Karin Fischer, Eine Klasse für sich, Besitz, Herrschaft und ungleiche Entwicklung in Chile, 1830-2010 (Baden-Baden: Nomos, 2011).

This sophisticated, nuanced study provides an important look at the formation of Chile’s business and economic elite and how it exercises its hegemony over society. Fischer concisely organizes the history of the Chilean bourgeoisie into distinct eras: 1) the liberal 100 years (1830-1930); 2) transition to industrial capitalism (1930-1973); 3) violent transformation of the military dictatorship (1973-1989); and 4) democratic neo-liberalism (1990-2010). Throughout all these sections, the author demonstrates a skillful, thoughtful command of the material. Analysis is always backed by careful documentation.

In addition, Fischer supplies numerous tables that enhance rather than distract from the flow of the narrative. Of course, much of the information may be known to scholars of Chile. The author acknowledges her debt to a rich treasury of previous scholarly work including that of James Petras and C. Wright Mill. Yet new information and insights create a historical narrative that is compelling and sets out the logic of how Chile’s business elite came to choose neo-liberalism.

Eine Klasse für sich pulls together research and analysis into a thoughtful, readable, and original account of Chile’s bourgeoisie. One interesting section is the discussion of the relationship between the economic theory of the “Chicago Boys” and the role of media shaping popular perceptions within civil society (IV.3.3). Mass media successfully created a predominance of neo-liberal ideas that reinforced the practices of the business elite.

General Pinochet and his military cohorts who overthrew democratically elected President Allende turned to the theories preached by Milton Friedman of the University of Chicago. Flocking southward from the United States, young followers of Friedman were given a free hand to turn Chile into one large neo-liberal experiment with workers’ institutions destroyed along with drastic upheavals caused by numerous privatizations, all done for the financial benefit of the business elite.

This splendid book concludes with a powerful prediction for the future. The author contends that social movements opposed to the status quo must be willing to go beyond immediate political demands to a debate about values and discussions on how life is best lived. To leap from neo-liberalism to a real democracy depends on whether creative grassroots movements can “break out of the ideological hegemony of neo-liberalism.” (182) While setting out the his-
torical development of the business elite, the book demonstrates the ways in which its ideas, one may even say its culture, must be challenged if the subordinate classes are to achieve true popular rule and, perhaps even a new type of society. *Eine Klasse für sich* is of great value and should be widely studied. An English translation would be useful to facilitate wider discussion and debate.

If there are faults with this study, they spring from this book’s strengths. That is, in producing a concise and stimulating study that is appealing to the intellect, Fischer has left readers wishing for more. It can only be hoped that this is but the first chapter in the author’s valuable examination of Chilean society.

Dr. William A. Pelz
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*Home and Native Land: Unsettling Multiculturalism in Canada* is an ambitious collection. Emerging from a 2007 conference titled *From Multicultural Rhetoric to Anti-Racist Action*, this work brings together junior and senior scholars from a range of academic disciplines, as well as artists, social organisers, and activists. Inside we find manifestos, reflective pieces on performance, art, and organizing, as well as more conventional academic essays. The diversity of contributions nicely illustrates the laudable intention to speak from multiple perspectives and to a broad audience.

Divided into four overlapping sections, the collection’s overarching objective, as suggested in the title, is to ‘unsettle’ Canadian multiculturalism. For the editors, ‘unsettling’ means disrupting multiculturalism’s status as settled (accepted, commonsense), as well as its settling functions (as a discourse that settles meaning and space, securing the state’s claims to territory, resources, and adjudicative power). Together, the chapters demonstrate that while multiculturalism has never been a stable entity, its meanings have nonetheless become “sedimented” over time (3). They show how it has been debated and contested since its inception, and how it continues to be made and remade in ever new and changing contexts.