

north and involved Villa's forces. This allowed the Zapatistas to carry out wholesale land redistributions throughout the territory under their control. Brunk suggests that Zapatismo's growth produced resource competition among villages, and that Zapata's reliance upon urban intellectuals to settle disputes undermined the Morelos Commune. Brunk also blames the intellectuals for not holding the Villa/Zapata alliance together as well as Zapata's failure in interfactional diplomacy.

Brunk acknowledges ideological differences separated Villistas and Zapatistas. Many of Zapata's representatives professed anarchism and were more committed to land reform, challenging liberal notions of private property, the rights of labor and the decentralization of state power. However, he reduces the failure of interfactional diplomacy to personalism, emphasizing the strong personalities of urban intellectuals such as Manuel Palafox and Díaz Soto y Gama, writing "they seemed to do everything they could to destroy the alliance" (p. 170).

Behind Brunk's theme of betrayal is a ubiquitous effort to identify a fundamental ideological gap between the Zapatismo of Morelos and the national level, represented by Zapata's radical intellectual advisers. Reliance on these advisers was pragmatic, since "Zapata's education and background did not prepare him for national politics" (p. 125). Zapata needed them as mediators, to give him the national perspective he lacked. The incorporation of the anarchist slogan "Land and Liberty" was rhetoric, and hardly reflective of Zapatismo's core, which was neither fundamentally anticapitalist nor antiprogress. Important to Zapata, Brunk writes, was fomenting grass roots, municipal democracy, plebiscites, an end to *jefe políticos* and the establishment of political and economic independence for municipalities (p. 184). Some scholars have identified these ideas as the essence of Mexican anarchism. Brunk asserts Zapatismo embraced the notion of the state embodied in the Constitution of 1857 (p. 132), but a close examination of Zapatista demands reveals that they ran counter to the caste-based social order legitimized by the document. Brunk concludes the "city", representative of progress and the aggressive intrusion of metropolitan capital, and legitimized by the 1857 Constitution, expropriated the revolution. Rather than an ideological breach between the movement's traditional core and radical intellectuals, perhaps Zapata's defeat resulted from the incompatibility of the movement's demands with the Constitutionalist goal of protecting private property within a newly-constructed polity.

Despite these shortcomings, Brunk's study reveals the popular character and pervasive influence of Zapatismo within the Mexican Revolution. This work will spark renewed interest and debate of peasant rebellion globally because it explores the inner workings of a much misunderstood component of the revolution. Samuel Brunk has written what will surely become a classic study of an enduring icon of twentieth-century revolution.

Norman Caulfield

MORAWSKA, EWA. *Insecure Prosperity: Small-Town Jews in Industrial America, 1890–1940*. Princeton University Press, Princeton [etc.] 1996. xxv, 369 pp. Ill. \$35.00; £29.95.

In 1985 the American sociologist and historian Ewa Morawska published *For Bread with Butter* on the immigration of various East European groups to the

small industrial centre of Johnstown (Pennsylvania).¹ During her research the author decided to exclude the Jewish community from her analysis of the settlement process from a local perspective because their socio-economic stratification (the Jews were predominantly small shopkeepers) differed too much from that of their East European co-immigrants, most of whom ended up as industrial workers in the local steel mills. For various reasons it took Morawska, who had meanwhile become a leading scholar in the immigration field, longer to complete her monograph on the small Jewish community (which around 1930 numbered some 1,300 of the then 50,000 inhabitants). The result, however, has been well worth waiting for. As in her first book on Johnstown she has combined a wealth of sources, including an impressive number of interviews with first- and second-generation immigrants. In this respect I can only repeat Leonard Dinnerstein's opinion in a review of Morawska's first book, when he wrote "I cannot conceive of anyone who could have been more thorough."²

The main question the author wants to answer in her latest book is how, compared with the New York Jews, the slower pace of adaption to American society of the Johnstown Jews can be explained. This problem is interesting because from the literature on Jewish immigration to the United States a "master pattern" has emerged, characterized by rapid upward social mobility, secularization and assimilation. This picture may be true for cities like New York and Cleveland, Morawska argues, but the situation of Jews in small towns with a different opportunity structure can differ in important respects, as the situation in Johnstown reveals. Here we stumble upon an important characteristic of the book: a case study within an explicit comparative framework. This comparative approach – strongly inspired by Skocpol's plea for a problem-oriented analysis (p. xx) – becomes evident in other ways as well: with the other East Europeans in Johnstown, between the first- and second-generation Jews, and with the non-Jewish establishment of Johnstown, etc. From her methodological contributions to the immigration field over the past decade we know that the comparative approach is a long-standing love of Morawska's. In *Insecure Prosperity* she is completely in her environment therefore. At the same time, it makes the book, rich as it already is as the result of the meticulous handling of sources, much more than another case study on yet another immigrant group in yet another American town.

This becomes evident too in the theoretical framework used to interpret the settlement process. Central is the concept of "ethnicization", borrowed from Victor Greene and Jonathan Sarna. It enables Morawska to understand better the way group-specific social and cultural patterns of immigrants are mixed with the traditions and ways of life of groups within the receiving society. The final result of this process can vary enormously, according to the structure of the environment where immigrants settle. Thus in her latest book she shows that in large cities the settlement process of Jewish Eastern European immigrants was quite different from that in small cities, and in small cities dominated by the service sector and light industry it differed from that in cities mainly characterized by heavy industry. In all cases the influence of the Jewish Eastern European "cultural tool kit" is clear, but due to different economic, social, political and cultural "opportunity

¹ *For Bread with Butter: The Life-Worlds of the East Central Europeans in Johnstown, Pennsylvania, 1890–1940* (Cambridge, 1985).

² *Journal of Social History* (Summer 1987), pp. 812–814. The quotation appears on p. 813.

structures” the character of the assimilation was quite distinct. The “ethnicization” model further distinguishes between different dimensions (economic, political, social, religious) in which assimilation takes place and shows that it is often not a homogenous process. Although I fully agree with the way she interprets her material in this context, the term itself I find somewhat confusing as I associate it primarily with a process of growing ethnicity. Since it is meant to capture the double-sidedness and multifaceted character of the settlement process, the author could have used the term “integration”, or even “assimilation”, if defined in a way more modern than the Chicago School foreman Robert Ezra Park has done. Morawska, however, clearly preferred a new term bringing together the two sides (ethnicity and assimilation) of the coin.

In six thematic chapters Morawska then analyses how the process of “ethnicization” of Jewish immigrants has evolved and how it has to be explained: the background in the Russian *shtetls* (chapter 1), the formation of an ethnic economic niche in Johnstown (chapter 2), economic strategies and instabilities in the 1920s and 1930s (chapter 3), the transformation of Jewish socio-cultural life (chapter 4), participation in local society (chapter 5), the perception of members of the Jewish community (chapter 6), and an epilogue on the post-war period. The question remains as to what the relative influence of *agency* (as expressed in socio-economic *resources* and socio-cultural *capital*) and *local opportunity structure* should be, weighed explicitly using the theoretical framework of Giddens and Bourdieu. I can reassure those who fear an overload of theory that the main part of the book contains more than enough “flesh”. Almost all relevant aspects of Jewish life and interaction are dealt with in an often quite down-to-earth way. Although the book is not always easy to swallow, Morawska generally succeeds in retrieving a lively image of the past, not in the least by weaving the rich interview material into her narrative. Moreover, she decided to deal with the theoretical considerations more elaborately in an interesting separate appendix (“(Self)Reflections of a Fieldworker”), in which she also goes into the methodological problems with the sources used. The thirty pages she devotes to these questions are quite extraordinary and enlightening, as they give an insight into the world behind the book: the doubts, ambiguities, her personal involvement with the topic she analysed, but also the research strategy. Finally, it contains an elaborate evaluation of the method of oral history, so important to the texture as well as to the major findings of this study.

Inevitably, the book also gives me an opportunity to raise critical questions. First of all, Morawska’s approach leads her to focus only on those who stayed in (or came to) Johnstown. The somewhat static picture she thus offers (slow pace of ethnicization) could therefore also have been the result of a particular selectivity in the migration process. What about those who chose to leave Johnstown? Did they dislike the social control of the ethnic enclave, or did their “cultural tool kit” differ too much from that of those who built the Jewish enclave in Johnstown? What kind of selectivity was at work?

A similar set of questions could be asked regarding Morawska’s comparison with Jewish communities in the – bigger – cities, like New York. Although it is evident that the settlement process differed in important respects, it is not entirely clear how general this “master pattern” was, nor to what extent it can be explained by the different background of the Jewish immigrants involved. Is it

possible to make more refined comparisons with small pockets of similar (*shtetl*) Jews in different surroundings?

Besides, it is not clear to me how specific the Jewish “cultural tool kit” is. The elements Morawska lists (rational belief in the control of their own fate, personal responsibility, optimism, but also the limited influence of human agency, p. 226) seem to me to be values that could also have been shared by small middle-class shopkeepers of another (or no) denomination. Simply positioning these beliefs against the “Slavs” who are different in this respect (p. 234) and citing Jewish inhabitants of Johnstown who state that these characteristics are indeed typically “Jewish” are not very convincing arguments. Comparisons with non-Jewish communities of small family businesses or middlemen would have enabled her to find out what is really Jewish about their attitude.

Further, I found it strange that the book lacks a formal conclusion, the author being content to restate the most important theoretical insights. It is not that insights cannot be found (there are many), nor that the author avoids being specific in this respect (on the contrary), but exactly because the book is so rich these insights would have deserved a separate evaluation. Now the reader is left with a short epilogue on the post-war period. Here the author shows – most fascinatingly – how the ethnically closed building of the Johnstown Jews disintegrated at a rapid pace. Which brings me to my final question. In view of the major changes that took place among the third and fourth generations, characterized in the epilogue by the one-liner, [now there are] “Jews in the community, but no community of Jews” (p. 252), this reader is even more interested in fundamental reflections on the implications of the long-term (four generations) outcome of this settlement process, especially because almost no case studies on immigrants in the United States go beyond the second generation.

Finally, many readers will loathe Princeton University Press for not including a list of references (it is available through the author, p. xxi). This decision – although very much in the spirit of the small-town shopkeepers central in this book – is an ugly stain on an important and superb analysis.

Leo Lucassen

LINDENBERGER, THOMAS. *Straßenpolitik. Zur Sozialgeschichte der öffentlichen Ordnung in Berlin 1900 bis 1914.* [Reihe: Politik- und Gesellschaftsgeschichte, Band 39.] Verlag J.H.W. Dietz Nachfolger, Bonn 1995. 431 pp. Ill. DM 62.00; S.fr. 63.00; S 484.00.

Thomas Lindenberg's study, a dissertation written at the Berlin Technical University, considers the street as a social location in which contradictions within society otherwise articulated only in the conventional political arenas can be experienced immediately and articulated in direct action. The study examines “street politics” from below and from above at a high point of public conflict on the streets and in a city in which state power, industrial workers and the labour movement were more concentrated than anywhere else in Germany. At the same time, the analysis is not restricted to spectacular, explicitly political disputes, but also covers the day-to-day “guerrilla warfare” between the street public and the