

consolidating their organizations. González Gómez traces the socialist unions' attempts to establish the *base múltiple*, or combined mutual benefit and union system of finance and organization, in the period after the First World War. This steered them towards centralization and the modern "service union" conception of the organization, a development which was brought to an abrupt end by the Civil War but which is now once again at the centre of the unions' agenda.

Yet as a number of articles in this collection make clear, wage earners were as likely to be members of popular, in the sense of inter-class societies, as of exclusively working-class initiatives. This was not only the case in the mainly rural areas that were home to most Spanish workers before the Civil War, but also in many urban areas. Despite the expansion of class or occupationally defined societies in larger towns and cities, in 1915 these still only accounted for a fifth of all mutual benefit societies in Spain. The implications of this mutualism, and of the persistent strength and appeal of the popular sociability and identities on which it was founded, are crucial questions raised in this book which certainly merit further study and analysis, not least by labour historians.

Inevitably in a collection of this type, not all contributions are of equal interest. Excessive empiricism blights some, whilst the limitations of others can be attributed to the premature publication of work still very much "in progress" or to the poverty of the available sources. The latter may explain the virtual absence of references to non-permanent forms of mutual benefit (the dividing societies found elsewhere) or to informal networks of solidarity which may have been particularly important in the lives of less-skilled, migrant and female workers often excluded from mutual benefit societies. This collection is essential reading not only for anyone setting out to explore these neglected areas of research, but also for all those interested in Spanish labour and working-class history in the nineteenth and twentieth century.

Justin Byrne

TEITELBAUM, KENNETH. *Schooling for "Good Rebels". Socialist Education for Children in the United States, 1900–1920*. Temple University Press, Philadelphia 1993. xi, 258 pp. \$44.95.

Just about the time that much of what remained of the once-active US radical movements virtually disappeared amidst the global collapse of the left, a new and promising phase in the historical study of these movements had been reached. Of course the US left's decline began long before the current crisis. The events of 1919 pretty much finished off the Debsian Socialist Party and 1956 did roughly the same for the Communists. Yet during their respective heydays both movements achieved much. The earlier studies by David Shannon, James Weinstein and Frank Warren emphasized the American Socialists' political strategies, the rise and fall of their party structures, while Theodore Draper ably charted the main outlines of both external and internal US Communist politics. Now, building on and extending this previous work, a new group of mostly younger scholars has begun examining the social and cultural dimensions of the American Socialist and Communist movements' histories. Kenneth Teitel-

baum's fine book on socialist children's schools is a good example of these recent contributions, both of their strengths and weaknesses.

The left's educational work, often carried out in face of indifference or hostility of Socialist and Communist leaderships (not to speak of widespread repression and pervasive anti-radical public attitudes), has been an important component of the new work on left social and cultural history. Preceding Teitelbaum's book on children's schools was Richard J. Altenbaugh's able account of the US labor colleges of the 1920s and 1930s, *Education for Struggle* (1990), and a small number of similar studies. In finding nearly one hundred Sunday Schools created and supported by rank and file US Socialists and members of its youth affiliate The Young People's Socialist League (Yipsels) before World War I, Teitelbaum, a faculty member at Binghamton University in New York, investigates a totally fresh subject never before studied. His is not an exhaustive account, since there were schools Teitelbaum never discovered, such as the Jewish Socialist Saturday schools, founded by three Hunter College students, that flourished in Brooklyn, New York, for at least a half decade after 1905. So, much more work needs to be done on left, alternative American education among both children and adults.

With one important qualification – to be mentioned below – Teitelbaum has provided a superb model of how some of this future work should be carried out. He shows that the Socialist Sunday Schools were meant to supplement, not substitute for, state public schools. Consciously designed to counter government-run education's reproduction of the exploitative capitalist order and its ideological superstructure, the US Socialist Sunday Schools (as well as those held on other days of the week) offered red fare to train young "good rebels". Classes held in local Socialist Party offices, in union halls, in offices of such sympathetic newspapers as the Yiddish New York daily *Forward*, etc., offered the competing vision of international worker solidarity rather than the conventional patriotic jingoism, and a new set of heroes and heroines (Karl Marx and Mother Jones) to replace the slaveholding and entrepreneurial notables celebrated in the non-socialist schools. Socialist pedagogues also taught their versions of Darwinian evolution, according to which an increasingly dysfunctional capitalism would eventually and inevitably become extinct and be replaced by a humane, non-exploitative socialism.

A key figure in Teitelbaum's account of US socialist education is the previously little known Kendrick Shedd, a University of Rochester teacher (whose papers are in the university from which he was forced to resign) deeply involved not only in setting up Socialist Sunday Schools, but also in designing relevant curricula and teaching materials. Contested by many in the Socialist Party who believed that the socialist message was not suitable for children, Shedd's pedagogical efforts and those of other socialist youth educators deserve the careful study given them in *Schooling for "Good Rebels"*. The students, mostly children of socialist activists, sang socialist songs in class, acted in socialist plays and participated alongside adults in demonstrations and other public political acts.

What is missing in Teitelbaum's work, and virtually the entire now-existing body of scholarship on left education, is an international dimension. Not that there was any central world socialist directorate that dictated educational policies to national movements, but understanding the significance of what was done in each country would be immensely enhanced by comparative study of similar

movements elsewhere. What, for example, was the nature of Socialist Sunday Schools in Great Britain, their aims, curricula, pedagogy, their connection with the parent Labour Party and the British state? Teitelbaum, of course, cannot be faulted for shirking that comparative study, which by its very nature must be a collective endeavor. A good beginning on the educational history of the US left has been made, and the work must now go on in a broader context.

Marvin E. Gettleman

SOFSKY, WOLFGANG. *Die Ordnung des Terrors: Das Konzentrationslager*. S. Fischer Verlag, Frankfurt/M. 1993. 390 pp. DM 49.80.

After the history of horror, are we now to have its sociology? Is that not to reduce the incomprehensible to the banal? Anyone asking such – admittedly defensive – questions ignores the fact that the first book on the German concentration camps was Eugen Kogon's *Der SS-Staat*, a book that not only related "what was" but claimed to analyse the social reality of the concentration camp system. With the title of his book Wolfgang Sofsky hints at the first section of Kogon's *Der Terror als Herrschaftssystem* ("Terror as a System of Power"), which, incidentally, emerged from an essay for the German Sociological Conference in 1948. In the blurb Sofsky's publishers credit his book with "a relevance similar to Kogon's earlier analysis of the 'SS state'". That is a strong claim, but not out of place. I for one have no doubt that before long this work will be counted among the classic studies of the period.

First I should point out what Sofsky does *not* do. He does not describe the role of the concentration camps within the overall framework of National Socialist power, nor does he talk about the role of concentration and death camps in different phases of Nazi rule. In particular, he does not deal with the question of how the mass murder of European Jews happened or could have happened. He describes the social reality of the concentration camps themselves. The book would be worthy of recommendation even if it were just a systematizing synopsis of historical works, memoirs and monographs. But the author goes beyond compiling descriptions and interpretations. By condensing the material available to him, he succeeds – in four chapters: "Space and time", "Social structures", "Labour" and "Violence and death" – in characterizing a piece of social reality which functioned according to certain laws that are only discernible through analysis.

Talking of "laws" may seem inappropriate here. What should those laws be other than a framework for the amalgam of despotism, chicanery and murder that constituted the reality of the camps even where they served, among other things, as reservoirs of labour? This in fact appears to be the fundamental problem with any sociological analysis of the concentration camps. What is to be "analysed"? Sofsky writes: "Excessive violence was commonplace in the concentration camps. Civil society's laws prohibiting homicide had been abolished. [. . .] Where terror is let loose and where its servants need not fear retribution, an essential constraint disappears. Violence, which is always a possible course of human action, has a free hand. The perpetrators never had to torture and kill, but they constantly had the opportunity to do so, alone or in groups, in all situations, casually or impulsively, with or without rage, with or