

“serious mistake to ignore this author’s ideas”, and that what was needed was research data to test them.²² Scott’s book does both; the latter it does remarkably. Her research findings expand our historical knowledge of complex racial dynamics in Cuba and Louisiana making *Degrees of Freedom* an important contribution for future testing (and challenging) of theoretical elaborations of race relations in the Americas.²³

Jorge L. Giovannetti

ROSSMAN, JEFFREY J. *Worker Resistance under Stalin. Class and Revolution on the Shop Floor.* [Russian Research Center Studies, vol. 96.] Harvard University Press, Cambridge (Mass.) [etc.] 2005. 314 pp. Ill. \$49.95; £31.95; € 42.50; DOI: 10.1017/S0020859007052868

Jeffrey Rossman’s well researched and passionately written book on the resistance of the textile workers to Stalin’s industrialization contributes to a number of issues that are the subject of heated debate in the historiography of Stalinism: the mechanisms of a genesis of social resistance to the regime, its extent, effects, dimensions and limits, and the process and sources of the construction of identities. The book explores, among other major issues, the evolution of forms of worker protest; the emergence of patterns of resistance; the impact of workers’s struggle on central power policies; the reasons for the failure of shopfloor resistance; the divisions between the workers caused by resistance; the role of a worker leader; and the degree of the (un)development of a political consciousness among workers, to name just a few.

Through more than a half a century of development, studies of Stalinism made a spiral in their exploration of state–society relations. Each phase of this spiral offered its own vision of major historical player(s) and dominant type(s) of social behavior. The totalitarian school of the 1950s–1960s and the official version of Soviet history that existed in the Soviet Union at that time, mirroring each other, placed a hypotrophic emphasis on the role of ideology and the state, either negative or positive, in forming social identities and types of social behavior. Either suppressed and brainwashed, or totally enthusiastically supportive, the society offered no resistance to the regime. With the emergence in the 1970s of the revisionist school in the West, Russian scholars, after political change in the USSR, joined their Western colleagues – historians of Stalinism discovered society and a rich spectrum of the types of social behavior and identities rooted either in Stalinist state strategies, or pre-Soviet experiences and the utopian ideals of the Revolution, or the social tactics of adaptation and survival.

Although in time the fascination with society was impregnated with an unjustified broad extrapolation of resistance and a prevalence of the support–resistance paradigm, by the 1990s, with the ease of Cold War tensions in the historiography of Stalinism, it seemed that a certain balance in the presentation of state–society relations had been found. Soviet history emerged as the interplay of two actors: while the state constantly sought total

22. Sidney W. Mintz, “Groups, Group Boundaries and the Perceptions of ‘Race’”, *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 13 (1971), pp. 437–450, 443, 450.

23. Helg’s comparative research of race and black mobilization in Cuba engaged with Hoetink’s theoretical interpretations in a very stimulating piece that both agrees and rejects arguments advanced by Hoetink; Helg, “Race and Black Mobilization”.

control to engineer life, people shaped the implementation of the state's plans. From the end of the 1990s, however, the development of a new trend – which some scholars refer to as a new political history while others prefer to call it a neo-totalitarian school – by shifting emphasis to the role of ideology and the state, seemed to disturb a shaky balance. Social historians began to sound an alarm against a tendency of the new political history to present the social response merely as a mechanical answer to state measures.

Jeffrey Rossman, with his *Worker Resistance under Stalin*, challenges the central thesis of the new political historians – the ability of the Soviet regime to monopolize the process of identity-construction, making it impossible for Soviet subjects to develop an ideological disbelief and avoid Soviet (Stalinist) identity. Rossman documents a fierce conscious collective resistance of thousands of textile workers in the vast Ivanovo Industrial Region (IIR) to the implementation of forced industrialization in 1928–1932. The Ivanovo workers demonstrate an immunity to the brainwashing propaganda of the Stalinist state and the epidemic Sovietization that some new political historians advocate. The source of this ideological and political immunity among the textile workers of IIR is the identity which is rooted, not in the grand modernization strategies of the Stalinist state, but in the pre-revolutionary class experience and the utopian ideals of the October Revolution that promised a worker paradise. This conclusion of Rossman challenges the Podlubnyi case explored by Jochen Hellbeck – in which the internalization of the values of the Revolution served as a source for the self-generated Stalinist identity.¹ While admitting that this type of identity was possible, Rossman, with his study, rejects the attempts to project the Podlubnyi's type of identity on to society as a whole.

Rossman shows the worker struggle not as merely an attempt to improve deteriorating living conditions – the result of the industrial leap forward – but as resistance to state attempts to monopolize the interpretation of the October Revolution and its values. Thus, the economic dimension of worker resistance is enriched with a political and ideological current. It seems sometimes that the author appropriates the workers' vision of Stalinism as a “betrayed” or a “stolen revolution”. It is not clear what caused this effect of appropriation: whether the author shares the workers' vision of Stalinism or, being fascinated with the story, “forgets” to distinguish his voice from the voice of the Ivanovo textile workers.

Rossman's presentation of the worker resistance as a struggle for an “alternative Soviet power”, rather than “an alternative to the Soviet power”, challenges the findings of Kotkin's *Magnetic Mountain*² – “speaking Bolshevik (Soviet)” comes not as a source of legitimization of the Stalinist regime but as a source of a fierce resistance to it. Historians of Stalinism in their exploration of resistance and everyday disobedient behavior – I personally conceptually distinguish the former from the latter – uncovered their political, ideological and socio-economic dimensions. Rossman's study adds to the complexity of the phenomena by presenting a case of resistance which being anti-Stalinist is not by its nature anti-Soviet or anti-socialist.

Worker Resistance under Stalin adds to the pantheon of identity types existing in the historiography of Stalinism: a textile worker protesting against Stalin's reforms in the name of the utopian ideals of the Revolution is now and forever standing next to a careerist climbing up the social and material ladder using the opportunities opened by the state's

1. Jochen Hellbeck, “Fashioning the Stalinist Soul: The Diary of Stepan Podlubnyi, 1931–9”, in Sheila Fitzpatrick (ed.), *Stalinism: New Directions* (New York, 2000) pp. 77–116.

2. Stephen Kotkin, *Magnetic Mountain: Stalinism as a Civilization* (Berkeley, CA, 1995)

grand modernization strategies, an apolitical “speculator” trying to survive the harsh times, a dweller of Magnitogorsk doomed to “speak Bolshevik” until “a mass internal defection” of the late 1980s – historians have to answer yet how the epidemic “speaking Bolshevik” turned into “I no longer believe in socialism”,³ a peasant rebel fighting collectivization for preservation of an ancestral culture, and a young man (Podlubnyi) fascinated with the Revolution (or, shall I say, blinded by it) to the point that he is not able to distinguish its ideals from the Stalinist reality.

Rossmann documents with confidence the case of the resistance of the textile workers of IIR as a mass phenomenon. However, a tendency to project the discovered identity on to the whole Soviet working class and to present this type of behavior as “a dominant leitmotif” of the shopfloor response to Stalin’s revolution “from above” (p. 17) has yet to be justified. The author himself stresses the exceptional hardship in the textile industries in comparison with other industrial sectors, the specific gender, experience, age, and education composition of the textile workers of IIR. A detailed analysis of the situation in the IIR is only occasionally related to the situation in other industries. Moreover, Rossmann documents that even this relatively homogenous group of workers demonstrates, at times, different types of behavior: male workers in the machine shop, for example, show more loyalty to the regime and patient behavior than the female textile workers (p. 100). And the most difficult question of them all still remains: does “speaking Bolshevik/Soviet” mean “thinking Bolshevik/Soviet”? To what extent does the class language of resistance of the mass of the textile workers represent their true beliefs, and to what extent is it a manipulation of the official rhetoric?

The importance of the conceptual debates should not obscure the empirical richness of this study. Rossmann’s thorough research in the regional and central archives of Russia has produced a wonderful result – a vivid, intense, colourful and complex story of the worker struggle not just for bread but also for the preservation of the shopfloor democracy and self preservation of the working class as a political group. To paraphrase a title of a famous Soviet novel, the dramatic story that Rossmann told could have been called “How the Working Class Was Silenced”.

Elena A. Osokina

CARLILE, LONNY E. *Divisions of Labor. Globality, Ideology, and War in the Shaping of the Japanese Labor Movement*. University of Hawai’i Press, Honolulu 2005. x, 292 pp. \$55.00; DOI: 10.1017/S0020859007062864

Lonny Carlie’s *Division of Labor* analyzes the development of the Japanese labor movement from the 1920s to the 1950s based on a “globally contextualized comparative” approach, that is, putting the Japanese labor movement in the context of larger geopolitical processes such as World War II and the Cold War, through which not only the history of the Japanese labor movement, but also those of French, Italian, and German labor movements were shaped. More specifically, Carlie examines rivalries as well as collaborations between different ideological currents in the Japanese labor movement

3. Both imageries – “speaking Bolshevik” and “a mass internal defection” from socialism – are Kotkin’s from his *Magnetic Mountain* and “The State – Is It Us? Memoirs, Archives, and Kremlinologists”, in *Russian Review*, 61 (2002), pp. 35–51.