

also the first to be subject to new forms of commercial entertainment such as the music hall, sports, and the cinema. As wage-earners, they had the cash to take advantage of commodified entertainment.

The disposable income he enjoyed, his lack of discipline and vocational training at work (both associated with the decline of traditional apprenticeships), and the loose control his family exercised over him generated growing middle-class concern regarding the working-class lad. This concern expressed itself in efforts to organize boys' leisure time in youth movements, among which the Boy Scouts are the most prominent. But here too boys exercised their power: too great an attention to the inculcation of middle-class ideals of patriotism, service, and responsibility chased working-class lads away. Accommodation to the desires of working-class lads was necessary — or they would not participate. The effort to cater to the desires of these lads was most apparent at the boys' clubs, whose variety of sports and games made them the most popular of youth movements among the working class.

Childs concludes by linking his discussion of working-class lads to a process of class formation. He argues that the emergence of a new homogeneous working class in Britain was closely tied to the generation he examines, which exhibited "a heightened and more cohesive feeling of class culture and class identity" (p. 162) than previous generations. The shift in working-class support away from the old parties and to the Labour Party (Childs's index of class formation) was generational: "Labour grew, in other words, not only as the unions grew, but as labourites grew up" (p. 161).

As fine as Childs's book is, it is open to criticism on two points in particular. Questions of gender and ethnicity are largely ignored. It is not simply a class that was created, and created itself, over the turn of this century, but a *gendered* class. Integral to the identity of the lad was that *he* was clearly distinguished from *her*. The mechanisms by which this was done and the relationship between questions of gender and class formation are left unexamined.

At the base of Childs's argument regarding the formation of a more homogeneous working class over the turn of this century is the erosion of intra-class divisions based on skill. Relations between ethnicity and the maintenance of intra-class divisions warranted at least limited consideration. The massive Irish immigration earlier in the nineteenth century may or may not have been assimilated to the emerging homogeneous working class of the turn of this century. More recent immigrants such as East European Jews almost certainly were not.

**Robert McIntosh**  
National Archives of Canada

**The Archival Fonds: From Theory to Practice.** TERRY EASTWOOD, ed. Ottawa: Bureau of Canadian Archivists, 1992. ii, 225 p. ISBN 0-9690797-6-1.

In the spring of 1841 Natalis de Wailly admonished the administrators of French departmental archives "to gather together by *fonds*, that is to unite all the deeds which come from a body, an establishment, a family, or an individual." Over time his simple statement has assumed its place as a (if not *the*) central tenet of the archival profession. The concept has taken on the aura of religious doctrine and, like its religious counterparts, has been the object of considerable analysis and interpretation by adherents. Examination of Wailly's message appears to have increased in recent years, perhaps because the temptations of the modern world threaten to interfere with our intent to heed it.

*The Archival Fonds* is a comprehensive attempt to explore Canadian understanding of Wailly's key concept. The monograph consists of four essays. In the first, editor Terry Eastwood sets out to introduce the other three contributions, but cannot resist exploring the topic on his own. In so doing he calls attention to what is the central problem for Wailly's latter-day disciples:

delineation of the boundary between one fonds and another. The solution, according to Eastwood, requires expertise in archival systems analysis; that is, the ability to recognize the structure formed by records that result from activities carried out in pursuit of a specific authorized function.

Essayists Terry Cook (representing English-speaking Canada) and James Lambert and Jean-Pierre Therrien (representing French-speaking Canada) do not so much examine the theory of the fonds as evaluate the effectiveness of a set of criteria governing practices associated with it. These criteria, intended to help archivists recognize entities that qualify as creators of fonds, were devised several years ago by Michel Duchemin. They are described in his article, "Theoretical Principles and Problems of Respect des fonds in Archival Science" (*Archivaria* 16 [Summer 1983], pp. 64-82). Cook, Lambert, and Therrien agree that while Duchemin's criteria *are* very helpful, they are not definitive, particularly where components of a bureaucracy are involved.

Lambert and Therrien thoroughly document the fonds-related uncertainties that linger in post-Duchemin Quebec. Should a fonds be broadly (maximally) or narrowly (minimally) construed? Does the concept of the fonds apply throughout the life cycle of records/archives? What happens to the boundary of a fonds when a given record-keeping responsibility changes hands in mid-life-cycle? Is the fonds best understood as an intellectual or a physical construct? The two authors emphasize that answers to these questions vary with the orientation of the respondent, and they illustrate this point by citing examples of the treatment of the fonds in various types of archival repositories in Quebec. They conclude that their colleagues are increasingly intent on respecting the fonds, although they may not agree on the means adopted for doing so. Discussion and debate is expected to continue in this arena.

According to Terry Cook, the fonds debate that is likely to continue in Quebec has its English-speaking counterpart. Fonds questions, it seems, know no boundaries. The only difference may be that English speakers are distracted by consideration of the relationship between the fonds and the uniquely Anglo concept of the record group. Cook himself addresses this relationship by contending that it is at present so dysfunctional as to warrant abandonment. In Cook's view, record groups have no place in fonds-based description.

Having dispensed with the record group, Cook proceeds to consider the relationship between the series, or file system, and the fonds. He notes that while such a system *may* fit neatly within the exclusive purview of a single entity that meets Duchemin's criteria for a fonds creator, it is increasingly unlikely that it will do so. Modern record-keeping systems can fit legitimately within the overlapping purviews of multiple qualifying fonds creators, and in so doing present a challenge to archivists wishing to implement Wailly's precept. Some, like Duchemin, prefer to recognize the primacy of one creator and affiliate the system exclusively with the fonds of that creator; others, including Cook, prefer a solution that allows the system to be affiliated with the fonds of all its creators.

In the last essay in this monograph, Heather MacNeil reminds readers that debate and discussion concerning the nature of the fonds should not continue so long as to interfere with descriptive practices that are based upon it. Acknowledging that recognition of the fonds is an arrangement problem and that her chief concern is description, she nevertheless joins the discussion by providing her own overview of the analysis needed to define the structure of a fonds. It is to the successful elucidation of this structure that the *Rules for Archival Description*, issued as a descriptive standard by the Bureau of Canadian Archivists, are dedicated. MacNeil points out that the *Rules* accomplish their purpose through provision of rules for description of the component parts of a fonds at various levels of collectivity (multi-level rules) and through provision of rules for the formulation of access points designed to reveal non-hierarchical structural relationships.

At no point in her discussion does MacNeil suggest that the *Rules* cannot accommodate the results of an arrangement that may assign a given system of records to more than one fonds. If it is true that the *Rules* are so accommodating, then it would appear that they could continue to serve as an archival catechism regardless of the outcome of the theological debate and discussion that the other authors of the volume have engaged in and hope will continue. *Archivaria* continues to ensure that theirs is not a vain hope.

**Sharon Thibodeau**  
National Archives and  
Records Administration  
Washington, DC

**The People of Glengarry: Highlanders in Transition, 1745-1820.** MARIANNE MCLEAN. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1991. xxiii, 285 p. ISBN 0-7735-0814-7 \$34.95.

In this meticulous, well-crafted, exhaustively-researched, and eloquently-argued volume, Marianne McLean has produced a work that joins the ranks of locally-based studies effectively turning the existing historiography of Canada on its head. Using a wide array of published and unpublished sources, McLean examines in detail nine group emigrations that left western Inverness, Scotland between 1773 and 1815 for Glengarry County in Upper Canada. McLean uses the case study of the Glengarry emigrations to explore the relationship between economic changes in the Highlands and immigration to Canada in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. As the title of the book suggests, this study is not focused on the élites leading the emigrations, but rather on the communities that emigrated, in order to determine what impelled the people to take so seemingly drastic a step.

On the basis of scrutinizing the communities within their specific western Inverness contexts before emigrating, and then assessing their pattern of settlement in Glengarry, McLean offers a refreshing perspective of highland immigration. She does not accept the view put forth by Michael Flinn, Eric Richards, and J.M. Bumsted that emigration was the ideal and inevitable solution to problems caused by major population growth for clansmen who could not adapt to changing times, and that immigration eventually was enthusiastically promoted by landlords to help ease the pressure of growing numbers on limited resources. Nor does she subscribe to the opposing argument advanced by historians such as James Hunter that the emigrations were a tragedy, as people were forced to leave first their country by landlords who wished to replace them with sheep. Instead, McLean argues that the immigrants were not fleeing from radical social change but rather from the poor deal which that change offered them. Instead of being a defeated society manipulated by landlords and circumstances, McLean contends that tenants reaped some benefits from the early stages of agrarian transformation, but as they saw their social and economic position at first weakened by rising rents and then undercut by the introduction of sheep farming after 1780, they chose emigration in the face of the serious threat sheep farming posed to their traditional access to the land.

The success of the emigrations hinged on the role of traditional leaders in the highland community in organizing the emigrations, on raising necessary funding, on the support they received from colonial officials in Canada, and on the voluntary and communal nature of the emigrations. McLean argues that whole families, large groups of neighbours, and entire communities including women and children migrated from western Inverness to Glengarry so as to not only fit Bernard Bailyn's "provincial" emigrant stream model, but, as McLean asserts, to be "more like the model than the model itself," covering as it does a more extended period of time than does the case study from which Bailyn based his model.

McLean presents a convincing argument. After a general introduction and a brief overview detailing the larger traditional organization of highland society in mid-eighteenth century western