

Volume III, which contains the material of Notebooks 6, 7, and 8, has a feature that gives further evidence of Gramsci's planned approach to his work: the first 42 pages of Notebook 7 (153–195) are headed "Notes on Philosophy. Materialism and Idealism. Second Series," while the last 54 pages of Notebook 8 (329–383) have this same heading, followed by the words "Third Series." These two long sections dealing with Gramsci's historical materialist critique of positivism and idealism refer back in turn to a section of Notebook 4 (in Volume 2 of Buttigieg's edition) where we find the "first series" of "Notes on Philosophy," with the same additional words "Materialism and Idealism." Readers interested in Gramsci's conception of praxis will be amply satisfied by all three notebooks of Volume 3. For example, key passages of his critique of Nikolai Bukharin's "sociological" Marxism make it clear why Gramsci believed, and illustrated in a variety of ways, that one could not understand dialectics "unless historical materialism is conceived as an integral original philosophy that initiates a new phase of history and a new phase in the development of world thought" (179).

Among other prominently featured topics of Volume 3 are Gramsci's reflections on why Italian literature is not "national-popular" (in Notebook 6), his views on individualism and ideology (in Notebook 7), and his penetrating discussion of the relationship between "superstructures" and "the ensemble of the social relations of production" (in Notebook 8).

Buttigieg's English translation of Gramsci's prose in Volume 3 is uniformly fluent and faithful to the original Italian text. The same holds true of its preceding companion volumes. This is not the least of reasons why Buttigieg has made a singular contribution to Gramsci studies in the United States and all other Anglophone countries. One cannot but agree with Edward Said's view that "Joseph A. Buttigieg's work is a monument of scholarship and of supple, deeply sensitive translation."

FRANK ROSENGARTEN

160 East 84th Street
New York, NY 10028
frosengart@aol.com

Through a Glass Darkly: U. S. Views of the Chinese Revolution, by William Hinton.
New York: Monthly Review Press, 2006. Paper, \$19.95. Pp. 287.

This posthumous volume by William Hinton, author of *Fanshen* and arguably the single most important English language writer on the Chinese revolution, is in many ways a fitting capstone to a career spent documenting

revolutionary change in China and countering anti-communist and anti-peasant knowledge of China. While it is not the type of bottom-up, grass-roots “documentary” study he is most famous for, it nonetheless contains a wealth of concrete material and anecdotes about collective agriculture and rural economies during the Mao years and after, based on his experiences working in and visiting rural China, in this case Hebei.

The bulk of the text, however, is dedicated to a withering critique of a recent, influential text, *Chinese Village, Socialist State*, by three noted China Studies scholars (Edward Friedman, Paul Pickowicz and Mark Selden). These authors were at one time sympathetic to the Chinese revolution and helped pioneer progressive scholarship against the mainstream, Harvard traditions, yet now write from a familiar “God-that-failed” perspective (as Hinton refers to it at one point). Their text represents the current global turn to the right, and as such is an apt target for Hinton. But it is also an Area Studies counterpart to Hinton’s *Fanshen* and *Shenfan*: like those books, it is based on years of visits to a single rural village, and maps out the alleged effects of the signature Maoist campaigns of the 1940s and early 1960s — land reform, collectivization and the Great Leap Forward. Friedman *et al.* attempt a complete repudiation of these campaigns, and conceive of the Mao era as nothing but an assault by an expansionist Chinese state upon the peasants and their alleged desire for “the market” and for private, household farming. Their narrative is told — as with most Cultural Revolution memoirs and analyses — from the standpoint of the losers or “victims” of the Maoist collective mobilizations. While such voices certainly should be brought on board, the problem with the Friedman text — as Hinton makes abundantly clear — is that its analyses are often shallow and overridden by an anti-state and anti-communist perspective, to the point where neither the obstacles to nor the resultant gains from the developmental Marxism of the Chinese state can be discerned at all.

Intimately familiar with this specific region and with the Chinese countryside and the Maoist agrarian strategy, Hinton sets out to correct the historical record from Friedman *et al.*’s “gross distortion of reality” and to recall for us the rationality, if not the necessity, of collectivization, cooperation and the (failed) Maoist attempt at an alternative, anti-Stalinist mode of development (33). At a strictly empirical level, Hinton succeeds brilliantly. One leaves his text with the sense that the “objective” basis of Friedman *et al.*’s condemnation, their very details, are unreliable; the sweeping generalizations based on these “facts,” even more so. Hinton’s grasp of data, from grain yields to land reclamation techniques, is without peer, even when he is using figures from Friedman *et al.*, recalculating them and wrenching them from the latter’s incautious or erroneous conclusions. Hinton’s analysis of the famine and crop failures following the Great Leap Forward communalization

campaign is particularly noteworthy in this regard. While delving into statistical tables, caloric energy requirements and the like, Hinton teases out the assumptions leading to greatly exaggerated claims of famine deaths (often based on falling birth rates, for example, claiming “deaths” of people who were not actually born at all). His characteristic style of not explaining away but even calling attention to leftist excesses and Mao’s own failures is on display here as well, which makes his defense of what was eminently sane and rational in the Leap’s developmental strategy all the more convincing.

The focus on *Chinese Village, Socialist State* might seem tedious to the non-specialist, and distract from the larger purpose of Hinton’s book: defense of the Maoist strategy and record against mainstream or “U. S.” views. Much of the arguing over minutia, however, occurs in separate, marked-off mini-sections of the text that Hinton calls “Spin Interludes,” and can easily be passed over.

Hinton’s larger analysis of the competing “lines” and class struggles in China after 1949 is likewise successful overall. His argument is perhaps strongest when he defends the necessity of state support for the successful communes (such as Dazhai) and state intervention into the economy more generally (such support and self-reliance or mutual aid go hand in hand), and of the “forceful” liberation of women from clan and patriarchal systems in the villages, including the traditional family structure. His arguments against the standard scholarly veneration of tradition, the local and “popular culture” — which Hinton argues is rural *gentry* culture — are sharp. Here and elsewhere Hinton uses the tools of class analysis, allowing us to see that class divisions very much existed in China after 1949 and that Mao and the left, from the Great Leap onwards, consistently acted to eradicate them. Whatever else one may say about Mao and the Party under him, they were quite consistent in taking the side of the dispossessed and laboring classes, and in the face of academic disavowals Hinton restores this class dimension to Chinese history.

And yet it must also be said that Hinton’s invocation of class in his analysis of the “two-line struggle” within the Party — represented by the Maoists on the one hand, who opposed private enterprise, the market principle and “the capitalist road” and Liu Shaoqi and Deng Xiaoping on the other, who were essentially Stalinist–economistic in their penchant for market mechanisms yet total Party control — comes off at times as overly reductive and borderline conspiratorial. (At one time the saboteur-like efforts of Liu *et al.* are likened to the U. S. COINTELPRO.) Certainly there were important, subtle yet complex and conflicting lines or visions within the Party and revolution that represented not just different economic theories but competing visions of socialism, the future, culture and “China”; and these should in the end be distinguished as left and right. But even though Hinton argued

elsewhere that these two lines (the people and policies within them) can and did overlap, and even though he hints here that these struggles were not always consciously held and carried out, the presentation in this text can at times seem too schematic. More sophisticated notions of ideology, discourse and political passion — and of class — are needed in the face of tired, Cold War notions of totalitarianism and the natural, liberal order of markets, individuals and “choice.” Hinton’s final text, however, makes this clear, too, and he restores a great deal of complexity, rationality and profound political struggle to China in these and later years. As with his earlier books, this one should be read by anyone interested in modern China and revolution.

DANIEL F. VUKOVICH

School of Humanities, Comparative Literature
The University of Hong Kong
Pokfulam Road
Hong Kong, China
vukovich@hkucc.hku.hk

Secrets of Women: Gender, Generation, and the Origins of Human Dissection, by Katharine Park. New York: Zone Books/MIT Press, 2006. \$36.95. Pp. 419.

In *Secrets of Women* — the culmination of her career as a cultural historian of science and medicine in early modern Europe — Katharine Park sets out to revise the history of anatomy in Europe which, in her view, has suffered from its exclusive focus on its development as an academic discipline and medical practice. This focus, Park argues, has hidden the role women and gender-related issues have played in the development of anatomical studies and has generated a set of faulty assumptions, namely: anatomy developed in contrast with the teaching of the Church, exemplifying a conflict between science and religion; it was a male enterprise, privileging the male body taken as the human canon; its academic development in the 16th century constituted a break with a previous medieval tradition that considered the opening of bodies a cultural taboo.

Park challenges these views, arguing that the history of anatomy should include various forms of dissection — autopsies, fetal excisions, evisceration — that, by the late 13th century, medical practitioners in Northern Italy (the cradle of anatomical studies) were already practicing, mostly for reasons that had little to do with medicine and healthcare, or with approval by the Church. Municipal authorities ordered the autopsies of people killed by the

Copyright of Science & Society is the property of Guilford Publications Inc. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.