November - December 1976, 41-46. For an excellent similar critique of Naylor, see Larry MacDonald "Merchants against Industry: An Idea and its Origins", *Canadian Historical Review*, 56, 1975, 263-281. It can be noted that MacDonald acknowledges Pentland's comments and suggestions on this paper. (263)
 50. Tom Naylor, *History of Canadian Business*, 2 vols., Toronto: 1975. Much of this debate has been more amusing than enlightening. See especially the Bliss-Naylor exchange in *Social History*, 18, 1976, 446-449 and 19, 1977, 152-163, which reached a vituperative level previously unmatched in Canadian scholarship.
 51. For the "Ryersonian" typification and for a general example of this tendency, see Mel Watkins, "The Staple Theory Revisited", *Journal of Canadian Studies*, 12, 5, Winter 1977, 82-95.
 52. *Ibid.*, 90.
 53. *Ibid.*, 91.
 54. *Ibid.*, 88-92. Note especially "[Pentland's thesis] still — incredibly — unpublished. Pentland deserves great credit for working within the Marxist paradigm when it was distinctly unusual to do so, and the tendency for his work to be ignored by the mainstream of Canadian economic historians — including myself [Watkins] in the 1963 article — tells us much about the limitations of orthodox economics as it impinges on economic history." Indeed! (95 n. 49)
 55. Bryan Palmer, "Most Uncommon Common Men: Craft, Culture and Conflict in a Canadian Community, 1860-1914", unpublished Ph.D. thesis, State University of New York at Binghamton, 1977 and Gregory S. Kealey, "The Working Class Response to Industrial Capitalism in Toronto, 1867-1892," unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Rochester, 1977. Both of these theses, on Hamilton and Toronto respectively, demonstrate the high level of industrialization attained by the early 1870's. They also are both more concerned with the details of that transformation of production than was Pentland. Another study supportive of Pentland's view is Stephen Langdon, *The Emergence of the Canadian Working Class Movement*, Toronto: 1975. Finally, Michael Katz's Hamilton project has now generated very interesting material on industrialization and on the development of class.
-