

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*

Divide: Modernism, Mass Culture, Postmodernism [1986]), and Carl Schorske (*Fin-de-Siècle Vienna: Politics and Culture* [1981]; *Thinking with History: Explorations in the Passage to Modernism* [1998]), who have envisioned modernism as a phenomenon exclusive to the world of high culture, identified by its sense of “aesthetic autonomy” and its “retreat from the historical world into the interiorized realms of the psyche and of art” (2-6). Gluck develops her argument about a more “inclusive” and “democratic” modernism by charting the various permutations and expressions of nineteenth-century bohemian culture, which is often linked with modernist aesthetics, from its emergence in the 1830s to the start of the First World War (4). Through her “historical archaeology” of different forms of the bohemian, including the romantic hero, the urban *flâneur*, the decadent, and the Primitive artist, Gluck persuasively shows how the modern artist, traditionally depicted as an isolated and removed figure, actually possessed many ties to popular Parisian society and culture throughout the nineteenth century (23).

Those concerned with the cultural and intellectual histories of Paris will find much of interest in *Popular Bohemia*. Gluck rightly emphasizes the role of the marketplace, commercial culture, and the mass press, all of which were fundamental to notions of modernity during the latter half of the nineteenth century, in order to draw connections between modernism, bohemia, and popular culture. By showing the ways in which the modern artist developed in direct relation to an expanding consumer society, new avenues of interpretation emerge about the origins and nature of the bohemian experience. Gluck demonstrates, for example, how romantic bohemians of the 1830s, typically seen as radical and subversive eccentrics, were “public performers” who used theatricality, spectacle, and lavish costumes to parody popular forms of entertainment, such as melodrama (78). In her analysis, *flâneurs* of the 1840s, known for their sober and detached musings on the urban experience, were “novelists and journalists, who occupied a symbolic and mediated public space, made available to them by the commercial press and the mass media” (78). Gluck also emphasizes how decadents of the *fin de siècle*, traditionally identified by their sense of alienation, malaise, and exclusivity, had attachments to the “carnavalesque world” of popular venues such as the cafés and cabarets of Montmartre (110).

Gluck argues that these aspects of bohemian culture were significant to the artist’s desire to capture the essence of what it meant to be modern: “The bohemian artist, in his changing guises as melodramatic hero, as anonymous journalist, as cabaret performer ... had a common mission: to make transparent the hidden, mysterious and fragmented aspects of modern experience” (163). In this way, she contends that artists were not aloof in their attempts to understand and make sense of their modern world, nor were they marked by a withdrawal from society into an interiorized and esoteric world of art. Rather,

they utilized popular forms of performance, theatricality, and ironic parody, to make their messages “legible” and “visible” to a wider public (119). Throughout *Popular Bohemia*, the city of Paris is integral to this line of inquiry. Theatres, clubs, cafés, cabarets, and the streets of the capital, all factor into Gluck’s ideas about the performative nature of the bohemian, and famous sites such as the Salpêtrière and the Trocadero Museum play critical roles in her fashioning of a public modernism. The city and its artists also figure prominently in her collection of illustrations from popular publications such as *Les Français peints par eux-mêmes* (1841), and famous caricatures by Honoré Daumier. These depict the many varieties of bohemian culture, and underscore Gluck’s point about its pervasiveness at the commercial level.

There may be some disagreement over Gluck’s approach to popular culture and its public venues. She admits as much when she points to critics such as T. J. Clark, who contend that bohemian spaces such as cafés and cabarets, while popular and democratic on the surface, and open to a “heterogeneous audience” that blurred class divisions, were not truly able to erase the “economic inequalities, social injustice, or class oppression of modern society” (125). Gluck’s reply is that bohemian cultural venues were never intended to fight this battle. Their goal, in her estimation, was to “transform perceptions” about the world in which people lived: “their hope was to transform modernity on the symbolic and experiential level, making it transparent, accessible, and emotionally expressive for ordinary people” (125-126). In linking various aspects of bohemian culture to this objective, not only through her discussion of artists from the romantic hero to the Primitive artist, but also through her re-evaluation of key figures such as Gautier, Baudelaire, and Gauguin, Gluck presents us with an alternative version of bohemia which “never subscribed to the myth of autonomy” (187). In this way, *Popular Bohemia* is an important study that should encourage historians to envision a modernism that is rooted in a public and popular experience, and will be of interest to those who continue to explore the intersections of art, culture, and society, as well as the historical conditions of modernity.

Julie A. Johnson—Queen’s University

Victor Serge, *What Every Radical Should Know About State Repression: A Guide for Activists* (Melbourne and New York: Ocean Press, 2005). Introduction by Dalia Hashad. First printed as *Les Coulisses d’une Sûreté générale. Ce que tout révolutionnaire doit savoir de la repression* (Paris: Librairie du Travail, 1926).

How do we understand the role of the police and law in maintaining capitalism? As revolutionaries and radicals how do we watch for and evade the police before