

analysis, a reading of this book does no more than to reinforce our opinion that for Avery, his '*Dangerous Foreigners*' were really dangerous foreigners and—I suspect—he would have treated them openly as brutish beasts but for the imposition of a new climate of toleration in Canada under official multiculturalism.

In this regard, his last paragraph sums up his visceral views very well. He simply ignores the fact that politically sophisticated, radical Ukrainians and Finns were instrumental in *creating and sustaining* the very institutions to which, according to Avery, they were turning for succour. He also ignores the fact that the Anglo-Canadian leadership of the Communist Party of Canada was trying to wrest financial as well as political control of the "ethnic federations", all "in the name of working-class solidarity" as prescribed by Joseph Stalin. Also ignored is the fact that many of these immigrants could best function in their "Ukrainian" or "Finnish" cultural milieu—not because they were stupid or congenitally defective but because they, like Avery, lived within the limitations of their native language and culture. Perhaps the worst omission in this respect is the fact that nowhere is it emphasized that only a portion of the members of these two communities belonged to the radical movement throughout the period of 1896-1932. For, when finally stripped of his own patronizing verbiage, Avery is as cruel an exploiter of the "European immigrants" as the most ruthless and unfeeling capitalist of the period which he discusses. He would despoil the heritage of these groups by committing their history to a cultural strait-jacket of his own manufacture.

Of Book Reviews and Polemics: A Rejoinder to Edward W. Laine*

George Woodcock, another Anglo-Canadian historian who has ventured into the field of ethnic and immigration history, recently made the following comment about negative book reviews: "It is generally agreed among writers that to be condemned is infinitely preferable to being ignored, and that the more elaborate the condemnation the more seriously one is being taken, at least as a threat."¹ On the basis of his review article, Dr. Edward Laine obviously regards *Dangerous Foreigners: European Immigrant Workers and Labour Radicalism in Canada, 1896-1932* (Toronto, 1979) as a very great threat indeed. Thus, readers are told over and over again in his thirteen-page treatise that Dr. Laine is not merely engaged in a scholarly exercise. Rather, he is trying to preserve the Canadian commitment "to provide the 'linguistically alienated' minorities with a cultural stake in the nation."²

The target of this massive assault is a short monograph: one hundred and forty pages of text, and fifty-four pages of notes, charts, and bibliographical references. My book is part of McClelland & Stewart's 'Social History Series' which is examining major themes in Canadian history, especially those which have been neglected in past general works.

* My references here to Dr. Laine's article require a word of explanation. When I received page proofs of Dr. Laine's review on 25 March 1980, I immediately requested the editor of *Archivaria* the right of rebuttal. Laine's piece as it came to me was thirteen pages long. Accordingly, my citations give both my pagination (1 to 13) and, in brackets, the pagination of the proofs I received. As far as I know neither the text nor footnotes of the Laine article have been changed since I received them in proof form. If, when *Archivaria* finally appears, changes have been made, I would be prepared to send at my expense the original review to which I address this rebuttal.

1 "A Counterblast by George Woodcock," *B.C. Studies* no. 40 (Winter, 1978-79): 71.

2 Laine Review, p. 2 (211).

Let me reiterate what I have attempted to do in the book. '*Dangerous Foreigners*' "is a study of European immigration to Canada between the years 1896 and 1932" with special emphasis on "the part which European immigrant workers played in the rapidly changing economic and social life of the country."³ In this book I suggest that Canadian immigration policy was strongly influenced by spokesmen for labour intensive industries and transportation companies. The result was an unprecedented migration of people into the country and the employment of large numbers of these immigrant workers in industrial jobs. The Canadian experience of these 'newcomers' was often alienating; they tended to be given inferior jobs and, in many instances, encountered irregular employment, low pay and high accident rates. I also attempt to show that large numbers of these workers did not accept their condition in a docile manner; rather a good many of them participated in various forms of collective protest, including membership in militant trade unions and socialist parties. I also make an effort to show that European immigrant workers were the special target of police authorities and the 'pro-business' press, not only because they were vulnerable, but because they were vocal. Finally, and most importantly, I suggest that during periods of economic and social crisis — 1919 and 1931 are examples — influential factions within both the Canadian business community and within Dominion and provincial governments, came to regard militant European workers as an inherently unreliable element in the Canadian labour force and a threat to social order. The techniques of harassment and deportation were often utilized against immigrant 'radicals', especially those associated with syndicalist, socialist and communist organizations.

Far from putting European workers down, my book attributes to them a most significant role in events of the greatest importance. Immigrant workers were not bystanders but active participants in the struggle to secure a more equitable distribution of Canadian economic benefits and to obtain cultural toleration and acceptance.⁴

But this is not how Dr. Edward Laine reads the book. In one of his more charitable comments he describes me as being a person "bound in the strait-jacket of a 'bilingual framework'."

Absurd as this may seem to non-Anglo Canadian scholars, an *idée fixe* still persists among Anglo-Canadian historians that a knowledge of the Queen's English and a good grounding in Canada's 'British' heritage sufficiently equip one to unravel all the skeins of Canada's past. Perhaps the arrogance and sense of superiority contributing to this myopic vision is congenitally endemic to the element of our society which has traditionally formed the *crème de la crème*.⁵

Later in his review Dr. Laine is less subtle both about me and what he calls the "Anglo-Canadian intellectual establishment": "Sadly, in the final analysis, a reading of this book does no more than to reinforce our opinion that, for Avery, his '*Dangerous Foreigners*' were really dangerous foreigners and—I suspect—he would have treated them openly as brutish beasts but for the imposition of a new climate of toleration in Canada under official multiculturalism."⁶

How is this sweeping charge substantiated? Has Dr. Laine found in '*Dangerous Foreigners*' a massive number of inflammatory and racist statements, a multitude of factual errors and a blatant disregard for the scholarship of Canadian immigration, ethnic and labour history. The answer is that he has not. To penetrate the scurrilous language and

3 '*Dangerous Foreigners*', p. 7.

4 Almost all of the reviewers have appreciated this aspect of the study. See, for example, *Canadian Forum*, February 1980, p. 38.

5 Laine Review, p. 4 (213).

6 *Ibid.*, p. 13 (222).

innuendo is to find that most of Laine's complaints revolve around technical errors and difference of interpretations about the Finnish Canadian experience.

About two pages of the text of *Dangerous Foreigners* are devoted to the subject of Finnish immigration to Canada and its labour and political consequences.⁷ By contrast, almost all of Laine's arguments relate to Finnish examples and sources, and many of his footnotes refer to his own work, both published and unpublished. Am I being unfair in suggesting that we are led to believe that the 'seminal' work on Finnish Canadian political behaviour is none other than Edward W. Laine's " 'Finnish Canadian Radicalism and Canadian Politics: The First Forty Years' (Paper delivered at the Biennial Conference of the Canadian Ethnic Studies Association, Vancouver, 11-13 October, 1979)?" Why, the discerning reader might ask, did Avery not use this 'seminal' work in the preparation of *Dangerous Foreigners*? Or again, why did he not use the detailed and convincing work of Varpu Lindstrom-Best and Mauri Jalava which are cited in Laine's review article?⁸ The answer is quite simple: they did not exist when *Dangerous Foreigners* went to press.

Unfortunately, until 1978 there were few studies available either in English or Finnish which dealt with the involvement of Canadian Finns in trade union and socialist movements.⁹ I utilized what printed English sources were available in Canada, and examined most of the studies relating to the American Finnish experience. Not sufficient, thunders Laine; Avery "places too much value on rather *dubious sources*. In footnote 34 *sources* miraculously become source when he deplores the author's *apparent*" reliance on Martha K.C. Allen, "A Survey of Finnish Cultural, Economic and Political Development in this [sic] Sudbury District of Ontario." (M.A. thesis, University of Western Ontario, 1954), a less than objective work written under the influence of the Cold War and informants who were principally 'White' Finns abetted by the fact that Allen could not function in the Finnish language herself."¹⁰ Whatever the merits or demerits of Martha Allen's work, it was cited by me in only two places. On the other hand, I refer in my book to many sources dealing with the North American Finnish experience. Are the works of J. Donald Wilson, Hyman Berman, Nathan Glazer, Ivan Avakumovic, Michael Passi, A.

7 Laine's argument that the author has included all Ukrainians and Finns in radical organizations is clearly refuted in the text. In chapter two there is extended discussion of the problems which Ukrainian and Finnish socialist organizations encountered in securing members; there is also an account of the important role which Ukrainian and Finnish mutual aid societies and churches assumed within these communities. Moreover, in chapter five there are numerous references to the difficulties which organizations such as the Ukrainian Farm Labour Temple Association and the Finnish Organization of Canada had with rival groups such as the Ukrainian Prosvita societies and rival 'White' Finn elements in Canada.

8 Varpu Lindstrom-Best, "The Finnish Immigrant Community of Toronto, 1887-1913" (Toronto, 1979); Mauri A. Jalava, "The Political Reaction of Finnish Factions in the Sudbury Area to the Great Depression." (Paper delivered at the Biennial Conference of the Canadian Ethnic Studies Association, Vancouver, B.C., 11-13 October, 1979). Equally significant is the work of Peter Krats, "Sudburyn Suomalaiset: Finnish Immigrant Activities in the Sudbury Area, 1883-1939," (M.A., University of Western Ontario, submitted for examination, 7 May, 1980). This detailed examination of the Sudbury area Finns was supervised by the author.

9 In a recent article J. Donald Wilson makes the following comment: "Despite the fact that Finnish-Canadians have played a significant role in the development of the labour and radical left movements in Canada, no historical study in English has given due credit to this fact." He makes the following statement in the notes to his article: "Although the only history of the Finns in Canada gives space to this theme, it is essentially a history of the 'church' Finns in Canada. Yrjo Raivio, *Kanadan suomalaisten historia* (Vancouver, 1975). "Matti Kurikka and A.B. Mäkelä: Socialist Thought Among Finns in Canada, 1900-1932," *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, 10, no. 2 (1978): 10, 19.

10 Laine Review, p. 7 (216). Laine does not substantiate his charge that Martha Allen was "under the influence of... 'White Finns'." Do we assume that sources which are listed in her bibliography such as Hannes Sula, *Canadian Suomalaisten Urheilukirja* (Sudbury, Vapaus Publishing Company) and *Suomalaiset Nikkeliäluela* (Sudbury, Vapaus Publishing Company, 1937) are "White" sources?

William Høglund, Michael Karni, Douglas J. Ollila, Jr., P. George Hummasti and Auvo Kostiaainen all to be considered dubious?¹¹ Will these authors now also be singled out for poor scholarship and 'racist' tendencies?

Of course Laine himself is selective in his choice of sources. Amazingly, considering the sub-title of my book, there is not a single reference in his 62 footnotes to any item of scholarship dealing with Canadian immigration policy, Canadian economic development, Canadian political behaviour or Canadian labour history. Familiarity with such sources might have helped Laine understand my purpose of studying how European immigrant workers were affected by the Canadian environment, and how English-speaking Canadians reacted towards these 'newcomers'. But Mr. Laine has much more on his mind than trying to understand how '*Dangerous Foreigners*' fits into the existing historiography; he is too busy finding fault. In his debunking exercise Laine's focus could hardly be more narrow. He is out to discredit by reference to what is seemingly his one area of expertise: Finnish diplomatic history.¹²

From his narrow base of Finnish examples, Laine postures as a European specialist—accusing me in the process of an "appalling lack of understanding of European history."¹³ Significantly, he does not challenge my interpretation of either the social and economic conditions associated with European trans-Atlantic migration or the development of European socialist movements.¹⁴ But he does take violent exception to my *apparent* association of European workers with "a tradition of violence." The truth is that the phrase, "tradition of violence," does not appear in '*Dangerous Foreigners*,' though it is used four times by Laine himself.¹⁵ My phrases for describing some of the characteristics of early European and immigrant working class movements are the following: "collective action," "working class consciousness," "collective violence," "primitive protests," and "mass demonstrations;" they are drawn from the lexicon of social historians like Charles Tilly, Peter Stearns, Herbert Gutman, Eric Hobsbawm and others.¹⁶ My usage is common to contemporary immigration and labour scholarship; Laine's usage, to his great discredit, seems very much of his own making.

-
- 11 Wilson, "Kurikka and Mäkalä;" Berman, "Immigrant Miners and Radicalism on the Mesabi Range," unpublished manuscript, Immigration Archives, University of Minnesota; Nathan Glazer, *The Social Basis of American Communism* (New York, 1961); Ivan Avakumovic, *The Communist Party in Canada* (Toronto, 1975); Michael Passi, "Finnish Immigrants and the Radical Response to Industrial America," in Michael Karni (ed.), *For the Common Good* (Superior, 1977); William Høglund, "Breaking with Religious Tradition: Finnish Immigrant Workers and the Church, 1890-1915," *ibid.*: Michael Karni, "The Founding of the Finnish Socialist Federation and the Minnesota Strike of 1907," *ibid.*; Douglas J. Ollila, Jr., "The Work People's College: Immigrant Education for Adjustment and Solidarity," *Ibid.*; George Hummasti, "'The Working Man's Daily Bread', Finnish American Working Class Newspapers, 1900-1921," *ibid.*; and Auvo Kostiaainen, "The Tragic Crisis: Finnish Canadian Workers and the Civil War in Finland," *ibid.*
- 12 Aside from Laine's recent articles on archival matters, all of his published work relates to his Ph.D. thesis, "Finland's Road from Autonomy to Integration in the Russian Empire, 1808-1910" (McGill University, 1974).
- 13 Laine Review, p. 8 (217).
- 14 '*Dangerous Foreigners*', pp. 36-37, 43-51.
- 15 Laine uses the concept in different ways: on page 8 (217) it is "a tradition of spontaneous violence"; in footnote 40 on the same page it is "as for a tradition of violence Finland possessed none;" and on page 9 (218) it becomes "a presumed innate tradition of violence."
- 16 Charles Tilly and Edward Shorter, *Strikes in France, 1830-1968* (London, 1974); Peter Stearns and Daniel Walkowitz (ed.), *Workers in the Industrial Revolution: Recent Studies of Labor in the United States and Europe* (New Brunswick, N.J., 1974); H.G. Gutman, "Work, Culture and Society in Industrializing America, 1815-1919," *American Historical Review*, June, 1973; Eric Hobsbawm, *Primitive Rebels: Studies in Archaic Forms of Social Protest Movements in the 19th and 20th Century* (Toronto, 1959). These works are also cited in the chapter two notes of '*Dangerous Foreigners*'.

Nor are Laine's fulminations about my alleged attempts to place workers from Russia, Italy, Austro-Hungary and Finland into a narrow peasant 'strait-jacket' any more convincing. In reality it is Laine who takes the narrow view of the European social background of immigrant workers, especially when he frets about the difference between "illiterate peasants" and "illiterate labourers". *'Dangerous Foreigners'* prefers to follow the lead of social historians such as Stearns, Hobsbawm, Pipes, Barton, and Tarrow.¹⁷ As I wrote in the book: "The peasant face of these societies belies the true nature of their employment patterns. Thus while the traditional life of the land was the focus of work, economic circumstances forced many peasants to become migratory industrial workers for at least a part of the year. The produce of the land and the industrial wage had for some formed the economic package by which they and their families were sustained."¹⁸

Yet even when the differences between various groups of European workers are discussed in *'Dangerous Foreigners'*, Laine is not satisfied. Thus, my statement that in general Finnish immigrants had a "higher level of 'literacy' and educational achievement" compared to immigrants from other eastern and southern European countries is twisted around by Laine for his own purposes.¹⁹ He prefers to see it not as a qualification of a general trend, but rather that 'Avery contradicts himself.' He then turns savagely upon my use of the word 'literacy': "one wonders why the use of quotation marks about the higher level of literacy? Was this doubt according to Avery?"²⁰ Is Laine warning future authors that the use of quotation marks, brackets and commas will hitherto be intensely scrutinized in order to detect latent bigotry?

One of Laine's few Canadian examples is to be found in footnote 46. Here he accuses me of referring to the series of strikes at the Lakehead between 1906 and 1909 as an attempt "to put the onus upon the immigrant workers in matters of violence."²¹ In trying to support this allegation Laine once again misses an opportunity to delve into Canadian historiography: no reference is made to Jean Morrison's, "Community and Conflict: A Study of the Working Class and its Relationship at the Canadian Lakehead, 1903-1913" (M.A. thesis, Lakehead University, 1974), or her article on the same subject; together they form the most complete study of this subject.²² Instead, Laine builds his case upon one letter which Prime Minister Borden sent to the Chairman of the Grain Commission in October 1917, eleven years after the events I described.²³ This type of documentation would test the credulity of even the most naive student of history!

Again in his charge that I have ignored government and corporate coercion, Laine shows that he has not read my book very carefully. For example, in describing the events at the Lakehead I refer to "the Canadian Pacific and Canadian Northern, companies well

17 Laine is confused about the phrase "illiterate peasants": my words were "illiterate labourers". This makes his subsequent tirade about the differences between peasant and crofter seem even more superfluous. *'Dangerous Foreigners'*, p. 49; Laine Review, p. 8 (217). Richard Pipes, *Social Democracy and the St. Petersburg Labour Movement, 1885-1897* (Cambridge, Mass., 1963); Joseph Barton, *Peasants and Strangers: Italians, Rumanians and Slovaks in an American City, 1890-1950* (Cambridge, Mass., 1975); Sidney Tarrow, *Peasant Communism in Southern Italy* (London, 1967). Other Finnish scholars do not appear to share Laine's concern about the term 'peasant'. L.A. Puntilla, for example, in his book, *The Political History of Finland, 1809-1966* (London, 1975) describes the goals of the Finnish Agrarian Union as follows: the tradition of peasant freedom was its ideal," p. 90.

18 *'Dangerous Foreigners'*, p. 43.

19 *ibid.*, p. 62.

20 Laine Review, p. 8 (217), ft. 40. The second bracket was not inserted so it is difficult to know where Laine wanted his comments to end.

21 *Ibid.*, p. 9 (218), ft. 46.

22 Jean Morrison, "Ethnicity and Violence: The Lakehead Freight Handlers Before World War I," in Gregory Kealey and Peter Warrrian (eds.), *Essays in Canadian Working Class History* (Toronto, 1976), pp. 143-160.

23 Laine Review, p. 9 (218), ft. 46.

versed in the techniques of corporate coercion." My book also describes how during the 1912 IWW railway strike the British Columbia provincial police assumed a major role on the corporate side of the struggle "closing down IWW camps and intimidating union organizers." In a section on World War I the repression of certain groups of European immigrants is described as follows: "By the spring of 1928 the Dominion government was under great pressure to place all foreign workers under supervision and, if necessary, to make them work 'at the point of a bayonet'."²⁴ These and other citations surely render ludicrous Laine's charge that I "would prefer to put the onus upon the immigrant workers in matters of violence."²⁵

Given this feeble Canadian material it is not surprising that Laine should rely so heavily on his Finnish sources. But even on his home ground he is not always convincing. For example, he denies that "collective protest" and "collective" violence were part of Finnish history: "As for a tradition of violence," he writes, "Finland possessed none."²⁶ He therefore takes great exception to this passage from *'Dangerous Foreigners'*: "In Finland the labour and socialist movements had both class and national characteristics. Indeed, the 1901 conscription riots and the 1905 general strike in that country were as much directed against Russification as against capitalism."²⁷ The fact that the passage from my book does not suggest a "tradition of violence" (Laine's term), but rather looks at specific events has been lost on him. Moreover, in trying to substantiate his argument of a "quiet Finland" Laine provides a rather questionable interpretation of events in Finland between 1900 and 1920: Finnish opposition to Russification is described as incorporating various "orderly forms of premeditated protest" (whatever that means); the General Strike of 1905 is portrayed as being "imported into Finland from Russia via the railway workers."²⁸ More established Finnish scholars such as L.A. Pontila and A.F. Upton have, however, demonstrated that the civil unrest in Finland in these years was somewhat more extensive, the presence of Russian military units and the activities of the secret police notwithstanding.²⁹ As Pontila has written: "Eugen Schauman's assassination of Bobrikov (the Russian Governor General) on June 16, 1904 was an expression of the prevailing mood." This same author also points out that during the 1905 General Strike "para-military organizations existed in Finland . . . two guards were formed; one bourgeois, the other working class." He also documents how these two sides came into collision during the Finnish Civil War of 1918: "Both during the struggle and after the victory of legal government the spirit of revenge dictated the use of violence."³⁰ Unless this source is also a "dubious one," Laine's portrayal of a "quiet Finland" is not persuasive.

24 *'Dangerous Foreigners'*, pp. 52, 55, 74.

25 Despite his claim that he has consulted my article, "Continental European Immigrant Workers in Canada, 1896-1919: From 'Stalwart Peasants' to Radical Proletariat," *The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, no. 1 (1975), Laine conveniently neglects to mention the critical stance which I adopt on the matter of government coercion of immigrant activists. Moreover, he manages to overlook altogether my detailed and critical account of the policies which the Winnipeg Citizens Committee of One Thousand, and the Borden government directed against non-British residents of Winnipeg: "The Radical Alien and the Winnipeg General Strike of 1919," in Ramsay Cook and Carl Berger, *The West and the Nation* (Toronto, 1974), pp. 209-231.

26 Laine Review, p. 8 (217), ft. 40.

27 *'Dangerous Foreigners'*, p. 49.

28 Laine Review, p. 8 (217), ft. 40.

29 L.A. Pontila, *The Political History of Finland, 1809-1966* (London, 1975); A.F. Upton, *The Communist Parties of Scandinavia and Finland* (London, 1973), pp. 106-151. The debate about whether Finland is a Nordic or an Eastern European country is very interesting, but it is not central to my work. After all Finland was part of the Russian Empire for most of the period which the book covers.

30 Pontail, *Political History of Finland*, pp. 62, 104-105, 109.

It is not my intention to become involved in a prolonged debate about Finnish history. My purpose here is to point out that Laine's views are often at variance with more established scholars, and that my book is not about Finland but about Canada—how European immigrant workers were influenced by the Canadian capitalistic labour market, and how these workers influenced Canadian society, especially the Canadian labour movement. What errors then has Laine found which relate to my primary purpose?

Quite clearly my account of Matti Kurikka's activities between 1905 and 1908 is not accurate, but correcting this would not necessarily change my argument that Finnish intellectuals such as Kurikka influenced Finnish Canadian socialist and labour movements. Nor am I convinced that Laine's attempts to belittle the role of Kurikka is accurate: "His [Kurikka's] influence with the mainstream radical movement amongst Finnish Canadians was already well ended before his two failures."³¹ Here Laine's views should be compared to J. Donald Wilson's extensive work on the subject.³² In a recent article Wilson has described Kurikka's impact as follows: "Kurikka performed a very important service in making socialist, theosophist and anti-clerical ideas better known among Finns in both the United States and Canada. In his way, he was an important precursor to the Marxian-minded socialists who took the centre stage among Finnish radicals both before and after World War I."³³

Equally contentious is Laine's curt dismissal of other Finnish intellectuals such as Martin Hendrickson, Antero Tanner and Leo Laukki: "Finnish labour radicals were most emphatically not followers of intellectuals amongst them."³⁴ This statement is not substantiated, and the reader must have faith that somewhere in Laine's unpublished paper "Finnish Canadian Radicalism" evidence will be provided. But lacking this 'seminal' work we must rely on other sources in trying to understand the development of Finnish Canadian labour and socialist organizations. Fortunately, scholars such as George Hummasti and Douglas Ollila, Jr. have shown that Finnish intellectuals such as Laukki were able to reach Canadian Finns through a variety of newspapers and educational institutions. Laukki, for example, was editor of *Työmies* (Worker) in 1911 and *Industrialisti* (Industrialist) in 1917; he was also director of the Work People's College in Duluth, an institution which attracted Canadian as well as American Finns.³⁵ Such evidence makes Laine's statement that Laukki "never had any influence in Canada" appear rather 'dubious'.³⁶

Dr. Laine and I also have our difference about the activities of other North American Finnish political activists. For example, on page five (214) of his review Laine takes exception to my account of the organizational work of John Ahlqvist, A.T. Hill and Arvo Vaara prior to World War I.³⁷ He admits that Ahlqvist was indeed a major organizer, but

31 Laine Review, p. 8 (217), ft. 38. What does Laine mean by "mainstream radical movement," Was it membership in the IWW? Was it membership in a trade union affiliated with the Canadian Trades and Labor Congress? Was it membership in a congregation of the Finnish Evangelical Lutheran Church? Laine's use of the term "well before" is equally disturbing. Was it 1889? Was it 1899?

32 J. Donald Wilson, "Matti Kurikka: Finnish Canadian Intellectual," *B.C. Studies*, no. 20 (Winter, 1973-4): 50-65; Wilson, "Kurikka and Makela," pp. 10-19; Wilson, "Kurikka and Mäkelä," p. 15.

33 Wilson, "Kurikka and Mäkelä," p. 15.

34 Laine Review, p. 10 (219), ft. 51.

35 George Hummasti, "Finnish-American . . . Newspapers," pp. 182-186; Douglas J. Ollila, Jr., "Work People's College," pp. 93, 102-103.

36 Laine Review, p. 8 (217), ft. 38.

37 Laine's views about the contest between the leadership of the Finnish Organization of Canada and the editors of *Vapaus* on the one hand, and the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Canada on the other are open to question. For an amplification of what I said in 'Dangerous Foreigners' see Peter Krats, "Sudburyn Suomalaiset."

dismisses Hill and Vaara as being “too young.” Yet Hill, in his memoirs, “Historic Basis and Development of the Lumber Workers Organization and Struggle in Ontario,” declared that he was “a member of the Social Democratic Party of Canada since 1913.”³⁸ Vaara’s activities are somewhat more obscure, although his testimony before the Immigrants Deportation Board in May 1932 indicated that he had come to Canada in 1908, and had been in contact with other Finnish workers in a number of lumber camps in Canada and the United States prior to 1914.³⁹

When Laine ventures away from Finnish affairs to more general questions his criticisms of my book are even more peculiar. On page twelve (221) of his review he makes the following denunciation of *‘Dangerous Foreigners’*: “In excluding the French, the Blacks, the Orientals, the Amerinds, the farmers but not harvesters, the urban workers, women, West Europeans and Scandinavians, the remaining group of ‘immigrants’ is rather small—especially when only the radicals from this group is to be considered.”⁴⁰ This sentence does not fairly represent the point of view which I argued in the introduction of my book; in particular, unlike Dr. Laine, I do not regard French Canadians and Amerinds as immigrants in this period of Canadian history.⁴¹ Equally strange is Laine’s complaint that I have not shown how it is possible “to separate the urban and agricultural elements from the mass of these groups.”⁴² Apparently Laine has misunderstood the argument I develop in both the introduction and chapter one that “geographical mobility and occupational pluralism typified the European immigrant experience in this period” (1896-1932). Thousands of these men shifted between various types of employment in their desperate search for a living wage: “such occupational diversity belies the simple division of the world of work into agricultural and non-agricultural categories.”⁴³ Laine seems to prefer a rigid categorization with everyone having *one* occupation and *one* place of residence. Perhaps this is how Dr. Laine finds his small group of European immigrants.

On pages ten and eleven of his review, Laine takes great exception to my “concerted efforts to differentiate between immigrants to Canada.” There were not, he maintains, fundamental differences between English-speaking immigrants and those from continental Europe: “even the more ‘desirable’ classes of English-speaking immigrants, whether from Great Britain or the United States encountered the same problems. Have there not also been signs declaring that ‘English need not apply’?”⁴⁴ Indeed there have, but my book does not argue the contrary. There were, of course, times when British immigrant workers could not find jobs in Canada, especially during periods of unemployment such as in 1907 and 1913. That some Canadian employers viewed British

38 Laine Review, p. 10 (219); Hill, “Historic Basis,” p. 2. Laine’s comments about the Hill source on page 3 (212), ft. 10 are very strange. In *‘Dangerous Foreigners’*, p. 159, ft. 79, the full citation for the Hill document is given; it is then described as a “memoir”. Still another distortion on the part of Laine is his accusation that on page 79 of *‘Dangerous Foreigners’* there is a quotation from the Hill “memoirs”; there is no such quotation, merely an acknowledgement of the source.

39 Public Archives of Canada, Immigration Branch Records, file 513116, Immigration Board of Inquiry, 7 May, 1932. Hill was seventeen in 1914 and Vaara twenty-four. Were they “obviously too young” to have been involved in socialist organizations? Lenin was seventeen and Trotsky twenty when they began their involvement with Russian revolutionary groups.

40 Laine Review, p. 12 (221). Ironically this statement about the “small group of radicals remaining seems to indicate Laine’s recognition that the sections of *‘Dangerous Foreigners’* dealing with organized dissent apply only to a small number of people from the different ethnic communities of Canada. See footnote 7 of this review.

41 As one study has put it, “In a fairly obvious sense, Canada is the Canadian Indians’ own country. Along with the Inuit, they were well settled here before the arrival of white immigrants from Europe.” Joseph Krauter and Morris Davis, *Minority Canadians: Ethnic Groups* (Toronto, 1978), p. 7.

42 Laine Review, p. 12 (221).

43 *‘Dangerous Foreigners’*, p. 8.

44 Laine Review, pp. 10, 11 (219-220).

workers unfavourably is clearly indicated in chapter one of *'Dangerous Foreigners'*: "By 1900 the CPR had apparently decided that [British]... immigrants made poor construction workers... not only were they unwilling to tolerate low wages and primitive working conditions, but they could use the English-language press to focus public attention on their grievances."⁴⁵ Similarity in "Language and culture," "occupation and place of residence" provided British immigrants with great advantages over other immigrant groups in adjusting to Anglo-Canadian society. While the works of Charlotte Erickson and other immigration historians has modified somewhat the view that British immigrants had *no* difficulty in accommodating themselves to the North American environment, their writings by no means support Laine's contention that British immigrants "encountered the same problems" as Eastern and Southern European 'newcomers'.⁴⁶

An even more powerful antidote to Laine's *bonne entente* view is to be found in contemporary reports such as *The Royal Commission to Inquire into the Immigration of Italian Labourers to Montreal, and Alleged Fraudulent Practices of Employment Agencies* (Ottawa, 1904), *The Report of the Ontario Commission on Unemployment* (Toronto, 1915) and various surveys of the Immigration Branch. Accounts in labour newspapers such as the *B.C. Federationist* and *Robotchny Narod (Working People)* further illustrate the specific disadvantages which European immigrant workers faced in Canada.

Certain technical aspects of *'Dangerous Foreigners'* have also excited Dr. Laine. One of these is the picture which McClelland & Stewart chose to put on the cover of the book. The failure of the publisher to indicate any more than the source of the photograph is cited as further evidence of *my* insensitivity towards the plight of European immigrant workers.⁴⁷ Curiously, Laine does not mention the one photograph to be found in the book itself which shows members of the Port Arthur Finnish Social Democratic Party at their 1914 convention. The men in the photograph are wearing suits, shirts and ties and do not at all conform to the two options which Laine creates on page three (212) of his review: "a paramilitary organization of 'dangerous foreigners' about to strike the CPR or simply a group of the 'boys' down from the farm dressed to impress the local 'straw boss' into hiring them." (p. 11) Unfortunately, the four pages of photographs which were scheduled to

45 *'Dangerous Foreigners'*, p. 25.

46 Laine's case might be stronger if it was based on something more than intuition. As it is, Charlotte Erickson, *'Invisible Immigrant's: The Adaptation of English and Scottish Immigrants to Nineteenth America* (Cambridge, 1953); Rowland Berthoff, *British Immigrants in Industrial America* (Cambridge, 1953); and Lloyd Reynolds, *The British Immigrant* (Toronto, 1935) all decisively refute his hypothesis. Significantly, Laine also overlooks an article which I wrote on the subject of British immigrant workers in Canada: "British-born "Radicals in North America, 1900-1914: The Case of Sam Scarlett," *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 10, no. 2 (1978): 65-85.

47 Laine Review, pp. 2-3 (211-212).

accompany the text were not included by the publisher.⁴⁸ Equally unfortunate was the fact that the text had to be shortened by twenty pages between the original submission of the manuscript in September 1978 and its publication in May 1979. Some, but not all, of the typographical errors occurred in this condensation. Obviously, more attention should have been paid to the correct spelling of the names of men such as R.V. Rosvall and J. Voutilainen, and in securing the most appropriate translation of the word *Vapaus*.

In the space provided by the editors of *Archivaria* it is not possible to answer all of Laine's criticisms and accusations, but I think I have been able to deal with the most important of them. That the book has imperfections is not to be denied: I am always grateful for constructive criticism, and the appropriate changes will be made in the second printing. But to have a reviewer lash out in the manner of Dr. Edward Laine is quite extraordinary. What has he proved? How many errors has he detected? The tally is as follows: an inaccuracy about Matti Kurikka's activities between 1905 and 1908; confusion between Karvia commune and Karvia province; the mis-spelling of Rosvall and Voutilainen; an inaccurate translation of the word *Vapaus*; and three imperfect citations in 528 chapter notes.⁴⁹ Having found these many faults, Dr. Laine builds quite a fantastic case.⁵⁰ I am accused of "radical-revisionist chic" (whatever that is); of writing "a seriously flawed and grossly insulting account of Canada's multicultural past." I am not only a "huckster," but someone who has done "much violence to history." Worse, I am made the villain in the very history I have written about. I would, Laine writes in a passage that violates academic decency, have treated European immigrant workers "openly as brutish beasts."⁵¹

Language of this type has no place in an academic journal; invective is a poor substitute for scholarship.⁵² But then Dr. Laine is a man with a mission. On page four of his review he writes about "the insularity of the Anglo-Canadian intellectual establishment" which has been "further nurtured by its tendency to authoritarianism. He links this "establishment" to "the element of our society which has traditionally formed the *crème de la crème*." Laine's special target among Anglo-Canadian intellectuals are those who have discovered "that there is untold fame and fortune to be gained from the exploitation of 'multicult'."⁵³

48 Laine's attitude towards McClelland & Stewart is interesting. On page two (211) they are a "huckstering" irresponsible press; on page four (213) they become "respectable Anglo-Canadian publishers." The negative view does, however, prevail. In this context, it is perhaps worth pointing out that the phrase "radical revisionist chic" is Dr. Laine's, and not McClelland & Stewart's as he implies on page two (211).

49 Most of the chapter notes are multiple citations; there are probably closer to 1200 citations.

50 Laine's pursuit of me has taken him back to my Ph.D. dissertation, "Canadian Immigration Policy and the Alien Question; The Anglo-Canadian Perspective" (University of Western Ontario, 1973). This work is also judged 'unsatisfactory': "an exercise in the avoidance of having to do research in the 'non-official' languages." This line of attack, of course, relieves Laine of the burden of disproving my account of the Canadian immigration experience, or the experience of European immigrants in Canada.

51 Laine Review, pp. 11 (221), 4 (213), 9 (218), 13 (222).

52 I am astonished at Laine's account of his verbal triumph of me at the Biennial Conference of the Canadian Ethnic Studies, Vancouver, October 11-13, 1979. I don't remember using the phrase "traditional violence" either in my paper or in my answer to questions: I defy Laine to prove otherwise. The paper I read in Vancouver, "Ethnic Loyalties and the Proletarian Revolution: A Case Study of Communist Political Activity in Winnipeg, 1923-1936," which Laine incorrectly cites, attempts to show how ethnic communities,—in this case the Ukrainians in Winnipeg's North End—could utilize the political system in order to secure social rewards. Hardly the 'stuff' of Laine's "tradition of violence." Laine Review, p. 9 (218), ft. 45.

53 Laine Review, p. 4 (213).

Now what does all this mean? Does it mean, I wonder, that anyone who publishes in Canadian immigration, ethnic and labour history without using all “the records created by the ‘immigrants’ themselves” will be branded as a “huckster,” or worse? How many will be able to pass the language test which Laine seems to regard as the sole criterion for the immigration historian? Alas, few will survive the purge; those remaining will be fearful of venturing outside the boundaries of their own ethnic speciality. Ethnic and immigration history in Canada must be open to all who can contribute. Nothing could be more foolish than to make it the preserve of one group or faction.

‘Dangerous Foreigners’ has now received ten positive reviews: they have come from journalists such as Frank Walker, former editor of the *Montreal Star*, Ken Adachi, ethnic historian and writer, and labour historians Bryan Palmer and Paul Craven.⁵⁴ The negative reviews are from Neil J. Lawrie, a freelance journalist with the *Winnipeg Tribune*, and Edward Laine—what bunkmates! On the surface the *Tribune* writer seems to differ from Mr. Laine: he objects to my “repeated snipes at the capitalists and the government,” the more so since “so many descendants of these immigrants now enjoy prosperous middle class lives.”⁵⁵ Dr. Laine accuses me, in effect, of being a lackey of these very same interests. Neither Lawrie nor Laine is prepared to accept the past as it really was. Better to see a “quiet Finland” untroubled by class conflict, and European and British workers “encountering the same problems.” Alas, Laine does not extend this decorum to his scholarly opponents. They are to be harshly pursued, at least those among them who are suspected members of the “Anglo-Canadian intellectual establishment.”

Donald Avery
University of Western Ontario

54 *Montreal Star*, 28 July, 1979; *Toronto Star*, 7 July, 1979; *Queen's Quarterly* Vol. 86, Winter 1979/1980, pp. 596-597; *Canadian Forum*, February 1980, p. 38.

55 *Winnipeg Tribune*, 22 September, 1979.