

**Kent State University Libraries (KSU)
Interlibrary Loan**

ILLiad TN: 168720 Odyssey / ODYSSEY



Borrower: AKR

In Process Date: 20070102

Lending String: *KSU, MIA, CWR, OSU, OSU

Patron: Williams, Dana

Journal Title: International labor and working class history.

Volume: 69 Issue:

Month/Year: Spring 2006 Pages: 210-213

Article Author:

Article Title: Williams, Dana; For Workers' Power; The Selected Writings of Maurice Brinton (Book Review)

Imprint: New Haven, CT ; Study Group on Internati

ILL Number: 26325555



Call #:

Location: C

Charge

Maxcost: \$50IFM

Shipping Address:

University of Akron

Bierce Library, ILL

315 Buchtel Mall

Akron OH 44325-1706

Fax: 330-972-6383

Ariel:



turned to what she calls a “paternalistic contract” that enticed rather than coerced policemen to make their vocation a career. Strikes in 1872 and 1890 had warned administrators and politicians that the physical and emotional demands of London police work threatened to undo modest progress toward professionalization. In response, the London Metropolitan Police offered better pay, improved benefits, merit-based promotion standards, livable pensions, paid leaves, and other enticements to convince police to stay on the force for the long term and thus help produce a consolidated professional force with its own cultural and social cohesion.

Shpayer-Makov offers some predictable but nonetheless interesting findings: promotion proved extremely difficult and limited for most policemen; steady employment rather than financial mobility motivated many recruits to first join the force then make police work a career; and creating standardized recruiting practices to produce the sort of force originally envisioned by Sir Robert Peel and early leaders of the Metropolitan Police took decades. Ultimately, the Metropolitan Police became a model of successful labor-management relations.

Shpayer-Makov has made a significant contribution to police scholarship and labor history, indeed also social history. The framework of treating the London Metropolitan Police as a work force rather than crime fighters offers a new and interesting means to look at Victorian and Edwardian era labor and process of how a vocation became a professional career. Successful stabilization and professionalization during a time of great labor upheaval in Europe and the United States is a testament to the progressive tactics and strategies used by the London Metropolitan Police. Indeed, this evolution, much like what the United States military experienced during the same period, was and could still be considered on the cutting edge of labor-management relations and professionalization for then as well as now.

This is solid history. Students and scholars alike in police history, criminal justice, social history, labor history, even sociology, will find this book useful and stimulating. Its price is prohibitive, which is not Shpayer-Makov’s problem but rather that of the publisher. Get the library to buy it.

William Thomas Allison
Weber State University

David Goodway, ed., *For Workers’ Power: The Selected Writings of Maurice Brinton*. Oakland: AK Press, 2004. 379 pp. \$24.00 paper.

Maurice Brinton is the penname for the distinguished British neurologist and revolutionary socialist Chris Pallis. As “Brinton,” Pallis wrote highly influential propaganda for the British group Solidarity from the early 1960s through the 1970s. Solidarity published a magazine of the same name for years, and participated in the United Kingdom’s antinuclear and labor movements. According to

this volume's editor, David Goodway, Brinton was the intellectual mainstay of Solidarity and was the group's most frequent author.

For Workers' Power is a rousing collection of dozens of essays written over a period of decades by Brinton, including analytical and philosophical pieces, eyewitness accounts, and book reviews. Brinton was widely known as the English translator of the French libertarian-socialist Cornelius Castoriadis, and this volume includes a number of reviews and introductions to Castoriadis's work. All essays permeate with an intensely critical eye toward how everyday working people have and can liberate themselves from the oppression, drudgery, and weight of capitalism, while avoiding what Brinton saw as pseudo- or counterrevolutionary methods of many leftists.

Brinton slays many of the Left's sacred cows: he hits the left-liberal political parties for their reformism, big trade unions for their hierarchy and disconnect from rank-and-file, and the main socialist and Leninist-Marxists groups for their power-lust and vanguardism. He even gives the anarchists, with whom he has the strongest affinity, an occasional lashing for some of their adherent's rashness and fantasy.

But, he reserves his strongest criticism for his fellow so-called revolutionaries who adhere to the dogma of Marxist-Leninism. Although he continually, and sometimes favorably, returns to quoting Marx, Lenin, and Trotsky, he still laments their actions as activists and the actions of those who later use their words for a laundry-list of what Brinton perceives as sell-outs of the working class. His favorite criticism of Lenin, which appears repeatedly throughout this volume, is Lenin's distrust and lack of faith in everyday working people. Brinton, as a proponent of revolutionary social action by all people, particularly workers, finds Lenin's position abhorrant: "the working class . . . is able to develop only trade union consciousness." Brinton's own eyewitness accounts of workers in Belgium, France, and Portugal, as well as his analysis of workers elsewhere seems to suggest the obvious; workers have repeatedly acted beyond the confines of their union and forged revolutionary situations which have allowed for larger gains than a union bureaucracy could. To further illustrate his argument, Brinton notes how the very followers of Lenin are often those who work to reign in the very workers who are "unable" to rise above union consciousness, but seem to be doing it all the same. The "functionalist" role of unions to buffer the working and elite classes, and to normalize and regulate class conflict is implicit in Brinton's observations, just as in Stanley Aronowitz's (1973) important work, *False Promises*.

Brinton's political ideology is explicitly anti-authoritarian socialist. To the average observer, this critique would seem, superficially, no different from the average capitalist cheerleader. However, Brinton's continuous flaying of Stalinists, Leninists, and Trotskyists stems not just from a political repulsion to their written and spoken dogma, but from his repeated observations of these forces selling-out working-class interests when solidarity is needed most. His writing thus appears to be more "left" than even the so-called "ultra-left." He lambastes the Belgian Communist Party for trying to takeover and control

the country's general strike in late 1960. Using compelling evidence, he accuses the French Communist Party of sabotaging the popular strikes in Paris in 1968 by trying to encourage workers to return to their factories in exchange for miniscule improvements in their jobs—and political rewards for Party honchos. Brinton's popular pamphlet *The Bolsheviks and Workers Control* (fully included in the volume) is a merciless critique of how Lenin squeezed economic control from the Soviets by the cynical idea of “worker control,” which amounted to little control, let alone self-management.

A few pieces are introductions to or reviews of articles about historic events. Brinton provides a critical lens to new interpretations of historic events like the Paris Commune, the Kronstadt sailors' revolt in the Soviet Union, and the dissolution of the factory committees by the Bolsheviks. He also editorializes from afar about unfolding events in Europe, including a general strike in Ulster, Northern Ireland, a factory occupation in Kirkby, England, and the materialization of the independent labor movement in Poland during 1980.

In addition to the excellent first-hand accounts of workers involved in struggles for self-management, the surprising treat in *For Workers' Power* is Brinton's review of the influential books of his time. It is easy in retrospect to critique decades-old works with 20-20 hindsight, but Brinton applies a thoughtful analysis of books at the time when the events were still taking place. The Paris student and worker uprising of May 1968, captured in Cliff and Birchall's pamphlet *France: The Struggle Goes On* and the Cohn-Bendit brothers' *Obsolete Communism: The Left-Wing Alternative* book are dissected as the hot, current events they were at the time. Contemporary readers would be left digesting these works three decades after being published, without knowing how authoritative other activists viewed them to be.

If one expects a dry, unemotional account of these momentous events, Brinton's activist-cum-historian writing will be startling. Although very precise and accurate with his accounting, he clearly has taken sides in these matters—he is on the side of the workers, always. His writing intends to inform readers about past events, but it is always directed toward the goal of solving the shortcomings of the working classes in these events; he uses history as a tool to inform future uprisings, strikes, and revolutions.

One wonders what he might have thought about non-European revolts, such as anticolonial or US civil-rights movements. Would his critique of class allow for the consideration of racial conflict? This omission may be a simple reflection of where Brinton's focus tends to be: on European class conflict. During the period he writes of, most anticolonial and antiracist struggles took place in Asia, Africa, and the Americas. The reader could count the number of times that race is even *mentioned* on one hand, and it is usually done descriptively not analytically. Very little is written about nationalist movements, nor on other issues of contemporary concern, such as today's so-called “new social movements” like the peace, environmental, feminist, and GLBT

movements—although this deficit may be the result of a deliberate choice made by the editor, not the author.

Although eschewing the “anarchist” label, Brinton’s work is undeniably anarchistic in nature. Yet, the period in which he mostly wrote (the 1960s and 1970s) the British anarchist movement was lackluster to say the least. As such, Brinton seems to have a lack of anarchist writing in his background and subsequently does not pull ideas from anarchist or libertarian works as much as he does from Marxist-Leninist ones. As a result, in his review of Paul Avrich’s *The Russian Anarchists*, he misunderstands Kropotkin’s basic argument in *Mutual Aid* (1902) that cooperation is merely another force of human evolution, not the counterpoint to competition (86). Additionally, he misses the many sources where Kropotkin observes and does argue for class conflict; Brinton is thus caught replicating the common Marxist-Leninist arguments against and misunderstandings of Kropotkin and other anarchists.

These deficits aside, the anarchist publisher AK Press saw fit to publish this historically important and contemporary collection of writings. Brinton’s writings have long-inspired left and radical movements, and hopefully with this printing will reach even wider audiences.

Dana Williams
University of Akron

John T. Chalcraft, *The Striking Cabbies of Cairo and other Stories: Crafts and Guilds in Egypt, 1863–1914*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2005. xiv + 345 pp. \$95.00 cloth; \$24.95 paper.

John T. Chalcraft’s manuscript takes us on a labyrinth voyage of Egyptian guilds, crafts, and service workers from the end of the cotton boom of 1863 to the end of the First World War. He retrieves Cairo’s cabdrivers, butchers, donkey boys, weighers, porters, masons, dyers, tailors, fishermen, and carpenters from dusty archives, old books and magazines and, by tracing their imprints, puts them back on the map of Egyptian nationalism and trade unionism in the twentieth century. Chalcraft, in producing this manuscript, imitates his subject matter. He uses unexplored archives, other scholars’ explorations, and an elaborate production scheme to produce a unique artifact.

The subaltern groups of Cairo, thanks to an abundance of literature on the unevenness of capitalism, state formation, and social movements, reveal to a meticulous researcher that they are an integral part of modern life, regardless of the role assigned them in our immediate past. Guilds, the most predominant forms of social organization of nonagrarian production in the preindustrial epoch, became indispensable to capitalism and modernity. The development of capitalism in the world market intertwined with the formation of a centralized state did not destroy the guilds system, but restructured it and finally transformed guild members to individual laborers involved in professions and