

evolution of textual interpretations fully explains the social and political impact of political economy? Did not the changing material world at least influence later generations of radicals and social democrats to produce new ideas that seemed to fit the conditions of their own time? More than once while reading this book, Stedman Jones's method (though not conclusions) reminded me of Gertrude Himmelfarb's two volume intellectual history of ideas about poverty, *The Idea of Poverty* (1985) and *Poverty and Compassion* (1991). Fifteen years ago, amidst the fury of the debates about the linguistic turn, such a comparison would have seemed shocking. In this instance, it is not the method that distinguishes the scholarship of Stedman Jones and of Himmelfarb, only their political commitments.

Stephen Heathorn—McMaster University

David Rogers and John McLeod, eds., *The Revision of Englishness* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2004).

This collection of articles operates on two levels. It sets out to analyse the reaction of various English writers, poets, and film makers to both the influx of immigrants from across the former empire that began in the postwar era and to the shifting definition of Englishness associated with that rapid demographic transformation. Given that Rogers and McLeod invited the contributors to "reflect self-consciously upon their relationship with Englishness as a part of their critical endeavours" (10), the articles also document the reaction of modern scholars to the question of what it meant to be English during the same period.

Focused on the issue of Englishness and how that identity has been challenged and changed since the effective collapse of Britain as an imperial power in the years after 1945, *The Revision of Englishness* is more cohesive than most collections of conference papers. Almost all of the essays have something thought-provoking to say about the lived experience of Englishness, whether portrayed through novels like Adam Thorpe's *Still*, Hanif Kureishi's *The Black Album*, and Salman Rushdie's *The Satanic Verses*; through the poetry of Philip Larkin, Ted Hughes, and Geoffrey Hill; through films like *Bhaji of the Beach*; or through the lives of the contributors themselves. In the last case, however, *The Revision of Englishness* sometimes seems to teeter dangerously on the brink of self-indulgence. Some of the self-conscious reflections invited by Rogers and McLeod convey the sense of being part of a captive audience at an academic conference perfectly, but that is probably not what the editors had in mind. For instance, Alan Sinfield's autobiographical admission that "I was in love with Derek, and wanted to have sex with him in some partly comprehend-

ed way” (32) does not add a great deal of analytical depth to what is already a very effective examination of the interface between queerness and Englishness.

Despite the fact that Rogers states that the essays in *The Revision of Englishness* “expose the workings of the ideology of pre-war ‘Englishness,’” (172) that is not always the case. And that is one of the chief criticisms that must be leveled against this collection: its overall lack of historical context. Certainly, some of the essays do recognize that the question of what it means to be English has been hotly debated for centuries—David Gervais’s article on Geoffrey Hill’s poetry and Vesna Goldsworthy’s analysis of Englishness and suburbia being particularly strong cases in point—but this tends to be the exception, rather than the rule. It is, to say the least, somewhat odd that, in a collection about national identity, Linda Colley’s work is cited only once and J. G. A. Pocock, who has written extensively on the relationship between Englishness and the collapse of empire after 1945, is overlooked entirely. Many of the essays in *The Revision of Englishness* quite rightly bemoan the fact that the modern sense of Englishness is so often synonymous with a hatred of the “other,” whether that “other” appears in the form of an ethnic, religious or gender minority. That, however, is hardly a postwar development. There has been a strong connection between Englishness and a hatred of the “other”—mostly a Catholic “other”—since the Reformation.

Even when the contributors do delve into the past, they often get it wrong. In his otherwise insightful comparison of the novels of William Faulkner and Graham Swift, Rogers notes that “England ... supported the South” in the American Civil War (175): a statement that is true only in a very limited sense. It would be more correct to say that the English government did *not* support the North, while popular opinion across the country was often bitterly divided over the war. Though only a minor point in Rogers’ article, this lack of historical nuance is representative of many of the articles in the collection.

For a collection that focuses so often on the experience of immigrants in postwar England, *The Revision of Englishness* is also surprisingly narrow in terms of its geographic scope. How has Englishness been defined on the crumbling imperial periphery and did the sense of self that was created there affect the shaping of identities at the imperial centre? Several of the contributors approach these questions, but they do not address them in any comprehensive way. According to Martin Corner, one of the characters in Salman Rushdie’s *The Satanic Verses* comes to England and vows, at first, to make “himself more English than the English” (159). Arguably, this same desire to appropriate metropolitan culture was a feature of life not only among immigrants in England, but also among the peoples of various countries within the nineteenth and twentieth-century British Empire. James Belich and J. G. A. Pocock have both argued for the existence of a series of ‘neo-Britains’ across the world: large or small groups of colonial subjects who self-consciously attempted to forge a

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