

tionship(s) between discourse/power, on the one hand, and ideology, on the other. My one criticism, however, is that Faison's emphasis on disciplinary techniques, and the relations of power that accompany them, tended to de-emphasize problems of expropriation (in the countryside, where most of the factory women came from) and exploitation. For it is precisely in the relationship between expropriation and exploitation that one could fruitfully combine the methods of Foucault and Marx. More specifically, what is lacking in Faison's analysis is a rigorous analysis of the recruitment process whereby the factory women became factory women in the first place.

The question here is how to think the problem of exploitation from the perspective of the recruitment process itself; in other words, prior to the process of exploiting the surplus labour time of the female workers in the production process. From what I have read in Janet Hunter's *Women and the Labour Market in Japan's Industrializing Economy* (2003)—a book which does not pose the relationship between gender, nation, and sexuality with the same analytical rigor—and from what I know about the interwar day labour market, where day workers identified and struggled against what they called “intermediary exploitation” (or *chukan sakushu*) stemming from recruitment practices, the textile recruitment process also seems equally exploitative, but again in this ‘intermediary’ sense. Intermediary exploitation specifically translated into distinctions between formal and real wages, and into a highly differentiated economy of ‘commissions’ represented by and remunerated to recruiters who exploited the vulnerable position of workers in the sphere of circulation, i.e., outside of production. How this problem of intermediary exploitation, endemic to the recruitment process, may be connected to the codification of female workers as ‘ideal women’, or to the recoding of nation and sexuality, is something that neither Hunter nor Faison take up. While I understand how difficult it is to access this problem in the archive, it nonetheless points empirically and theoretically to some limitations in contemporary historical analyses of the interwar labour market that need to be addressed if we are to really understand the historicity of the struggles by female factory workers in Japan.

Ken C. Kawashima
University of Toronto

Robert Service, *Comrades!: A History of World Communism* (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 2007).

With the passage of time since the collapse of Soviet power in Europe and the opening of long closed Russian archives, the world is ready for a sophisticated, fair and readable survey of world Communism with an understanding of context and a feel for nuance. Such a volume would serve an invaluable role in introducing neophytes to this rich, textured and highly contested history. Along comes

Comrades! filled with clear, readable and, at times, even witty prose. Despite this advantage, *Comrades!* sadly is not able to meet even the most minimal expectations. The author is conservative to the point of being reactionary, but this is not the problem. After all, everyone is entitled to their own point of view.

If Stalin's monstrous mockery of Marxism was a tragedy, Service's inability to present the most relevant facts accurately is a farce. Ironically, this book is soviet-centric, seeing every Communist movement as a mere appendage of the Kremlin. According to Service, this is unavoidable. Blinded by his own prejudices, *Comrades!* drips with the type of anti-communism most prominent during the 1950s Red Scare. Anyone who shows the slightest sympathy or understanding of Communism is subject to dismissal, if not outright character assassination. For example, Issac Deutscher is not simply a historian with whom Service disagrees, but rather a "useful propagandist" for Trotsky (374). A leader of the French Communists is not only wrong about the Soviet Union, he is "an ageing poodle who had usually trotted obediently down the line" (466).

At times, the author appears to be downright quirky as when he seems obsessed with Russian secret police wearing leather coats. A casual reading might lead one to believe that the popular resentment against the various agencies ultimately known as the KGB was based on their wearing of leather coats (101). Would Russian citizens have been more friendly towards the Cheka if they wore cloth coats? Of greater import than such personal idiosyncrasies is the stream of factual errors that afflict *Comrades!* Particularly ill informed when discussing anything outside his Russian specialty, Service lets flow a stream of factual errors that one could not excuse even in an undergraduate paper written by an unusually dense freshman.

Space does not allow a full recounting of all these mistakes, but the following examples leap out. Service presents Chile's socialist President Salvador Allende as the head of a Communist government (2-3). Italian Marxist Antonio Gramsci, who was born in Sardina, is put forward as a Sicilian who died in prison, when in fact he died after his release (92). The German Communist Party is blamed for an uprising in January 1918 (that never took place) almost a year before they were formed (86). *Comrades!* has philosophy professor Herbert Marcuse teaching at the wrong campus in California. Marx and Engels are not spared this reign of error as they are made to stand "forth as the destroyers of democracy" (32). It is, according to Service, a straight line from "Lenin to Pol Pot and Fidel Castro" (4). Can one imagine the howls of outrage if a left-wing historian began with Adam Smith and then proceeded to draw a straight line to Hitler, Mussolini and the massacre of a million Communists in Indonesia?

Comrades! is so deeply flawed as to be useless as a text on this complex and important subject. Although the factual errors alone disqualify this book as a serious history, Service also appears perversely to accept Stalin's belief that Communist movements can only be judged by their usefulness to the Soviet

Union. The idea that there were any indigenous sources of non-Russian communism is dismissed when it is not ridiculed. Furthermore, this is asserted rather than factually supported. One wonders if decades of researching Stalin's Russia has caused the author to (unconsciously) adopt the Stalinist school of historiography. Even the language used in the conclusion reminds one of the insults heaped upon Stalin's enemies. Readers learn that communism is a "Plague Bacillus" whose mutation has given us Hitler, Mussolini, Saddam Hussein and bin Laden (481-482). This reads like one of the more vicious speeches given at Stalin's Moscow Show Trials.

Tellingly, this work compares Communism unfavorably with fascism and Nazism. After all, claims Service, look at the "limited nature of the changes in society made by Hitler and Mussolini" (486). No doubt this statement would come as a great surprise to the millions who suffered and died in places whose very names conjure up horror: Dachau, Buchenwald and Auschwitz, to mention but a few. Service would do well to remember that one can be anti-communist without being an apologist for fascism. Many non-communists, although not Service, understood that 'limited changes' was not what either German Nazism or Italian fascism were about.

The tens of millions of people who thought that by being in the Communist movement they were fighting and dying for a better world deserve better. Even granted that at times they may have been mistaken, betrayed or manipulated, still, they saw many things more clearly than the author of *Comrades!* They saw the devastating nature of poverty and the soul numbing aspects of oppression. True, non-Russian communists may have not always practiced democracy, yet in their gut most knew freedom was more than being able to decide which faction of the ruling class would administer the state apparatus. They were often wrong and some may have even worn leather coats, but what they really wanted was a better world. They believed, as German communist poet Bertolt Brecht put it: "Change the world, it needs it."

William A. Pelz
Institute of Working Class History