

replica of Britain in what was usually an entirely different geographical and social context. Exactly like Rushdie's *Saladin Chamcha*, the inhabitants of these countries often ended up claiming to be "more English than the English." The contributors to *The Revision of Englishness* might have made more of what appears to be a strong connection between colonial and metropolitan experiences of Englishness, whether in terms of historical reality, artistic representation or the interface between the two. If nothing else, such an approach might have given the collection a wider academic appeal.

Such criticisms notwithstanding, *The Revision of Englishness* does constitute an often effective effort to analyse how various artists have attempted to deal with the question of what it has meant to be English in the postwar era. The essays are uniformly well written and, for the most part, free of that academic jargon that can make literary criticism such a horror to read. The collection ends, suitably enough given its title, with a rousing call for a new sense of Englishness "resonant as a signifier for a 'civic' vision encompassing the local and global" (184). It is a beautiful dream, though, one suspects, not much more than that.

Todd Webb—Brock University

**Peter Winn, ed., *Victims of the Chilean Miracle: Workers and Neoliberalism in the Pinochet Era, 1973-2002* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2004).**

Peter Winn is on a mission. He is out to shatter the persistent fantasy of an economic miracle in Chile under the dictatorship of *de facto* president General Augusto Pinochet. Toward that end, Winn has assembled a consistently excellent collection of analyses. Beyond any reasonable doubt, he has laid waste to the claim that Pinochet brought prosperity to Chileans. Reason, though, has often had little to do with how the "miracle" argument has taken shape over the past thirty years. In fact, despite the strong analysis of Winn and others, it is likely that the miracle myth will have legs for some time to come.

In 1973, after Pinochet led the Chilean military in a US CIA-backed coup d'état he launched a two-pronged internal war against so-called Communist subversion. First, the dictatorship set about destroying political enemies by killing them, jailing them, driving them into exile, or forcing them into so-called internal exile in the South. Second, over the next decade and a half, the Chilean government dismantled government involvement in the economy wherever it could. This project boasted multiple components. In the 1970s these included the positioning of the "Chicago Boys" (University of Chicago-trained right wing economists) in positions of authority, the destruction of organized

labour, the sale of state-owned enterprises, and generous give-aways of state resources to foreign investors. After 1980, it also featured “pioneering” neo-liberal initiatives that included the first system of private pension plans in the Americas (long since celebrated by Republican Party activists as an appropriate model for the United States).

Well researched and powerfully argued, the chapters in *Victims* chart a common set of themes. They are declining working conditions, the impoverishment of working peoples, the weakening of class consciousness and class based politics, and the rightward shift of the political center in post-Pinochet Chile as a victory of dictatorship period economic policies. Despite the consistently high level of the collection, it might have been strengthened in two ways. First, each of the authors is based in the United States. This is not in and of itself a problem. But the debate over the Chilean miracle has been and continues to be deeply politicized in Chile. It has taken on a life of its own, intimately tied since 1990 to the political contours of memory and justice around the Pinochet Era. In light of this, in light of Chileans remaining deeply divided still on the Pinochet legacy, and in light of a number of unique and rich contributions of Chilean authors to the debate, the collection would have profited from the inclusion of Chilean scholarship and the editor’s having addressed the scholarly literature on this theme as politics and ideology. Second, while the chapters concern a wide variety of workplaces and industrial sectors, there is almost no attention to aboriginal people as workers. This is especially disappointing in light of the political roles of the Mapuche, for example, in regard to the rise and fall of the dictatorship, and the places of indigenous peoples in Chilean society.

Peter Winn’s chapter on the Pinochet Era is masterful, the best overview of post-1973 Chile that I have read, and an excellent starting point for anyone interested in the links between state terror, social policy, and economics in Chile. Winn has also written a brilliant study of the decline of the Chilean textile industry since 1973. A traditional stronghold of the political left and organized labour, the textile sector was decimated by Pinochet Era state violence, and social and economic policies. With thousands of lost jobs, textile workers and factory owners pressed the post-Pinochet era democratic government for state aid. But dictatorship economic policies continued to hold sway through the 1990s. In a climate of globalized trade and investment there was no help forthcoming. What was left of the Chilean textile sector after 1990 had all but vanished by 2002.

Unlike textiles, the Madeco metallurgical industry represents a strong measure of success for its having thrived under Pinochet to become a South American leader. But like similar Chilean success stories, according to Joel Stillerman, Madeco’s rise was built on worker losses through declining wages, disappearing benefits, longer hours, weaker union representation, and a van-

ished class solidarity that was common to many workplaces. There are similar results for seasonal fruit workers. But here Heidi Tinsman argues that dictatorship policies had a more profound impact on women than on men. Her argument is sophisticated. Pinochet's assault on organized labour led to a severe exploitation of women that was marked by much longer hours and poorly paid piece-work. At the same time, Tinsman contends that work and wages improved women's authority in their communities and homes, including the power in many situations to leave abusive relationships. Rachel Schurman's "Shuckers, Sorters, Headers, and Gutters" considers work in a new dictatorship-period export industry—seafood. Here an environmental problem is linked to declining work conditions. While the state-supported fishing industry produced enormous exports, by the early 1990s a combination of domestic and foreign overfishing had destroyed Chilean fish stocks. Workers not only confronted the low wages, job insecurity, and absence of benefits common to other sectors, but the industry itself was jeopardized by reckless inattention to the well being of fish populations.

Ever since the late 1970s, there has been a steady stream of statistics flogged by economists dead set on "proving" that Pinochet's state terror was a "necessary" evil on the path to prosperity for all Chileans. There has never been any credible evidence for that claim. A range of scholarly analysis has long since highlighted growing poverty in Chile since the mid-1970s, associated with each of the Pinochet Era major economic ventures, from the gross mismanagement of privatizations to the failed promise of private pension plans over the past few years for the first generation of dictatorship era retirees. But in the context of Chile's ongoing struggle to rid itself of the Pinochet legacy, and the strong ongoing presence of pro-Pinochet apologists in positions of authority, a deeply politicized and polarized argument around the "miracle" will continue, in spite of this edited *tour de force* and other important works showing the miracle for what it really was.

David Sheinin—Trent University

**Mary Gluck, *Popular Bohemia: Modernism and Urban Culture in Nineteenth-Century Paris* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2005).**

In *Popular Bohemia*, Mary Gluck aims to re-orient our historical and theoretical understanding of modernism, in order to bring it closer to the "humble and neglected regions of popular culture and everyday experience" of the nineteenth century (2). In doing so, she sets her argument against that of scholars such as Matei Calinescu (*Five Faces of Modernity: Modernism, Avant-Garde, Decadence, Kitsch, Postmodernism* [1982]), Andreas Huyssen (*After the Great*