

postwar period, Hungary, for example, had more in common with its co-imperialist power Austria than it did with Tsarist Russia. Thus, why consider the two regions side-by-side? At the very least, it would have been useful for the authors to have addressed the hotly contested issue of defining the borders (mental and geographic) of Eastern Europe, rather than to have simply subsumed East European countries within the Russian sphere of history.

This complaint notwithstanding, I highly recommend *Turizim* to historians concerned with such issues as transnational developments in leisure and consumer culture, as well as the role of culture (broadly understood) in modern nation and state building. Filled with rich detail and analysis, Gorsuch and Koenker's volume successfully brings tourism history, and the socialist experience of modernity, out of the historical ghetto and into the mainstream—where they both belong.

Michelle A. Standley
New York University

Eugene Gogol, *Raya Dunayevskaya: Philosopher of Marxist-Humanism* (Eugene, Oregon: Resource Publications, 2004).

Raya Dunayevskaya (Rae Spiegel) was born in the Ukraine in 1910. In 1922 she moved to Chicago with her family, where she joined the Communist youth organization the Young Workers League, and worked in the offices of the American Negro Labour Congress' paper, the *Negro Champion*. Expelled in 1928 for Trotskyism, she served as Trotsky's Russian-language secretary in Mexico in the late 1930s. In the early 1940s, as a member of the Workers Party, Dunayevskaya joined forces with C.L.R. James, perhaps best known for his history of the Haitian slave revolt, *The Black Jacobins*. Known as the State-Capitalist Tendency, in 1945 they became the Johnson (James) - Forest (Dunayevskaya) Tendency. Along with co-leader Grace Lee, they led the Tendency in the Workers Party, then as a minority in the Socialist Workers Party, then as an independent group. In 1955 the Tendency split apart, with Dunayevskaya and her followers creating the paper *News and Letters*, which continues to this day. Dunayevskaya herself died in 1987.

Eugene Gogol's work *Raya Dunayevskaya: Philosopher of Marxist Humanism* presents Dunayevskaya's ideas by means of long quotations and a minimum of his own analysis. In this work Gogol, who was one of Dunayevskaya's secretaries in the 1980s and the editor of *News and Letters* from 1980 to 1992, is not so much writer as reporter. At times Gogol himself is almost invisible, in one sense an admirable act of self-effacement, in another a worrisome abdication of his responsibilities as author. The book is repetitive, at times frustratingly so. We are presented with aspects of Dunayevskaya's life and work over and over again, yet come away from the book knowing remarkably little about her, or about many of the peo-

ple who worked with and supported her. We are left as much with an iconic figure as with a flesh and blood human being.

In 1976 Raya Dunayevskaya described other left thinkers as “a lot of nobodies who call themselves Marxists” (233). Most readers will find a writer and activist who critiqued the vanguard party and the elitism of more important revolutionaries than herself claiming to have gone beyond them a bit hard to take. Gogol claims, as did Dunayevskaya herself, that the theory of state capitalism as applied to the Soviet Union under Stalin was her theory. Dunayevskaya may have been the theory’s most important and insightful advocate—Tony Cliff supporters may disagree—but the reader needs to know that the Industrial Workers of the World, the Council Communists, and other leftists had theorized the Soviet Union as state capitalist years before Dunayevskaya developed her theory. The lack of generosity here, the failure to acknowledge that Dunayevskaya was the inheritor of the work of other leftists, is a troubling, but not surprising assertion about a woman who claimed to be the only Marxist of her generation to understand Marx (215).

In addition, Gogol provides the reader with little sense of Dunayevskaya’s place in the mid-twentieth century sweep of Marxist humanism. For Gogol, other advocates of Marxist humanism do not exist, because Dunayevskaya created Marxist Humanism with a capital ‘H’. A quick perusal of the Marxist Internet Archives (MIA) site provides the reader with a better sense of Dunayevskaya and her place than does Gogol’s book. The MIA acknowledges Gogol’s point that Dunayevskaya played a crucial role in disseminating the concept of Marxist humanism by providing the first English translation of Marx’s *1844 Manuscripts*, but it goes beyond him by locating her in relation to the ex-Stalinist academics who theorized Marxist humanism in the era of the New Left. Gogol’s index has no entries for Ernst Bloch, C. Wright Mills, Marshall Berman, Isaac Deutscher, Edward Thompson, or a number of other prominent thinkers and writers. Even Erich Fromm, a longtime correspondent and confidante of Dunayevskaya, is missing.

Only Hegel and Marx scholars will understand, and likely appreciate, long, detailed discussions of Hegel’s absolutes, Hegel’s dialectics and the centrality of the concept of double negation. Gogol gets so immersed in Dunayevskaya’s own immersion in Hegel that he does not allow the reader to come up for air, or to stand back and appreciate the ways in which Dunayevskaya’s Marxist Humanism allowed her to refute postmodernism. Gogol begins by observing that “much postmodern thought denies the idea of revolution, denounces any revolutionary role for dialectical thought, and questions the existence of revolutionary subjectivity” (1), but fails to fully develop the insight in the body of the book. More relevant to many readers than Hegel’s brilliance and his profound influence on Marx is the book’s indirect revelation of Dunayevskaya’s critique of the falsity of much postmodern criticism of Marxism, especially the aspect of postmodernism that condemns Marx for positing the working class as the subject of history. Dunayevskaya, before postmodernism was well known in North America, had already negated its critique by

pointing out that in the project of overthrowing capitalism's rule the problem is that the working class and the peasantry have not been the subject of history, not that they have. By the 1960s Dunayevskaya and *News and Letters* were already positing African Americans, youth, and women as the subjects of history, and actively participating in their struggles. Dunayevskaya understood that postmodernism is one of the 'cultural substitutes' for genuine revolution put in place by people excusing their failure to fight for the total reorganization of capitalist society (225).

The truth, eloquence and continuing relevance of Raya Dunayevskaya's impressive body of work is here, but the reader will need to be patient and open-minded. Readers up to the challenge will discover Dunayevskaya's brilliant observation that Marx's labour theory of value is really a value theory of labour. They will come to appreciate Dunayevskaya's powerful evocation of the need to realize the innate abilities of the world's men and women through the negation of class rule, racism, and misogyny. They will be impressed by Dunayevskaya's insistence that *News and Letters* be a paper edited by a wage worker that features the voices of workers, women, people of colour, inmates, and other prisoners of the Capitalist Dream. For these reasons alone *Raya Dunayevskaya: Philosopher of Marxist-Humanism* is well worth reading. Readers may emerge from the experience uneasy at Gogol's unquestioning adulation of Dunayevskaya, but willing to concede that she points us beyond totalitarianism, rampant capitalism and postmodernism to a more human future.

Peter Campbell
Queen's University

Bonny Ibhawoh, *Imperialism and Human Rights: Colonial Discourses of Rights and Liberties in African History* (New York: State University of New York Press, 2006).

The ambition suggested in Bonny Ibhawoh's *Imperialism and Human Rights* is a bit misleading as the book focuses closely on colonial Nigeria and not the entire continent, but the issues raised here fit in the bigger discussion among historians who are trying to map the antecedents of the human rights movement. Ibhawoh traces the uses of a rights discourse by colonial elites against the colonial government. His aim is twofold: first, to demonstrate that a rights discourse was appropriated by Africans who used it to position themselves politically across a broad array of contested issues such as antislavery, property rights, the colonial legal system and customary law, and, second, to interrogate the politics of this rights discourse which often shored up the interests of a colonial elite against other indigenous political powers.

In concluding his study, Ibhawoh wryly remarks that the practitioners of the rights discourse who acceded to power after independence abandoned this pol-