

reached out to minority workers. The respect the IWW won from African-American organizations was not based simply on its record in Philadelphia; rather, as Cole demonstrates in the bulk of this admirable work, Philadelphia Wobblies simply put into practice the IWW's longstanding commitment to racial equality.

*Wobblies on the Waterfront* offers a richly nuanced treatment of the conditions that both enabled the IWW to establish and maintain job control on the Philadelphia waterfront, and which ultimately led to its loss. Among the factors that weakened IWW job control were the migration of large numbers of Southern African-American workers to Philadelphia in the years leading up to the 1922 strike who lacked the experience of working together with white workers to build the union; increased segregation and racial tension in Philadelphia including the formation of strong Klan and Garveyite movements; a general economic slowdown that meant that scabs would be available; a strongly united group of employers, many national and multinational operators; the city, employers, ILA, and federal government's determination to crush the IWW despite the heavy short-term cost; and the union's weakened condition as a result of the war-era repression and postwar internal conflicts. Indeed, when the 1922 dispute began many key organizers were still in prison and the strike was led by less experienced officials who ignored rank-and-file reluctance to strike and refused to call union meetings once it became clear that support was faltering. (One of those officials later brought the ILA to the port, running a "union" that while racially integrated, unlike many ILA locals, was notorious for its corruption and tolerated job conditions reminiscent of those the IWW had successfully organized to overcome.)

The 1922 debacle followed an unsuccessful 1920 strike in which workers failed to win their objectives but returned to work united. But in 1922 the union was badly damaged; employers had succeeded in splitting workers along racial lines (while many African-American longshoremen stayed with the strike through the end, and remained in the IWW afterwards, many others crossed picket lines) and the IWW lost its vital control of the hiring process and of the job. The 1922 defeat was catastrophic. Employers reinstated the 50-hour working week, dramatically increased the volume of cargo longshoremen were required to haul, restored the hated shape-up, and established nearly unfettered control of the waterfront work force.

The IWW built a substantial membership among maritime workers, operating a network of union halls around the world to support its seafaring members through the 1940s and beyond. The union waged major longshore strikes on the Great Lakes (and in Argentina and Chile) in the 1910s, and in Portland, Oregon, and San Pedro, California, in the 1920s. This history of sustained on-the-job organization has been neglected despite the proliferation of historical work on the IWW; Peter Cole's *Wobblies on the Waterfront* helps fill this gap, and is an important contribution to labor history in its own right.

Jon Bekken

RITA, CHIN. *The Guest Worker Question in Postwar Germany*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge [etc.] 2007. xi, 281 pp. £40.00; \$75.00; doi:10.1017/S0020859009990149

Rita Chin's study on the guest-worker question in postwar Germany analyses the complex and conflicted way in which the Federal Republic of Germany came to terms with

the fact that it gradually, although unwillingly, was becoming an immigration country. Chin provides a mostly well-informed overview of the development of the West German *Ausländerpolitik* (policy towards foreigners) from the mid-1950s to the early 1990s, and shows how this policy has been influenced by public debates surrounding the migration issue and by the role of (mostly German-Turkish) writers. Surprisingly, neither the title nor the cover of the book refer to this particular focus of research. Both title and cover picture (which shows the famous photo of the reception of the one-millionth guest-worker in 1964) rather suggest that the book provides a social history of the guest-worker period in West Germany, dealing with the realities and experiences of these workers.

Instead, a large part of the book is dedicated to the literary production and self-conception of Aras Ören, Yüksel Pazarkaya, Saliha Scheinhardt, Zehra Çirak, Akif Piriñci and Zafer Senocak – some of the best-known German-Turkish writers of the past decades. Chin analyses their individual ways of dealing with the specific institutional frameworks which have been established in Germany for the literary productions of foreigners (*Ausländerliteratur*): How have they used these frameworks for their own purposes; how have they challenged and partly overcome their narrowness? How has their literary work been received by journalists, literary critics, and their German audience, and how have they influenced the representation of (Turkish) guest-workers and immigrants in German society? While focusing on these questions Chin recognizes these writers as self-conscious actors, not only as objects caught in the framework or role which well-meaning German academics and intellectuals have assigned to them.

It is undisputably correct and well overdue to analyse and assess the impact of immigrants on German society, and to recognize them finally as actors and not only as victims – which has been the case for too long. In this respect Chin's study is important and innovative, especially for an audience who lacks knowledge of the German language and who therefore cannot easily access the findings of a younger generation of scholars in Germany dealing with the topic (see p. 12, note 17, where Chin mentions some of these findings). Considering this merit of Chin's study, it might seem fussy to point out that she ignores other parts of immigrant society, especially those who were recruited as guest-workers and who probably had a larger impact on German society than the writers mentioned. Here one could think of guest-workers engaged in trade unions, citizens' groups, social services dedicated to migrants, migrant organizations, and those who founded their own companies and became self-employed etc.

Given the misleading (and therefore rather annoying) title of Chin's book, which raises expectations that remain unmet, the argument about ignoring the guest-workers themselves becomes inevitable. All the more since Chin affirms, rather than proves, the influence which the featured minority artists had on the public debate about foreigners and their position within German society and the German nation-state. She talks, for example, about the "revolutionary potential of *Ausländerliteratur*", and about the "status" of minority writers "as ideal dialogue partners" whose "participation" was "absolutely crucial to the success of integration policy", about their role as "experts on panels and television shows and at public meetings and conferences" (p. 137), without analysing or even giving significant examples of these allegedly crucial forms of participation.

To be clear, I do not want to deny the influence of these writers. They belong to the migrant intelligentsia which in general played an important role in representing the migrants and their concerns – which, by the way, were very different. For example, not every guest-worker or migrant wanted to become a German citizen, especially not in 1980

when only few of them perceived themselves as immigrants who would be staying in Germany for good. This, too, explains the small number of naturalizations by then, which Chin one-dimensionally attributes to the rigorous German citizenship law (p. 84) which was only changed in 1990 and – more fundamentally – in 2000.

Despite the title and cover-picture of Chin's study her analyses of the public debate on guest-workers focuses almost exclusively on Turkish migrants. This is justified insofar as from the early 1970s Turks represented the largest migrant group in West Germany and gradually became identified as the central problem of West German *Ausländerpolitik*. By the end of the decade the so-called *Türkenproblem* resounded throughout the land. This catchword stemmed not only from the large quantity of Turkish migrants, but also from the fact that they were perceived as the culturally most foreign group. It is, however, not correct that the West German authorities "perceived the presence of this group as especially problematic" from the very beginning, and that the rotation clause which was included in the first recruitment contract with Turkey "effectively discriminated against Turks" (p. 49).

This common misunderstanding partly relates to the fact that the German authorities in the early 1960s did indeed become aware that the large-scale recruitment of foreign workers might lead to long-term immigration – a "danger" that could be prevented by the impractical, and therefore temporary, rotation clause which, incidentally, was welcomed by the Turkish government who initially insisted on the short-term character of labour migration.<sup>1</sup> Furthermore, this misunderstanding is the result of projecting the *Türkenproblem* of the 1970s and 1980s back into the early years of migration. Back then, cultural differences between Turks and Germans were – if at all – rather perceived as exotic; in general the public did not differentiate between Turkish guest-workers and those from other countries of recruitment. Also, in the first years of recruitment a lot of Turks came from urban areas, mostly from Istanbul. Only later more and more migrated from rural areas, and when they started to bring their families with them and to create their own social, economic, and cultural infrastructure cultural differences became more and more visible.

Since the vast majority of guest-workers were male, family reunion led to a considerable increase not only of Turkish children, but also of Turkish women. Vis-à-vis this demographic shift it was no coincidence that the gender aspect was becoming central to West German debate and research on the integration of foreigners – a fact which Chin analyses thoroughly, with the merit of showing how, on the left side of the political spectrum also, doubts began to be raised about the *Integrationsfähigkeit* (ability to integrate) of the Turks. In this context, Chin correctly identifies "an epistemological shift taking place in the very discourse of integration, especially among academics, social workers, and feminists" (p. 160). They, too, started to identify "the particular situation faced by foreign women in West Germany as a central problem for the work of integration". According to their experiences and findings "migrant women experienced

1. See Karin Hunn, "Nächstes Jahr kehren wir zurück...". *Die Geschichte der türkischen "Gastarbeiter" in der Bundesrepublik* (Göttingen, 2005), pp. 54–56. Already in 1964, three years after the first recruitment contract with Turkey, a second version came into effect without such a rotation clause. See also Karen Schönwälder, *Einwanderung und ethnische Pluralität. Politische Entscheidungen und öffentliche Debatten in Großbritannien und der Bundesrepublik von den 1950er bis zu den 1970er Jahren* (Essen, 2001), p. 254 and pp. 256f.

overwhelming isolation and oppression, suffering from such feelings much more acutely than their husbands and children” (p. 161).

In spite of the sympathy and empathy that existed among these groups for the guest-workers and the allegedly oppressed Turkish women, their different cultures and traditions became to be seen as a threat to a modern, democratic, and liberal German society and to the “basic gender equality for which German feminists had fought so hard” (p. 166). This, again, led to the paradoxical situation that by the mid-1980s “the terms of integration set out in more progressive circles converged with the conservative logic of cultural incommensurability”, although liberals and leftists in general still “tended to insist on the mutability of migrant culture and devoted enormous energy to the grassroots work of cultural reform” (p. 171).

It is especially this part of the analyses of the public debate on integration and German multiculturalism which makes Chin’s study well worth reading for experts on German migration history. Those looking at integration and multiculturalism in Germany from the perspective of German Studies can draw even more profit from it. Moreover, it can be recommended to all those who are generally interested in German postwar history.

Karin Hunn

FIELD, DEBORAH A. *Private Life and Communist Morality in Khrushchev’s Russia*. Peter Lang, New York [etc.] 2007. x, 147 pp. € 45.00; doi:10.1017/S002085900990150

Deborah Field’s book explores the patterns of love and family life in the USSR under Nikita Khrushchev (1954–1964). While it is an archive-based historical study, it is in many ways inspired by a sociological discussion and contributes to a scholarly debate, very lively since the end of the 1980s and reaching an apogee in the late 1990s, concerning the public privacy of socialist societies. Borrowing the concept of public sphere elaborated by Jürgen Habermas and revised in a frequently quoted book edited by Jeff Weintraub, the author pursues the discussion inaugurated by other scholars, including Vladimir Shlapentokh, Oleg Khar-khordin, Katerina Gerasimova, Susan Reid, and Svetlana Boym, who explored private life in Russia from the perspective of the public sphere. The originality of the present monograph is that it is devoted specifically to the Khrushchev era, a brief moment in Soviet history which marked a turning point in political and everyday life. While the thaw experienced during that period has recently attracted the attention of historians and sociologists alike, there are as yet few publications on the social history of that period.

Field’s study is based on several types of source, all of them in Moscow. The author consulted the archives of ministries, educational institutions, plants, councils, and courts, analysed publications on love in newspapers, journals, and propaganda literature, and also in 1993–1994 conducted oral interviews with Muscovites from different social milieus.

The first two chapters are devoted to an analysis of the essential elements of the social context of the 1950s and 1960s: *communist morality* as an official ideology regulating private life, and crowded housing conditions. The author proposes an original interpretation of the purposes and functioning of that communist morality, a Bolshevik invention somewhat forgotten during the time of Stalin and reinvented during the thaw. The Stalinist system was built on the foundation of mass enthusiasm, backed by fear of