

Canada. Developed out of a union for janitors and window cleaners, the SEIU nowadays represents 2.2 million cleaners, care workers, nurses, and other service professionals, many of them immigrants and women. The authors describe the history of protests, the wide variety of strategies, and the importance of individuals both within and outside the home-care movement. They argue that state policies enabled workers, recipients of care, and political constituencies to demand better wages and better care. The home-care movement experimented with new structures of representation and used different strategies at different levels – state level, community level, and labour-union level. In doing so, it was able to change the focus of the US labour movement to such an extent that the service sector is now one of its most vibrant parts.

In this part of the book the voices of home-care workers themselves are louder, as the authors have been able to include more interview material. The women speak with passion about their work, underlining its great emotional and social value for themselves and for those they take care of, but also emphasizing the fact that it is “real work”. It is precisely this thin line between care and work that has hampered the recognition of home-care workers as workers. The large number of people and organizations involved in the unionization of home-care workers across the United States is impressive, and so are the results. Despite the enormous challenges, the home-care movement has shown that professional long-term care can be guaranteed only when care providers are paid adequately, are protected by the law, and are recognized and respected.

This book is not only an excellent contribution to labour history, but also a tribute to home-care workers in the United States. For non-Americans, the complicated US landscape of politics and health care becomes clearer, although the many different authorities, organizations, and programmes involved, and the corresponding abbreviations, are at times confusing. The list of abbreviations at the beginning of the book is therefore very useful. In addition to its academic importance, this book is of great social relevance as it outlines in clear terms the urgent need to rethink and re-evaluate care work in the United States and beyond.

*Marina de Regt*

Dept. of Social and Cultural Anthropology, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam  
De Boelelaan 1081, 1081 HV Amsterdam, The Netherlands  
E-mail: m.c.de.reg@vu.nl

“Glückauf” auf Japanisch. Bergleute aus Japan im Ruhrgebiet. [Title on cover: Japanische Bergleute im Ruhrgebiet.] Ed. by Atsushi Kataoka, Regine Matthias [sic], Pia-Tomoko Meid [u.a.] Klartext, Essen 2012. 318 pp. Ill. € 22.95. doi:10.1017/S0020859013000576

It is not the habit of this journal to publish reviews of commemorative publications aimed at propaganda, as this book is at first glance. “*Glückauf*” auf Japanisch was published to commemorate the arrival of Japanese miners in the Ruhr in the 1950s and 1960s and hopes to contribute to the “further development of friendly economic relations” between Japan and Germany, more specifically Rhineland-Westphalia. The book is nevertheless interesting as a “case” of migration history.

In general, postwar labour recruitment in Germany was highly selective. It systematically excluded potential migrants of African and Asian origin in favour of Europeans

(including “guest workers” from Turkey).<sup>1</sup> Why, then, was an exception made in the case of miners from Japan, and later also Korea? The book provides answers to this question (without the authors explicitly noting the exceptional nature of these cases, however), especially in the chapters written by Regine Mathias and Werner Pascha. Mathias shows that, in the 1950s, Japan was still largely dependent on domestic supplies of coal to meet its energy needs. After World War II a programme of mechanization and rationalization was launched, based mainly on German technology. But even by the mid-1950s Japan still lagged behind. Miners were sent to Germany in the hope that they could learn something about the modern mining techniques being applied there. However, experience in German mining was sought not only because it gave workers an opportunity to learn about modern mining methods; Germany also had “modern” labour relations, in the form of *Mitbestimmung* and worker–employer cooperation. Another important motive for sending Japanese miners to Germany was to learn about these kinds of industrial relations, which were associated with a “free and democratic country”.

Why was this so important? Because it was in sharp contrast to the antagonistic labour relations of the period in the Japanese coal industry. From the end of the war, industrial relations in mining were characterized by major confrontations between miners’ trade unions and employers, with the radical, communist-oriented Tanrō championing the miners’ struggle. Strikes were frequent, especially in protest at the effects of rationalization policies in the mines. One of the main reasons for sending miners to Germany was to expose them to more peaceful and cooperative industrial relations. In the eyes of the Japanese government, Japanese miners had not only to become acquainted with modern, rationalized mines, but also to learn to accept and comply with measures aimed at rationalization, as the German unions had, unlike their radical Japanese counterparts.

Between 1957 and 1965 this wish on the part of the Japanese government resulted in the arrival of 436 Japanese miners. The Germans accepted this because of labour shortages in the German mines. Initially, these motives did not really coincide, but in the 1960s the intentions of the Japanese changed: miners were now primarily being sent to Germany to alleviate unemployment in Japanese mining as a consequence of further rationalization and mine closures. The booming Japanese economy of that period could easily absorb unemployed miners, however, so in the end many fewer miners opted to go to Germany than originally intended. A solution was found in the recruitment of Koreans for the German mines, not by accident in my view, through the intermediation of the US Development Organization in South Korea, which drew on the example set by the Japanese.<sup>2</sup> The migrants were selected by the South Korean government on the basis of their proven anti-communist views,<sup>3</sup> but nevertheless they took part in several strikes in Germany to demand equal treatment.<sup>4</sup>

All this shows that the arrival of Japanese and later Korean miners in Germany had a specific political background. As for the Japanese, their recruitment failed as soon as they became part of the normal German “guest worker” programme in the 1960s. The Koreans

1. Karen Schönwalder, “Why Germany’s Guest Workers were Largely Europeans: The Selective Principles of Post-war Labour Recruitment Policy”, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 27 (2004), pp. 248–265.

2. Sun-Ju Choi and You Jae Lee, “Umgekehrte Entwicklungshilfe. Die koreanische Arbeitsmigration in Deutschland”, in Frank Frangenberg (ed.), *Projekt Migration* (Cologne, 2005), pp. 831–832.

3. Cornelius Nestler-Tremel and Ulrike Tremel, *Im Schatten des Lebens. Südkoreaner im Steinkohlebergbau von Nordrhein-Westfalen – eine Untersuchung zur Rotationspolitik mit ausländischen Arbeitnehmern* (Heidelberg, 1985), p. 117.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 831.

who came in the wake of the Japanese and were accepted by the Germans because of the Japanese example fitted much better into this programme, but they were still subject to ideological and political pressures and constraints imposed by the South Korean government at home.

*Ad Knotter*

Sociaal-Historisch Centrum voor Limburg, Maastricht University  
Sint Pieterstraat 7, 6211 JM Maastricht, The Netherlands  
E-mail: a.knotter@maastrichtuniversity.nl

SHAFFER, KIRWIN R. *Black Flag Boricuas. Anarchism, Antiauthoritarianism, and the Left in Puerto Rico, 1897–1921.* University of Illinois Press, Urbana [etc.] 2013. xvii, 220 pp. \$65.00. doi:10.1017/S0020859013000588

Kirwin Shaffer says (p. 10) that the crisis of the old Eurocentric approach to anarchism is demonstrated by the increasing appearance of studies which talk about the influence of anarchism in territorial spheres very distant from Europe (Africa, Asia, or Latin America) and by the progressive circulation of research which, from a social and cultural viewpoint, has brought us notably closer to the cultural production of the anarchists, to their countercultural challenges or to their educational and artistic proposals. This is an author who has been notable over recent years for extracting and communicating the characteristic aspects of the activity carried out by the anarchist movements in Central America and the Caribbean, fundamentally in those territories which were Spanish colonies, and which subsequently came to depend more or less directly on the United States of America. For some of us, this renewing impulse justified the idea that there is life beyond canonical studies on anarchism (we find it difficult to see ourselves in this Anglo-Saxon concept of radicalism), and that the roots of a heterogeneous, dynamic, and ground-breaking movement lie in diversity.

Why Puerto Rico, though? Shaffer recalls that it is clear that the nerve centre of Spanish-speaking libertarian activism in the Caribbean area was based in Cuba, more precisely in Havana. Acting as a real hub, the anarchists from Havana generated a wave of ideological, cultural, and trade-union effervescence which extended through the neighbouring states and which was notably echoed in the powerful neighbour to the north, in particular in the Florida peninsula and in the New York area. Organized around newspapers such as *Tierra*, Cuban anarchism was capable of fostering a transnational movement which could act as a vehicle for conflicts and realities which originated in the local sphere, but which culminated in achieving a supranational dimension within the broader framework of the struggle against capitalism and its related interests, and the gestation of international labour solidarity. Nevertheless, Puerto Rico was obviously not Cuba.

As Shaffer understands it, the development of Puerto Rican anarchism is, however, especially attractive, precisely because of what could be insignificant: its specificity. For Shaffer, the originality of anarchism in Puerto Rico, the fact that it followed a unique path in the history of anarchism in Latin America, is based on two aspects. (1) The Puerto Rican anarchists were colonial subjects of the United States, a scenario only comparable with the Panama Canal zone controlled by the North American power. (2) In contrast to what occurred in other areas of Latin America, in Puerto Rico we are not faced with a