

BOOK REVIEWS

INIKORI, JOSEPH E. *Africans and the Industrial Revolution in England. A Study in International Trade and Economic Development*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge [etc.] 2002. xxi, 576 pp. £55.00; \$75.00. (Paper: £19.95; \$29.00.); DOI: 10.1017/S0020859003011179

Despite the title, this work stretches beyond the confines of England's Industrial Revolution and situates Africans as the prime labor force which built the modern world. Based on more than thirty years of research and drawing on a vast array of primary and secondary sources, Professor Inikori has produced a masterpiece arguing for the centrality of Africans not only in the Industrial Revolution, by itself a bold claim, but more broadly in the rise of the Atlantic world economy between 1650 and 1850. In addition, Inikori continues the recent historiographic trend, of which he notes, by placing slavery at the core for understanding the rise of western Europe and the United States.

Inikori persuasively argues that Britain's Industrial Revolution was fueled by international overseas trade centered in the Atlantic that was dependent upon the utilization of enslaved Africans in the Americas. Inikori produces overwhelming evidence for support, including a vast array of quantitative material documenting the pre-eminent position of African labor in the production of strategic materials for the industrial revolution, especially cotton. Drawing on an impressive blend of primary and secondary sources, he provides thorough case studies of key industries linked to the industrialization process and profiles individual firms engaged in this transformation. Following the introduction, each chapter contains helpful tables that present impressive quantitative data and a separate thirty-six-page appendix supplies additional documentary evidence.

A chapter outlining the major historiography of the Industrial Revolution traces three major interpretive trends. The first, from 1880 to 1945, and the most recent, from 1985 to the present, stress the role of overseas trade. By contrast, the dominant argument from 1945 to 1985 centered on internal factors, especially English technology. Inikori points out however, that internal factors like technology fail to explain England's economic growth from 1650 to 1850. In fact, as he demonstrates, to the extent that certain key technologies proved essential to industrialization, like cotton textile production, these were, in turn, dependent upon overseas trade with the slave-based economies of the Atlantic.

Inikori moves beyond the profits debate begun by Eric Williams to a more thorough and exhaustive analysis of Williams's larger point: the centrality of African labor in the making of the Industrial Revolution. Inikori begins by charting the English economy over eight centuries from 1086 to 1850, and dividing this *longue durée* into two sections, 1086 to 1660 and 1660 to 1850. In the former phase, a combination of population growth and expansion of overseas trade generated important socio-economic changes in the southern counties of England. In the latter period the English economy underwent a structural transformation from agriculture to industrial production. He locates the center of the Industrial Revolution in England in certain regions, which underwent radical alterations, the most important of which was Lancashire between 1660 and 1850, followed by the West Riding of Yorkshire, and finally the West Midlands.

Continuing a regional focus, Inikori charts the African impact upon specific Atlantic

regions in the production of commodities for export, providing a region-by-region analysis. He concludes that Africans and their descendants produced no less than 40 per cent of the total value of Spanish American exports in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries combined, no less than 50 per cent in the eighteenth century, and at least one-third of the total export production during the latter half of the nineteenth century. In Brazil and the French and British Caribbean, African labor produced virtually all the commodities exported. A similar but slightly less intense situation existed in the United States, where plantation crops in the southern states like tobacco, rice, and indigo became more concentrated on slave-produced cotton which dominated exports by 1860.

Shifting from the regional emphasis, Inikori's next three chapters each focus on specific economic sectors in England which were directly connected to the Atlantic slave economy: the slave trade, English shipping, and English financial institutions. Overseas trade, fueled by the rise of Atlantic commerce, stimulated the rise of the shipping and shipbuilding trades. Simultaneously, the development of financial institutions, the evolution of banking houses, discount houses, the stock exchange, and insurance houses were all directly connected to this process. Inikori provides a detailed analysis, including documenting vessels employed in the West African trade, in an effort to more clearly establish the link between English shipping employed in the Atlantic slave economies and the industrialization process in England.

After investigating strategic industries like shipping and financial institutions, Inikori traces the contribution of African-produced raw materials to the overall supply of raw materials for the industrialization process in England from the eighteenth to the mid-nineteenth centuries. In particular, he stresses the strategic values of individual raw materials, and notes that, in purely quantitative terms, overseas trade was already the main source of raw materials for British industries from 1794 to 1856. Moreover, arguably the most important industry, cotton textiles, was almost entirely dependent on raw materials overwhelmingly produced by African slaves in America. In retrospect, without the slave-produced commodities of the Atlantic region, especially but not exclusively cotton, England's Industrial Revolution appears highly unlikely.

By "reorienting" the explanation of England's industrialization to an Atlantic slave economy, Inikori has placed renewed emphasis on an old and recurring paradigm: how Atlantic slavery and slave labor built the modern West. This has serious implications for various "master narratives" offered by historians in American, European, and world history, who continue to avoid this premise with surprising success. Thankfully, Professor Inikori has produced an intellectually rigorous tour de force which corrects the historical record and demonstrates the centrality of Africans in the making of the modern world.

Eric Kimball

When Dad Died. Individuals and Families Coping with Family Stress in Past Societies. Ed. by Renzo Derosas [and Michel Oris]. Peter Lang, Bern [etc.] 2002. ix, 496 pp. € 50.90; DOI: 10.1017/S0020859003021175

Many studies have been written on the plight of widows and orphans in the past. Although the title might suggest otherwise, this book is not just another contribution to the literature on their coping strategies. It addresses long-standing assumptions on the working of family systems from a microdemographic and highly quantitative angle. Almost by definition, the

nuclear family system of northwestern Europe implied severe problems when the bread-winning husband and father died. It can be expected that the ensuing distress and poverty were translated in higher mortality of the surviving relatives. But does this hold true after careful inspection of demographic data? And were these families truly isolated in the sense that kin did not assist? Conversely, did widows and orphans fare better in non-nuclear systems, like the stem-families of southern Europe and Japan, or the multiple-family households in China? The strength of this book lies in its convincing effort to measure the *efficiency* of different family systems in the protection of their weaker members in crisis situations. As such, it is a major contribution to both social and family history.

The book opens with a comprehensive overview of the literature on broken families in both Europe and eastern Asia by Michel Oris and Emiko Ochiai. The second part is devoted to European agrarian populations. Who became head of a farm when the father died? Partly, the answer lay in the ages of the surviving wife and children. The prevailing inheritance system was also very important. Antoinette Fauve-Chamoux shows how Pyrenean stem-families responded to and modified the Napoleonic system of egalitarian transmission. Eastern Europe is represented in this book only by an article on a Latvian estate by Andrejs Plakans and Charles Wetherell. Apparently, the serfs on this estate had considerable freedom in appointing household heads. The remainder of the book concentrates on the effects of a father's death on the subsequent life courses of his wife and children. Many of the articles are based on population registers or other continuous administration of households. Recently, multivariate techniques have been developed that capture the dynamics of families while controlling for a host of social and cultural factors. Although these statistical explorations do not excel in readability, they contain a wealth of fascinating findings. Here, I can only highlight some of them.

Western European household formation was based on economic independence and neolocality. On marriage, a couple founded their own household where they would live with their future children and, possibly, servants. Without either husband or wife, it became much more difficult to sustain the household. According to Peter Laslett's "nuclear hardship" hypothesis, widows and orphaned children were marginalized in those areas where the nuclear family predominated. Supposedly, their only hope lay in charity. To some extent, this is corroborated by the findings in *When Dad Died*. In Italy, nuclear and complex households coexisted in the same areas. Marco Breschi and Matteo Manfredini show that widows were indeed better off when they lived in a complex household. On the other hand, the ties between parents and children, as well as relations with more distant kin, were stronger and more effective than Laslett has supposed. In eastern Belgium, the effects of father's death on mother's survival were reduced greatly when adolescent children were present in the household. In the agrarian village of Sart, the presence of sons was of crucial importance, but in the industrial town of Tilleul it were the daughters who stayed to help their mother. Also, kin living in the community significantly decreased the widow's risk of dying. As in Italy, complex households in China offered protection to widows. The more adult men were living in the household, the better her chances of survival were. However, the value put on male offspring implied that a widow would be treated much better if she had a son. On the other hand, sons without a mother had a rough time when their aunts were living in the same household. Apparently, aunts managed to divert family resources to their own children. This finding puts the patriarchal nature of the Chinese family into perspective. As Cameron Campbell and James Lee put it: "fathers could not care for their sons, in the face of competing mothers" (p. 322).

In nuclear families, the adult male assumes different roles at the same time. He generally makes the decisions and represents the household as its head. He is husband and father, and finally, his labour input is crucial for the family economy. It is difficult to see which of these roles was most important to the survivors. In complex families, however, it is possible to look separately at the effect of the loss of the authority figure (the head), the more emotional distress caused by the death of husband, and the “material” damage caused by the loss of an adult male worker (who was neither head nor father). Noriko Tsuya and Satomi Kurosu have devised this interesting test and put it to practice in a study of two Japanese villages (1716–1870). They conclude that Japanese household heads ensured relatively equal distribution of household resources between the sexes. After their deaths women (other than wives) and female children were less well protected and suffered excess mortality. The death of the father – when not the head – was equally distressing to sons and daughters. In contrast, the negative consequences of the loss of a male worker were limited.

Various contributions emphasize that the death of the mother was more detrimental to a child’s wellbeing than the death of the father. However, in their article on the Dutch town of Woerden, Erik Beekink, Frans van Poppel, and Aart Liefbroer boldly question the negative consequences of father’s decease as such. They direct attention to a statistical artefact that is generally overlooked (likewise in this volume): the common causes of the death of parents and children. For instance, an epidemic disease may wipe out both a father and one or more of his children. How to discern these common causes from “real” consequences of parental death? They do so by discriminating between time intervals after the death of the parent: when a child dies within the first month they suspect a common cause. Their results are highly surprising. Whereas the death of the mother continues to lower a child’s chances of survival, the effects of the death of the father disappear after the first month. In the following five months, fatherless children had even lower mortality than children whose father was alive! The authors quote a Dutch medical doctor who observed (in 1859) on lower-class widows: “after the death of their husband their material and moral life and that of the children has markedly changed to the better” (p. 259). Clearly, widows were much more effective than widowers in caring for the children, as well as attracting support from relatives or charitable organizations.

To measure the wellbeing of widows and orphans, most authors use the unambiguous indicator of mortality. However, we need more insight in the actual consumption patterns, as well as in the relative contributions of labour and charity to incomes. The discussions of remarriage and migration are, rather unsatisfactorily, limited to calculations of rates. Furthermore, the geographical and social trajectories of the children remain obscure. In short, this book offers an excellent and innovative discussion on mortality, but many implications of a father’s death for the life courses of the widow and her children await further study.

When Dad Died originates from the Eurasian Population and Family History Project, a comparison of western Europe (Sweden, Belgium, and Italy) and eastern Asia (Japan, China). Using the same sources and techniques, the participants compare premodern populations in their reactions to economic and demographic stress. The planned series of publications will be a landmark in demographic history, and will challenge social historians to rethink their image of the family.

Jan Kok

SILVERMAN, MARILYN. *An Irish Working Class. Explorations in Political Economy and Hegemony, 1800–1950*. [Anthropological Horizons, vol. 19.] University of Toronto Press, Toronto [etc.] 2001. xiii, 566 pp. C\$85.00; £50.00; DOI: 10.1017/S002085903031171

Thomastown is a small town in the southeast of Ireland. In the summer of 1980, when the American anthropologists Marilyn Silverman and Philip Gulliver started their research there, the town had about 1,300 inhabitants, with another 1,400 in the rural hinterland. How then can this small ordinary Irish town be of interest to labour historians in Europe and the United States?

In *An Irish Working Class* Marilyn Silverman, Professor of Anthropology at York University, shows the fruitfulness of local studies in analysing political processes as viewed from the perspective of local, everyday life. The locality forms a point of reference from which it is useful to address the nature of political meanings and ideologies, since these were grounded in social relations and material life. With her local-level focus, she aims to build general interpretations of both the past and the present. Consequently, the book is not a “community study”. But, according to Silverman, only a local perspective can help us to uncover processes such as the criminalization of custom, the growth of labour consciousness, and so on. Silverman’s aims are therefore threefold: “to suggest how anthropologists can study political economy and the culture of class; to construct an analytical ethnography of a segment of the European working class; and to portray the world of Ireland’s labouring people”. In her approach Silverman is critical of the Irish labour-history tradition. She contends that Irish labour historians have remained focused on biographies of leaders, the history of organizations, and the tension between nationalism and socialism. To a certain extent I agree with Silverman’s critique, though there are several exceptions to this tradition.¹

Inspired by E.P. Thompson and other, mainly British, working-class cultural historians, Silverman attempts to write a history from below, and at first glance she is very successful. The structure of the book works very well in allowing her to create a perspective from below, and throughout the book we meet ordinary people, of different periods, expressing their views on politics, class formation, and social and economic conflicts. Silverman uses the concept of hegemony to analyse the linkage between the cultural and the political spheres, and she studies how working-class political activists channelled class awareness and experience into political action.

She is to be commended for taking such a long view (1800–1950). And for quoting generously from the source material; this does much to place ordinary workers at the centre of her narrative. The sources Silverman uses to reach these people and to explore their political mobilization include interviews made by various parliamentary commissions, the minutes of the Board of Guardians in Thomastown, newspaper reports, the minutes of trade unions and political organizations, and interviews conducted by Silverman and Gulliver. As a reader, you sometimes feel that you are close to these ordinary workers in their struggle for survival and their everyday lives. This long period, combined with the accounts from which Silverman quotes, make evident the changes

1. See for instance Betty Messenger, *Picking Up the Linen Threads: A Study in Industrial Folklore* (Belfast, 1988), and Maura Cronin, *Country, Class or Craft? The Politicisation of the Skilled Artisan in Nineteenth-Century Cork* (Cork, 1994). Even *Saothar: Journal of the Irish Labour History Society* has, over the years, published several articles with a more cultural focus.

within political culture and in relations with the state, local authorities, and the middle class. One theme that can be followed throughout the nineteenth century and the first half of the twentieth is conflicts about the river and fishing rights, which were of considerable importance for working-class people, and which also became a powerful propulsive force in popular political action. Other conflicts were those between employers and workers, and between workers and the state – where one issue was unemployment relief. But there were also conflicts within the working class, on issues of nationalism and political radicalism – themes emphasized in the chapters on the twentieth century. As mentioned above, Silverman aims to study the culture of class, to construct the ethnography of a segment of the European working class, and to portray the world of Ireland's labouring people. She also has an ideological point of departure. She wants to narrate this labouring version of Thomastown's past, so that some understanding of it will be preserved, the experiences of earlier generations can be known and celebrated, and that these workers from the past, who have invariably been omitted from the history books and the dominant historical narratives, will not be forgotten.

However, there is at least one important shortcoming in her book. Despite its title, the author's aims, and her point of departure, Silverman's study does not cover the entire working class of Thomastown. Actually the culture, the ethnography, and the world of the labouring class are studied from a male perspective. In that sense her study is in the rich and rewarding tradition of E.P. Thompson's *The Making of the English Working Class*. She has taken little notice, though, of the massive critique of Thompson from a wide range of historians who have stressed the importance of gender relations.² Consequently, throughout the book it is men whose experiences and views of the world we hear; women remain silent. Silverman has fallen into an old trap – letting groups prevented from expressing their experiences in traditional sources remain invisible in history. Her study reminds one of the state of labour history during the 1970s, when the working class and male industrial workers were regarded synonymously. So, while Silverman in one way contributes to new perspectives within Irish labour history, in another way she takes it back to the 1970s when the working class was perceived to be something connected to the world of men. One of the problems with Silverman's approach is that, while she aims to study culture and everyday life, the sources she uses emphasize the public and political spheres but not the private. Within trade unions and political organizations, in court and before the Board of Guardians, it was men who talked and opined. It was also these that newspapers reported. As a consequence, the source material Silverman has chosen is unsuitable for her aims (at least if she wants to draw conclusions about the entire working class). Another problem is that she emphasizes production and neglects issues of reproduction and care within the locality.

In neglecting the sphere of women, gender relations, reproduction, care and the issue of family, Silverman does not make the best use of her local perspective. The local perspective creates opportunities to study the whole lives of working-class people, to study all those aspects of life that are important for people's experiences and which influence their political actions. If you want to explain class awareness and political culture, you have to consider the entire lives of men and women. Nonetheless, Silverman's study is a welcome contribution to Irish labour and working-class history. The perspective from below, with

2. See for example Joan Wallach Scott, "Women in the Making of the English Working Class", in *idem*, *Gender and the Politics of History* (New York, 1988), and Anna Clark, *The Struggle for the Breeches: Gender and the Making of the British Working Class* (Los Angeles, CA, 1997).

its emphasis on the culture and political actions of ordinary workers, has revealed much that had hitherto been marginalized by Irish historians. The next important challenge will be to study the whole lives of women and men, and how their experiences were reflected in popular politics.

Mats Greiff

KORSCH, KARL. Briefe 1908–1939. Hrsg. von Michael Buckmiller, Michel Prat und Meike G. Werner. Briefe 1940–1958. Hrsg. von Michael Buckmiller und Michel Prat. [Karl Korsch Gesamtausgabe, Band 8, 9.] Stichting beheer IISG/Offizin, Amsterdam, Hamburg 2001. 1740 pp. Ill. € 149.00; DOI: 10.1017/S0020859003041178

In 1978, Michael Buckmiller from the University of Hanover started editing the complete works of Karl Korsch. By then, Korsch was already a legend; a lot of his writings had been republished in various forms, especially those from the years 1918–1922 when he was actively engaged in the struggle for socialization and soviet (or workers' councils) democracy in Germany. He gained further respect as a leading critic of both versions of Marxist orthodoxy, Leninism and Kautskyanism, whose deeply rooted affinity he exposed, in spite of official polemics. His writings, especially his small volume on Karl Marx published in English in 1938 for the first time, were rediscovered and devoured by young aspiring neophytes of Western Marxism in the 1960s and 1970s. For many young intellectuals – particularly in Germany – he became the paragon of a critical Marxism. His friendship and collaboration with Bertolt Brecht, a companionship that lasted from the 1920s until Brecht's death in 1956, earned him further fame as the "teacher" of many left-wing intellectuals and artists in Weimar Germany.

Buckmiller was the first to make full and good use of the Korsch papers at the International Institute of Social History in Amsterdam. Since 1978, six volumes have been published, all of them with the active support of the IISH. Volumes 8 and 9 of the "Complete Works" edition will be followed soon by volume 4 (in two parts), containing the writings from the 1920s, when Korsch was the leading theorist of the KPD and became one of the most outspoken critics of communist and Comintern politics on the left. Volume 7, to be published in 2004, will contain Korsch's various writings from the period when he lived in the USA from 1936 until his death in 1961. Many of these texts, in particular a great number of fragmentary drafts for articles and outlines as well as notes for books planned, are being published for the first time (they include the texts relating to Korsch's planned "Buch der Abschaffungen", dealing with the possible future of socialism). The final volume according to the publishing plan, volume 6, will be devoted to Karl Korsch's book on Karl Marx, published for the first time in English in 1938, in Morris Ginzberg's series on "Modern Sociologists", and republished in New York in 1963.

The two volumes reviewed here provide a lot of first-hand and first-rate material not only for a biography of Karl Korsch himself but also for a better understanding of the life and times of the intellectual left in the twentieth century. Of course, it is not complete. A lot of the correspondence was lost when Korsch was forced to leave Germany in 1933 and during his long years of exile; some letters regarded as too personal were destroyed after his death. Nonetheless, more than 600 letters, both from the collections of the IISH and from various private collections, are published here – most of them for the first time. The

majority of the letters (more than two-thirds) date from 1933 or later, the correspondence ending in 1958 when Korsch fell incurably ill and had to be hospitalized. There are considerable gaps in the correspondence, especially in the 1920s, the years when Korsch was most active both inside and later, after being expelled in 1926, outside the Communist Party. There are just five letters from 1924, none from 1925, and just one from 1926. All the letters come with an extensive and meticulous commentary by the editors, referring to names and events as well as books and manuscripts. Volume 9 provides a chronological list of all the letters published, as well as an index of all the addressees and recipients of the letters and a general name index.

For anyone interested in the intellectual history of the German left in the twentieth century, volume 8 provides quite a discovery. It documents at length Korsch's involvement as a young student and budding jurist with neo-Kantianism and the movement for life reform (*Lebens-reform*), especially the "free student movement", which propagated democratic self-government of the universities as well as various other forms of associative democracy (in schools, in towns and villages, and even in monasteries). Nearly 100 letters written between 1908 and 1919 by Korsch to Walter Fränzel, the intimate friend of his youth, highlight these hitherto unknown idealistic beginnings of his intellectual development. During World War I the friendship was broken.

We learn almost nothing new from the scant remains of his correspondence about Korsch's activities during the November Revolution, when he joined the USPD and served on the first government commission dealing with the issue of the nationalization (*Sozialisierung*) of German industry, soon becoming a prolific writer on issues of nationalization and the theory of socialism, publishing his first major works on Marxist theory while starting a political career as a Member of Parliament and serving as Minister of Justice in Thuringia for a very brief period (which became fatal to his academic career as a professor of law at Jena University). The story of those years is told in the introduction to both volumes by Michael Buckmiller. For the period 1929 onwards, more letters have been retrieved and we obtain a better and more detailed view of Korsch's intellectual life and his activities as a theorist and teacher of the left without party affiliations. By then, he had been expelled from the Communist Party, lost his seat in the *Reichstag*, published two of his major works (*Marxismus und Philosophie* in 1923 and his lengthy critique of Kautsky's magnum opus, *The Materialist Conception of History*, in 1928), and become engaged as a scholar and teacher in various intellectual circles of the left, including the Philosophische Gruppe and the Studienzirkel "Kritischer Marxismus". His friendship and long-lasting collaboration with Bertolt Brecht as well as with other artists and writers dated from those years, when Berlin was something of a cultural and intellectual metropolis. The bulk of the correspondence deals with Korsch's life in exile, from 1933 onwards.

From the very beginning, he contributed dozens of reviews to the *Zeitschrift für Sozialforschung*, although never a longer article – actually, he had been one of the founding members of the Institut für Sozialforschung, remained close friends with Felix Weil, and corresponded with Friedrich Pollock, Leo Löwenthal and Max Horkheimer for many years, although he remained an outsider. Why Korsch stayed on the sideline of the institute's activities even after it had been moved to the USA, where he himself arrived in 1936, is not easy to explain. In terms of intellectual concerns and inclinations, he had a lot in common with Horkheimer, and, to a lesser degree, with Adorno. Since the early 1920s he had been struggling with the problem of Marxism and philosophy and trying to re-establish the true and original sense of Marx's "materialistic" point of view as well as the

scientific content of “dialectical” reasoning as expounded in Marx’s work. Pursuing his studies, he had become a specialist in advanced mathematical, statistical methods in the social sciences and had acquainted himself with the actual state of the art of methodological debates – the positivism of the “*Wiener Kreis*” as well as American pragmatism. The only specialization he actually missed was economics, although he had prepared a new edition of the first volume of Marx’s *Capital* in 1932.

In spite of his outstanding qualifications and various efforts, he never managed to attain a tenured, regular job at any university in the United States. For a short period only, between 1943 and 1945, he taught at Tulane University in New Orleans – at the level of assistant professor. According to the US standards valid then, but not today, he was simply “too old”. So he became something rather German: a “private scholar” (*Privatgelehrter*), although in a US environment, living on a small grant from the Institut für Sozialforschung until 1951 and supported by his wife, Hedda Korsch, who worked as a Professor of English at several US colleges. As he lacked a regular public of students and colleagues, many of his letters became rather lengthy essays in the guise of personal letters – especially his letters to Paul Mattick and to Paul Partos. With both, although to different degrees, he shared many of his plans and thoughts and collaborated regularly for many years. He renewed his friendship with Ruth Fischer – the leader of the KPD who had been expelled in 1926 like Korsch himself. Working for Harvard University, Fischer became a renowned writer on Stalinism and Soviet politics. Again, Korsch became her highly esteemed adviser and discussion partner in matters of Marxist theory and politics; with a few breaks, they corresponded from 1950 to 1957.

Korsch’s most prominent correspondent, of course, was Bertolt Brecht, who regarded himself as Korsch’s disciple and addressed him as “the teacher” or “my teacher”. Hardly a dozen letters (from 1934 to 1948) from Korsch to Brecht (plus some to Brecht’s son, Stefan) could be retrieved. In the last letter in this edition, from Korsch to Hans Bunge, dated 28 June 1958, he gave a short outline of his collaboration with Brecht, which lasted more than thirty years. At times, in the early 1930s in Berlin and in exile in Sweden, they worked and lived rather close together. Korsch was quite frank in his correspondence with his famous friend, expounding his ever-changing plans as well as his rather persistent theoretical views to Brecht at length. In his relation with Brecht, Korsch remained the teacher – as Brecht acknowledged (“you will always remain a teacher, as long as you live”). Some of Brecht’s many unfinished projects, including his novel on the life of Julius Caesar and, from 1945 onwards, his various efforts to rewrite the Communist Manifesto in verse and to present it as a piece of didactic poetry (*Lehrgedicht*), were warmly supported by Korsch, who spared neither his criticism nor his – generally detailed and lengthy – advice when it was asked for (see, for instance, his letter to Brecht, dated 15 April 1945, in volume 9, pp. 1092–1099). They disagreed on many issues of world politics – especially the changing character of the Soviet regime and the role of the USA in the postwar world – but did so like gentlemen, always using the formal “*Sie*” in their correspondence until the end.

Korsch’s book on Marx, written in German and published in English in 1938 in the author’s own translation, had its greatest impact on the neo-Marxists of the 1960s and 1970s, long after its author’s death. If there is anything specific about this new wave of “Western Marxism”, it is the insight that Marx’s lifelong project, the critique of political economy, was meant to be and actually was something much more radical than a socialist textbook on economics – an insight largely due to Korsch. As we can now see from his letters, Korsch had already started a “rethinking Marxism” project of his own and largely

on his own in the 1940s. His later projects all revolved around plans, outlines, and drafts for another major work on Marx and the history of Marxism, a book in which Korsch wanted to demonstrate the full power of the methodical rule he had already put forward in his *Marxismus und Philosophie* of 1923: in order to understand and evaluate the strengths as well as the limits of Marx's achievements as the founding father of a new social science, one has to apply the "materialist conception of history" to Marx himself and to Marxism itself. A historical materialist explanation of Marxism, its rise, its crises, its fall and its possible resurgence in different guises was the one great project of Korsch's intellectual life from the early 1920s onwards. In the course of this project, he realized how many and how large the "unsettled problems of Marxism" were that Marx had left as part of his rich legacy.

In this respect, Korsch's correspondence with Roman Rosdolsky is most interesting and one of the most remarkable discoveries we owe to these new volumes. Their correspondence started in 1950 and lasted until 1954 (there are some thirty letters from Korsch to Rosdolsky, published for the first time in volume 9, and there are more letters from Rosdolsky to Korsch in the Rosdolsky papers at the IISH, which will be published soon). Both were Marxist scholars in exile, both were excluded from universities and research institutes, and both were seriously and for the first time studying Marx's manuscripts of 1857–1858 – first published in the Soviet Union in 1939 and 1941, though their publication went largely unnoticed. These long and detailed (but unfinished) manuscripts, which became familiar as *Grundrisse*, the very first version of which was later to become Marx's *Capital*, were crucial for the revival of serious scholarly interest in Marx's writings in the 1960s and later. Theodor W. Adorno and many younger scholars in Germany discovered them and realized that they were as important for an understanding of Marx's work as the discovery of the Parisian manuscripts of 1844 some thirty years earlier. Although Korsch did not produce anything like Rosdolsky's seminal study on the *Grundrisse* (Rosdolsky's *Making of Marx's "Capital"* was published posthumously in 1968), he was one of the first Marxist intellectuals to understand fully its importance – especially with respect to the unsettled problems of Marxism. The correspondence between Korsch and Rosdolsky again documents one of the many voluntary collaborations of his scholarly life, Korsch commenting at length on Rosdolsky's work in progress, while explaining the changing outlines of his own unfinished magnum opus on Marxism and telling his friend about his own efforts. Some of his letters to Roman Rosdolsky seem rather prophetic as regards the future development of Western Marxism: Marxism has become "literature", hence a potential victim of academic fads in the style of American social science. The philosophers are back again: while Marx was trying to get away from philosophy, and succeeded to a large extent, Lukács, Marcuse and their followers tried to turn this whole process again and to retranslate Marx's theory into a Hegelian style and language (see Korsch's letter to Roman Rosdolsky, dated 17 July 1953, in volume 9, p. 1532).

Much of Korsch's correspondence from 1933 onwards is an ongoing comment and self-reflection – in correspondence with friends – on his plans and projects and the various drafts and outlines for books never finished; he also constantly refers to his work on articles and reviews. These two volumes certainly make one eager to reread Korsch. They also whet our appetite for the many drafts and unpublished manuscripts of Karl Korsch that will be published in volume 7 of the present edition. In fact, they leave us craving this next volume.

Michael R. Krätke

China's Communist Revolutions. Fifty Years of The People's Republic of China. Ed. by Werner Draguhn and David S.G. Goodman. Routledge-Curzon, London [etc.] 2002. vii, 279 pp. £55.00.

The Chinese Revolution in the 1920s. Between triumph and disaster. Ed. by Mechthild Leutner, Roland Felber, Mikhail L. Titarenko and Alexander M. Grigoriev. RoutledgeCurzon, London [etc.] 2002. xv, 323 pp. £55.00; DOI: 10.1017/S0020859003051174

These two volumes are both products of international scholarly cooperation. *China's Communist Revolutions* is the product of a conference organized by German and Australian scholars, and held in Hamburg on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the People's Republic of China (PRC). *The Chinese Revolution in the 1920s* is also the product of a conference, held in 1998 in Berlin, but represents the outcome of a longer cooperation between Russian and German scholars devoted to the uncovering, organization and publication of Russian-language documentary materials on Comintern and Russian Communist Party involvement in the Chinese Revolution. Neither volume is restricted to scholars of the countries participating in the cooperation. *The Chinese Revolution in the 1920s* is particularly impressive in bringing together European and North American scholars with their Russian and Chinese counterparts, the latter including scholars from both the PRC and Taiwan. These two volumes are quite welcome at a time when the study of the Communist Revolution in China has gone out of scholarly fashion despite its significance, if for no other reason than the history it shaped. While quite independent of one another, the two volumes in their coverage span the entire history of the Communist Revolution.

The Chinese Revolution in the 1920s offers an intensive examination of Comintern and Russian relationships with the Chinese Communist Party, focusing most importantly on the mid-1920s; which also explains its subtitle. Its nineteen chapters, of necessity brief, are organized around the four themes of "united front policy", "Chiang Kaishek", "institutions" (involved in the communications between Russia and China), and, "social movements" (labor and peasants, most importantly). A concluding chapter by Michael Titarenko, Director of the Institute of Far Eastern Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences offers a brief description of the project of which this volume was one product. What drives this volume is the promise of new perspectives on the Chinese Revolution, and the involvement in it of the Comintern and the Soviet Union, made possible by new Russian-language documentary materials, although not all the authors utilize these materials.

China's Communist Revolutions, by contrast, offers more general, interpretive essays, as is appropriate perhaps to an anniversary volume. The editors (and conference organizers) eschewed overviews and broad assessments in favor of "more irreverent and iconoclastic" approaches to issues of the PRC and their academic study (p. vi). Though not formally organized in sections, this volume, too, is roughly divided in four parts, this time temporally: prelude to the PRC, the early years of economic and social transformation, the Cultural Revolution, and post-Mao reforms. Despite the editors' intentions, most of the articles, by well-known scholars of twentieth-century China, do indeed read as broad assessments, in most cases summarizing previous work. The articles are useful as summary assessments of the themes take up, on occasion even striking an "iconoclastic" note, as in Michael Schoenhals's use of rhetorical theory to analyze the politics involved in "naming"

of the Cultural Revolution. One wishes that the editors had retained for the volume the title for the original conference, “Was the Chinese Revolution Really Necessary?” – which might have forced greater “irreverence” on the contributors, and perhaps even encouraged a distinction between “really necessary” and “historically necessary”. Still, the pluralizing of “revolution” in the book’s title is noteworthy.

The two volumes are addresses to different kinds of readers. The articles collected in *The Chinese Revolution in the 1920s* are likely to be of interest to specialists in the Chinese Revolution, the Comintern, and Russian communism. The articles are too brief, and too intensive in the material they cover, to capture the interest of the more general reader. A discussion by the editors on the significance of new materials for our understanding of the issues involved would have been very helpful. It is quite evident that materials made available by the opening of Russian archives have made possible a more complicated view of individual persons, events and organizations; but it is not clear that they have substantially transformed the overall interpretation of the revolutionary movement of the 1920s, which requires not just new materials but new questions and methods.

The essays in *China’s Communist Revolutions* are more substantial in coverage, and could indeed be read profitably as “surveys” of the themes covered; so long as the reader keeps in mind that the themes chosen address only aspects of the revolutionary process, and the interpretations offered are limited by the idiosyncrasies, ideologies, and the methodological preferences of participating scholars. The absence from the volume of any substantial discussion of issues of ideology and culture may be a testament to the positivism that informs the volume, and is a regrettable lack, especially given the otherwise promising suggestion of the title that there may be more than one revolution at issue in the Chinese Revolution (with the one exception of the Schoenhals essay that I have already mentioned). It is also something of a shame, for which the publisher must assume some responsibility, that this volume is lacking in an introductory chapter by the editors explaining the goals of the project, the choice of themes, and the reasoning guiding the organization of the volume beyond some kind of simple temporal succession.

Arif Dirlik

FILTZER, DONALD. *Soviet Workers and Late Stalinism. Labour and the Restoration of the Stalinist System after World War II*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge [etc.] 2002. xviii, 276 pp. £45.00; \$60.00; DOI: 10.1017/S0020859003061170

The author of several studies on Soviet workers during the industrialization of the 1930s, during the Khrushchev period, and during perestroika, Donald Filtzer now turns his attention to the postwar Stalin years.¹ Until very recently, the period between the end of World War II and the death of the Soviet leader in 1953 was one of the “darker” eras of Soviet history, about which very little was known. With significant archival restrictions being lifted over the last ten or so years, both Russian and Western historians have started to explore the final long decade of Stalin’s reign, during which the dictator achieved a virtually unassailable position within the system bearing his name.

1. D.A. Filtzer, *Soviet Workers and Stalinist Industrialization: The Formation of Modern Soviet Production Relations, 1928–1941* (London, 1986)

Filtzer's study of Soviet workers during late Stalinism is among the first contributions to a nascent historiography on this period. As a starting point for his analysis Filtzer takes the thesis developed by Elena Zubkova, according to which the crucial development of the postwar years was the subordination by the regime of a population that hoped "their" victory over Nazi Germany would be rewarded with some relaxation of control and repression, and perhaps even with outright concessions to people's aspirations, analogous to the reopening of the churches that had taken place during the war.² Whereas Zubkova focused primarily on the political confrontation that resulted from the reimposition of state control over a population filled with hope and expectations of better times, Filtzer looks into the social and economic confrontation that accompanied it. His argument is that the two were inseparable, in that the reimposition of political control depended on the reconstitution of the system of production in which the power of the Stalinist elite was grounded. This had two dimensions to it. In the first place the war had caused tremendous devastation, and the lost capacity had to be restored. Secondly, the war had disrupted existing lines of command within the economy and society. While key decision-making had been concentrated at the very top, lower officials and managers obtained greater leeway in everyday policy implementation at the grass-roots level, and Filtzer argues that this had undermined the edifice through which the elite transmitted its decisions to lower echelons and through which it expected those decisions to be enforced. Thus, the regime faced a double challenge of simultaneously restoring the economy and reconstructing the institutional foundations through which it managed that economy.

One of the most vivid manifestations of the repressive policies this engendered was the unprecedented degree of control over labour power that the regime sought to exercise in the process of reconstruction. State control over labour power took two forms. In the first place, a considerable part of the workforce in industry and construction consisted of unfree or indentured labour. Besides the slave labour of the Gulag, these were the young, predominantly rural, labour recruits conscripted for vocational training through the State Labour Reserves system, and collective farmers mobilized for work in industry and construction through the semicompulsory system of "organized recruitment of labour" (*orgnabor*). None of these forms of unfree labour was new to the Soviet Union. The Gulag and *orgnabor* dated back to the industrialization of the 1930s, and the State Labour Reserves system had been set up on the eve of the war to facilitate the recruitment of labour in the countryside. During the period of postwar reconstruction, though, the regime resorted to the use of unfree and indentured labour on a much larger scale than before. Due to the very high loss of life among men of working age that had occurred during the war, the regime saw itself confronted with acute labour shortages. This activated a reflex that had been present in labour policy from the early 1930s on: to resort to coercion as soon as labour power failed to turn up at the factory gates in sufficiently large numbers of its own accord. The second dimension to state control over labour power during the postwar years consisted of a legal curb on job-quitting and the use of penal sanctions for violations of labour discipline. These forms of control had been introduced on the eve of the war and remained in place until after Stalin's death. Workers who quit their jobs without the permission of the factory administration could be forcibly returned to their place of work, and absenteeism or lateness at work could lead to workers being sentenced to compulsory labour at their place of employment.

2. E.Yu. Zubkova, *Obschestvo i reformy, 1945–1964* (Moscow, 1993).

Four of the six chapters of the present book deal with the attempts by the regime to impose these strict forms of control over labour power, and with the ways in which workers responded. The first chapter focuses on labour recruitment for industry, construction and transport, in particular on forms of forced or semivoluntary recruitment, as well as on the role of slave labour in postwar reconstruction. In the fourth chapter, Filtzer takes a more detailed look at the drafting of young rural recruits through the State Labour Reserves system and the network of vocational training establishments attached to it. Dealing with a topic virtually untouched by historians, this is one of the most original chapters, together with the following one, which analyses the enforcement, or rather the limits to the enforcement, of the laws against changing jobs. Chapter 6 focuses on the industrial enterprise, examining labour conditions, the principles of work organization and the position of workers vis-à-vis managers on the shopfloor. Chapters 2 and 3 focus on living conditions, which in Filtzer's argument are crucial for understanding the outcome of the struggle for control between workers and the regime.

The postwar years were years of intense hardship. In 1946–1947 a harvest failure led to famine in the countryside and to serious food shortages among the urban population. After rationing had been abolished at the end of 1947 some improvements followed, but standards of living remained abysmally low throughout the period under study. Filtzer contends that this was an important factor in dampening the population's expectations of better times and in rendering society politically passive. Reducing consumption levels and exerting a constant downward pressure on levels of material wellbeing simultaneously enhanced the regime's efforts at imposing control and at channelling scarce resources into the reconstruction of heavy industry. By 1948–1949, when production reached prewar levels, the regime had "won" on the economic front, and started gradually to loosen up the restrictive labour legislation that had been in place during the preceding years. Having regained control over workers and over the economy, the regime subsequently moved to quell dissent among the intelligentsia and the state apparatus, which fell victim to several fierce campaigns of political repression during the late Stalin years.

Filtzer opens up important new areas of research. His examination of labour policy and the position of workers in the postwar years is grounded in a wide array of archival sources, most of which have only become accessible to the scholarly community in recent years, and it can be expected that others will follow in his footsteps to carry out the more detailed analysis he recommends concerning a number of key developments. To this reviewer, the main question raised by the book touches on issues of periodization. Historiography usually divides Stalin's long rule into three periods; before, during, and after World War II. This is certainly a sensible periodization, given the fact that the war forms a major watershed in the history of the Soviet Union, and Filtzer quite naturally follows this periodization. At the same time though, as far as Stalinist labour policy is concerned the book clearly reveals the remarkable degree of constancy across this watershed. All the restrictive labour legislation that plays such a central role in Filtzer's analysis, for example, was implemented either on the eve of the war or during the war, and remained in place afterwards. Nor does the continuity between the pre- and postwar periods end here. The way in which the regime squeezed the resources for postwar reconstruction out of the working population by depressing consumption, raising norms, and bolstering labour discipline bears a striking analogy to the mobilization of resources during the industrialization drive of the 1930s. This suggests that it might be worthwhile studying state-worker relations under Stalinism from a perspective that transcends the

traditional division into periods and regards the period 1928–1953 as a unity. Filtzer's book has brought us an important step forwards in this direction.

Gijs Kessler

HAURY, THOMAS. *Antisemitismus von links. Kommunistische Ideologie, Nationalismus und Antizionismus in der frühen DDR*. Hamburger Edition, Hamburg 2002. 527 pp. € 35.00; DOI: 10.1017/S0020859003071177

In recent years, a number of scholarly studies focusing on the Sozialistische Einheitspartei Deutschlands (SED) and its relation to Jews have been published. The papers and documents of the SED, the Jewish community, and other organizations have been analyzed; contemporary witnesses have been interviewed or have reported in their memoirs about the State Communist Party's relationship to the Jewish community in both its religion and secular forms, i.e. to those people who were able to escape the Nazi genocide and who then returned to East Germany, for the most part from exile. Since these sources have already been evaluated to a great extent, any new book on the subject that intends to provide material for discussion must offer its readers a new perspective on the matter. To what degree has Thomas Haury been able to do this in his recently published doctoral dissertation, written at the University of Freiburg?

Haury locates his central object of interest – the anti-Semitic purges of the SED in 1952–1953 – within the context of communist policies towards Jews since the turn of the century. In addition to this, he also draws comparisons between these purges in the GDR and the way in which the Federal Republic of Germany in its initial years confronted or “worked through” the Nazi past. In the first chapter of his book, Haury analyzes “the fundamental structures of the anti-Semitic world view”, which he investigates from the nineteenth century up to the division of Germany after 1945. Within political anti-Semitism, the figure of “the Jew” was stigmatized as the eternal enemy, as the foreigner who could not be assimilated, and as the carrier of ideologies who remained estranged from an “imagined sense of community”, and from the nation. This has, of course, already been argued frequently by other scholars.

Haury, however, is interested in the continuation of such thought after Auschwitz, as well as the “dilemma of nationalism” in Germany after 1945. “Through Auschwitz”, he argues, “German nationalism, upon which any ‘national identity’ could be based, has been lost – the certainty of being a good nation.” Any attempt “to re-establish a national identity” must also seek to neutralize Auschwitz. It is precisely here, according to Haury, that we should locate the work of nationalist historians such as Nolte, Hillgruber, and Hildebrandt, who regard the Holocaust as a false, but understandable response to the Bolshevik threat (p. 145). Haury designates these and similar attempts as “secondary anti-Semitism”, which no longer holds the Jews responsible for all the problems in the world and thus distances itself from Nazism, but which at the same time subliminally regards Jews as “troublemakers” who sought to obstruct the return of a democratic Germany into the community of “normal” nation-states (pp. 157ff.).

In the second chapter, Haury investigates the question of whether we should regard Marx's treatise “On the Jewish Question” from 1843 as anti-Semitic, and whether this text established an anti-Semitic tradition within modern socialism, as Edmund Silberner and others after him have argued. Haury rejects this position, but insists correctly “that Marx

used, in a completely uncritical fashion, contemporary anti-Jewish stereotypes for his own political and philosophical purposes" (p. 181). Like Marx, however, most of his direct followers in Germany expected – insofar as they concerned themselves with Jewish affairs at all – that Judaism would “disappear”. With the progressive development of capitalism, it was thought that Jews would forfeit their social function as carriers of precapitalist mercantile capital and be assimilated into the population at large. In chapter 3, Haury investigates the SPD’s position on this issue in Imperial Germany. Here, he correctly argues that the “revisionist” wing around the journal *Sozialistische Monatshefte* had a better and more exact notion of the efforts exerted by many Jews for national and cultural self-affirmation.

In chapter 4, Haury turns to a central issue of contemporary scholarship: the relation of Leninism to anti-Semitism. Lenin, according to Haury, “spoke unambiguously against anti-Semitism and for the emancipation of Jews, advocating the assimilation paradigm. Lenin did not associate Jews with haggling and money, with capitalism and modernity, or with conspiracy theories or Manichaeism.” For reasons of party strategy, Lenin did, however, reject the Jewish Arbeiterbund’s demand for national-cultural autonomy (p. 222). According to Haury, the Bolshevik’s specific concept of the party, which becomes visible in Lenin’s writing and his political actions, already contained the “totalitarian potentials” evident in Stalinist practice (p. 229). These include the exclusion of the so-called “parasitic” classes and groups (in particular capitalists) from the working nation, which is constituted in the process of creating a socialist state. Haury argues, however, that Lenin’s “conspiracy-theory tendencies” coexist with his Marxist analysis of class, and that the former are not comparable to anti-Semitic or Stalinist “conspiracy paranoia” (p. 252). I should add here that after 1917 Lenin fundamentally regarded Jews in Soviet Russia as a nation and helped to promote Yiddish national culture – an important problem that Haury does not discuss in his book.

In chapter 5, Haury turns to the distinction that the Kommunistische Partei Deutschlands (KPD) made between the “proletarian nation” and “foreign-national capitalist elements” during the Weimar Republic. Within the strict Manichaeism of the KPD world view, capitalists were regarded as the “national enemy” of the working people. A clique of internationally connected major capitalists was said to have forced their will upon the German people: these “bank magnates”, “speculators”, “stock jobbers”, and “profiteers” (according to the terminology of the KPD) had to be “eradicated” (p. 287f.). Here, Haury correctly identifies a structural affinity to the anti-Semitic world view, although an anti-Semitism that blamed Jews for the capitalist economy, parliamentary government, or cultural modernity cannot be found in KPD literature of the time (p. 284).

Nevertheless, precisely this discourse made it difficult for a majority of SED leaders after 1945 – even while initially recognizing the collective responsibility of the entire German people for Nazi crimes – to support Politburo member Paul Merker in his demand that every possible form of support be given to the survivors of Nazi genocide, regardless of the victims’ social origins or political perspectives. Already, soon after the founding of the GDR, the SED leadership began to debate how far concessions should be made to those Jews who had indeed suffered grave hardships, but who (ostensibly) had not fought against the Nazis. Should the GDR go so far as to reimburse Jewish entrepreneurs for property confiscated by the Nazis? Wouldn’t this promote the re-establishment of capitalist relations?

What began as a petty tug-of-war about the scope of restitution then expanded in 1952,

under the influence of the anti-Jewish policies of Stalin's final years, into specifically anti-Semitic measures in the GDR. These were not comparable in their brutality to the terror in the Soviet Union or Czechoslovakia. However, these measures were enacted in the same country that, a few years earlier, had organized and executed the Holocaust. Of course, Jews in the GDR could not be officially persecuted as such. Rather, the campaign was directed against "Western emigrants", "deviationists", "anti-Party agents", and against "Zionists". At the very latest, the introduction of the term "Zionism" indicated what lay behind this coded language. While Alexander Abusch, an SED Politburo member, was initially considered as a possible main defendant in a planned political trial, it was ultimately Paul Merker who assumed this role. Merker was not Jewish, and his selection was intended to refute any accusations of anti-Semitism. However, Merker had himself been deeply involved in Jewish affairs, which had led to accusations that he was "pro-Zionist". None of these facts, which Haury carefully reconstructs in his book, are new. However, the author attempts to offer an interpretation that explains why the SED apparatus so readily adopted this anti-Semitic dimension.

According to Haury, Zionism functioned "as a central metaphor within the Marxist-Leninist world-view, and was linked to the assertion of a worldwide conspiracy of antinational Wall Street capitalists, the opposition of 'working people' to 'finance hyenas and parasites', and the threat arising from the subversive work of hidden internal enemies" (p. 429). Haury argues that this ideology – which was propagated over a long period of time and which was believed by Jewish communists as well – was responsible for the fact that Party members themselves often did not perceive the anti-Semitic dimension of "Party purges" at all. Burgeoning doubts were subordinated to their belief in the correctness of the Party's actions. While the SED leadership did have to support the anti-Semitic course ordered by Stalin, measures in the GDR never attained Soviet dimensions. However, the SED leadership was genuinely interested in eliminating those persons whose experience as exiles in the West or whose persecution as Jews allowed them to be labelled as potential nonconformists.

In his book, Haury presents an accurate overall picture of these tragic events. His approach, however, is not as novel as he claims. Much of the information in his book can be found in existing publications on the subject. Haury's critique of Leninism is sharp, but not unfair. However, his account does, to a great extent, omit the fundamental and irreconcilable opposition between Soviet policies towards Jews under Lenin and under Stalin, in particular the practical dimensions. The book is also rather repetitive; it is longer than necessary, and the narrative is not always easy to follow. This is a dilemma of many German doctoral dissertations, whose authors have worked on them for too long. Overall, however, the book is a solid and useful study. Fundamentally new information on the subject will probably be possible – if at all – only after scholars have investigated the files of Soviet security organizations.

Mario Kessler

HAREVEN, TAMARA K. *The Silk Weavers of Kyoto. Family and Work in a Changing Traditional Industry.* University of California Press, Berkeley [etc.] 2002. xxvii, 347 pp. Ill. Maps. \$55.00; £36.95. (Paper: \$21.95; £14.95.); DOI: 10.1017/S0020859003081173

Rich in illustrative photographs and equipped with an excellent index, this book is the result of Tamara K. Hareven's visits to the Nishijin weaving district of Kyoto that began in 1981 and continued for thirteen years. These included one sabbatical year but were otherwise of three or four months in duration. Through interpreters, the author interviewed 110 men and 90 women, most of whom were weavers in the district, although their numbers included others associated with Nishijin textiles as well as farming and fishing family wives on the Tango Peninsula who wove for Nishijin manufacturers. Hareven's timing was fortunate: enduring economic doldrums had made the denizens of the once closed world of Japan's oldest weaving community extremely anxious regarding Nishijin's survival and consequently willing to share their experiences with anyone displaying an interest in Nishijin. By 1985, her much appreciated advocacy in the Japanese press on behalf of "the need to save Nishijin's traditional industry and the sources of livelihood of its artisans and manufacturers" (p. 22) was helping to open hearts and doors. Her limited Japanese language and consequent use of translators, on the other hand, were not research assets. (Pages 19–20 suggest that she herself was unclear regarding how much control she had over translation.)

Part 1, the first third of the book, contains a useful history of Nishijin and its weaving industry, a detailed description of the district's work and employment system and its weavers' views of this system. Under this system, manufacturers tightly controlled weavers, regardless of whether the latter worked in their own homes on their own looms, as so many of them now did, or at home on a manufacturer's looms, in a manufacturer's small factory, or as cottage weavers on the Tango Peninsula or elsewhere. The author's emphasis on working families is apt: a manufacturer's company was usually a family business, and in workers' homes husbands and wives both wove for long hours on the piecework that procured the family income. The amount paid for this work depended upon the type and quality of the finished piece, and it was not uncommon for a wife's weaving to command a higher price than the pieces her husband produced. The women weavers Hareven met were outspoken "and shared the conversation equally with their husbands" (p. 16). In addition to her own weaving, a wife sometimes assisted her husband in preparation for his weaving and usually performed most of the housekeeping and childcare tasks – especially when the children were small. Women who thus spent fewer hours at their looms and consequently earned less than their husbands often referred to themselves as subsidiary contributors to the family welfare.

In boom times of yore, skilled weavers had been at least able to quit the employment or contract arrangement of one manufacturer and go to work for one who paid better piece rates. However, even in the best of times they wove, ate, and slept in extremely cramped working-living quarters, enjoyed few holidays or leisure hours, toiled through the night to finish orders, and suffered inordinately when manufacturers withheld orders to artificially maintain the high prices of merchandise not yet sold. In the past, many weavers had endured such conditions because they had hoped some day to become *jimae*, small-scale manufacturers, each of whom owned a few looms contracted out with weaving work to other weavers while the *jimae* and his family members continued to weave too. However long-standing, depressed market conditions – caused in large part by changing dress

practices that no longer included much kimono wearing – had destroyed the possibility of achieving *jimae* status.

In the 1980s and early 1990s, Nishijin weavers were very aware that their artistry, skill, and long labouring hours enriched manufacturers while the weavers themselves became poorer and poorer. With the seemingly permanent economic crisis, weavers faced little chance of finding an even slightly better employer. Manufacturers now routinely reduced their weavers' employment by deliberately imposing a long waiting period between orders. "Each time the weavers deliver a completed *obi*, the manufacturers delay the weavers for an interval just long enough to curtail the weavers' production, but not long enough for them to qualify for unemployment compensation" (p. 48). Manufacturers were sending much of what little weaving work was available to cottage weavers in rural areas, where farm and fishing wives worked for cheaper rates than Nishijin weavers. Enormously proud of the fine works of art their craft produced and the hardships they survived pursuing it, Nishijin weavers deeply resented their manufacturers' exploitation. Convinced that the organization of their profession and the individualism of its practitioners made collective workplace action against employers a losing cause, they nevertheless acknowledged that, along with labour legislation, the presence of even very weak labour unions had improved their lot somewhat. (Nonweaving neighbours' intolerance of the noise of looms going all night long had also helped to shorten their working hours.) Weavers bitterly noted the technical ruses manufacturers used to ignore post-World-War-II labour legislation. Perhaps most telling of all, most of them did not want their children to become weavers.

The Nishijin people's own stories, fourteen chapters of varying lengths carrying transcripts of some of Hareven's interviews, occupy most of the remaining two-thirds of the book. Weavers, former weavers, manufacturers, manufacturers' relatives, a production manager, a weaver's assistant, and a warper discuss, in terms of their own particular lives, the Part 1 themes of weaving work and lives, and the ideas of workers and employers. These accounts appear to be rather raw data: seemingly the tape recorder was turned on, the individual or individuals spoke, the tape recorder was turned off, someone translated the words on the tape and with very little editing or provision of historical context the translations became pages 105–302 of the book. Vivid personal portraits of past and present emerge from these transcripts: a proud patriarch of a distinguished manufacturing firm, a hardworking father with a delinquent past who used to gamble away his earnings, a wife determined to make her husband share housework, a little boy who was sent out to work like an adult, women quietly handling much of the administration in family businesses, a highly skilled husband-and-wife team at a pair of ever moving looms, a weaving woman remembering how she and other women had been forced to take their infants and toddlers with them to the crowded little factory where they worked, a Tango Peninsula wife struggling to weave all day, look after her crops, and get up at 3.30 am to see her husband off when he goes fishing.

Still, this reader wished for a little more. One wonders why the stories of these particular 23 individuals were chosen out of those of the 200 interviewed by Hareven. From internal evidence, one can sometimes guess the approximate year a recording was made but not always. This is unfortunate because, without the date of the conversation, the reader often has little idea which specific time period within the years 1981–1993 the speaker is discussing. Since only responses are elicited and the researcher's questions are never revealed, one does not even know if all the interviewees were asked the same ones.

Discrepancies in testimony are not ironed out: for instance, was Mrs Fujiwara fifty or forty-six at the time of the interview? More disturbing, helpful context is missing: for example, how did weavers' education through the first or second term of the sixth grade compare to the pre-World-War-II schooling of the rest of the population in Kyoto? In Japan? What did Mr Shibagaki actually do as a lower-class worker in the war-supply industry? Explication of his version of the prewar textile tax system on p. 235 would have been very welcome. Most distressing of all, by the time one reaches these individual narratives one finds oneself rereading much of what one has already read because Part 1 is full of long quotations lifted from these stories. I found the very general conclusion in the nine pages of the last chapter to be disappointing. Nevertheless, there is a great deal of important information about the silk weavers of Kyoto in this book.

E. Patricia Tsurumi

ROCHLIN, JAMES F. *Vanguard Revolutionaries in Latin America*. Peru, Colombia, Mexico. Lynne Rienner Publishers, Boulder [etc.] 2003. vii, 293 pp. Maps. £45.50. (Paper: £18.50.); DOI: 10.1017/S002085900309117X

This book aims to give a comparative analysis of modern revolutionary movements in three Latin American countries. Although a few smaller groups also receive some attention, the book focuses on the Shining Path (Sendero Luminoso) in Peru, the FARC and the ELN in Colombia, and the *Zapatistas* (EZLN) in southern Mexico. These are quite different groups, but they all had their heyday in the late twentieth century, in a period when revolutionary ideologies were on the retreat in most parts of the world, and also in Latin America. Rochlin is interested in the origins and logic of these attempts to start revolutionary guerrilla movements in this period because they can "provide a panorama of the emerging contours of Latin America's strategic terrain in the twenty-first century" (p. 5). The movements in these three countries are all approached in the same fashion. First, Rochlin examines their historical origins and ideologies; he then focuses on their actions and the strategies they employ to reach their revolutionary goals. Finally, their success is evaluated, mainly using the work of a number of classical authors on war and successful government, such as Thucydides, Machiavelli, Clausewitz and Sun Tzu II.

As the author states in his introduction, his intention is not to understand why people rebel, but how they do so. If I understand Rochlin correctly, he wants to analyse Latin American revolutionaries not so much in the context of the wider society, but in the context of their own ideologies and political and revolutionary aims. This promise is not entirely fulfilled, because the book is basically directed at answering the question why and when "a variety of social vulnerabilities" can descend "into the chaos of warfare" (p. 4). The book is therefore full of observations on the causes of rebellion in Latin America.

The book starts with an analysis of the Shining Path in Peru. This is not surprising, since it is the only one of the three revolutionary movements that can really be treated as history. When its charismatic leader, Abimael Guzmán, was captured by the government of Albert Fujimori in 1992, the movement was all but undone, despite rumours of its re-emergence in present-day Peru. In retrospect, it becomes clear that the movement only posed a real danger to the Peruvian state for a short period, between 1989 and 1992. This is not to deny the real and present danger felt by the Peruvian population in that period, when bombs were exploding in the major cities of the country and the government was utterly incapable

of effectively responding to that danger. But it qualifies Rochlin's somewhat rash statement that the movement was "one of Latin America's most potent and ferocious guerrilla movements of the twentieth century" (p. 23). The contradictions in the book's approach become immediately clear in the second chapter on the Shining Path. Presented as an analysis of the movement's ideology and political strategies, it rapidly turns into an analysis of the desperate and violent methods employed by the Peruvian governments of Alan García and Alberto Fujimori to try to suppress it. Fujimori eventually succeeded in doing so by capturing its leader, Abimael Guzmán.

The second part of the book focuses on the situation in Colombia, and above all on the position of the two main revolutionary movements in that country – the FARC and the ELN. The two chapters devoted to this story are much better structured and show a profound insight into the country's complex problematics which is lacking in other parts of this book. Rochlin describes in lucid detail the chaotic and complex imbroglio in which Colombia has been involved since the violence started in the late 1940s. In the Colombian case the distinction between political strategy and ideology is very useful. Both the FARC and the ELN have been particularly adept in finding weaknesses in the defence mechanisms of the Colombian state and in consistently finding new political allies and sources of income. They have been helped by Colombia's coca cultivation and the drugs trafficking in which the country was involved. It gave them access to almost unlimited financial resources, but at the price of losing their ideological and political "purity".

Both also committed important tactical and strategic errors, overplaying their hands, involving themselves in atrocities against the civilian population, and making important political mistakes. The FARC's most important historical error appears to have been that it was not satisfied with the *zona de distensión* that the Pastrana government handed over to it in 1998. Instead of consolidating its position and seeking an honourable peace, the movement continued to humiliate the government, and especially its leader Andrés Pastrana. When Pastrana convincingly lost the 2002 elections to the hardliner, Uribe, the FARC lost the initiative and had to retreat to conventional guerrilla warfare again. This is becoming much more difficult, however, because of the advanced US technology that Plan Colombia brought to the country. Rochlin presents a detailed and well-informed analysis of the complex recent history of Colombia's revolutionary movements. His narrative remains somewhat descriptive, however, and constitutes an inventory rather than an innovative analysis. He concludes by noting that in Colombia different levels of revolutionary struggle are coinciding. He writes (p. 159): "The Colombian case represents a crazy quilt of premodern, modern, and postmodern features".

The third case, that of the *Zapatistas* in Mexico, is the least convincing of the three, mainly because Rochlin tends to reproduce the romantic and sometimes even euphoric interpretation of the movement that conquered the world in the first years after its emergence in 1994. The movement's use of the Internet, its linkage to environmental issues, and its romantic rhetoric under the leadership of the mysterious and eloquent Sub-Comandante Marcos led many observers to see it as a new type of movement, pointing the way to new forms of political action in the twenty-first century. However, after the initial shock, the Mexican government resorted to a mix of compromise and repression to isolate the movement quite successfully, wearing it down and restricting its practical political consequences to a minimum. The part of his book that Rochlin dedicates to this post-1996 period, when the Mexican central government took the initiative and the *Zapatistas'* influence dwindled, is tantalizingly short – too short at least to conclude, as he does, that

“the Zapatistas have represented an important phenomenon in Mexican politics and with regard to hemispheric security” (p. 207). Using the classical sources so much favoured by Rochlin, it could just as well be said that the example of the *Zapatista* movement has shown once again the practical weakness of romantic revolutionary movements.

Reading this book, I frequently wondered what kind of public the author had in mind in writing it. It offers no new information or innovative perspectives on the three cases presented, nor does it offer original theoretical or conceptual insights. Its comparative aspirations, laudable as they may be, do not live up to their promise. Even in the conclusion, the three case studies are treated separately without any real comparative analysis. Finally, the book’s narrative is too dense to make it useful as a general introduction. Rochlin’s intention appears to have been more or less political. He aims to understand these three revolutionary cases so as to find ways to avoid the emergence of similar movements in the future. In his own words, the utility of these cases must be seen “in a preventative sense”. Rochlin’s emphasis on social inequality and governmental incompetence as causes of discontent and the emergence of revolutionary social movements is certainly valid. However, the short general descriptions of these movements offered by Rochlin do not help us very much in understanding their origins, their popularity (however temporary), and their ultimate failure. I would therefore recommend readers who are interested in these questions to consult good monographs on each of these movements. Rochlin’s book can serve only as an introduction to the complex questions facing political scientists and historians when they try to understand these contemporary revolutionary movements.

Michiel Baud