Historical discourses about identities in Africa have spanned myriad dimensions, including those that are social, economic, cultural, political, linguistic, and “ethnic.” Perhaps among the most debated and deconstructed of identities has been that of the Zulu, and this study adds significantly to this growing historiography. As historians have shown, almost from the inception of the eponymous kingdom, contemporary observers were as instrumental in shaping perceptions of Zulu identity as the Zulu themselves. Even now, South African politicians, such as the “100% Zulu Boy” President Jacob Zuma, seek to define and strategically deploy ubuZulu Bethu (“our Zuluness”), while academics provide cautionary arguments about the abuses of history in the assertion of this ethnicity to justify patriarchal domination and violent political conflicts. In this work, Michael R. Mahoney provides a keen examination of Zulu ethnicity during the crucial formative phases of the precolonial and colonial periods.

Mahoney defines Zulu ethnicity primarily in political terms and specifically in terms of Africans’ allegiance to chiefs who were subordinate and loyal to the authority of Zulu kings. He notes the many exceptions to this loyalty among powerful precolonial chiefdoms, such as the Qwabe, who rejected Zulu domination despite having been forcibly incorporated into the kingdom. He then goes on to show the ways that most Africans in Natal colony, as opposed to the adjacent heartland of the kingdom, rejected the various kings’ authority. He argues that this political tension also defined Natal Africans’ rejection of Zulu ethnicity until such time as it became necessary and useful to them. This raises some largely unanswered questions about what he means precisely by ethnicity. There is, for example, little consideration of what are arguably essential features of Zulu ethnicity, such as language or artistic culture, which both Natal Africans and those living under the Zulu kings shared. So, though it may well have been that Africans in Natal rejected the Zulu kings, it is not clear that, historically, they also rejected all features of Zulu ethnicity.

Mahoney covers some familiar ground, including the critical period when the founding king, Shaka, wrought the Zulu state, the watershed Anglo-Zulu War and the ensuing destruction of the kingdom, and the youth-driven Bhambatha Rebellion of 1906. He makes effective use of the available colonial records and
provides fresh analysis of them as he integrates the considerable corpus of secondary literature into his argument. It is, however, chapter 4 on migrant labor that best illustrates his central point—that the young male migrants of Natal sought to embrace Zulu ethnicity only when it served their material interests. As one saying goes, \textit{ubuZulu abudliwa} (you cannot eat your “Zuluness”); yet, as Mahoney shows, in segregation-era South Africa, “Zuluness” was leveraged to provide economic and political opportunity. Overall, the writing is lively and engaging, and the book is highly recommended for those interested in the compelling unfolding story of Zulu identity.

\textit{Georgia College} \\
Aran S. MacKinnon


Menachem Begin, one of the most polarizing figures in Israeli political history, is a challenging subject of study. Avi Shilon does an impressive job in a biography that integrates the personal with the political and the psychological with the ideological. In narrating a life that was marked by a number of controversial incidents that continue to have resonance today, Shilon succeeds in presenting evidence of varied perspectives and deepening the portrait of Begin the man as well as the political actor. In choosing to present Begin’s experiences and choices largely as he himself or those very close to him understood them, Shilon has the advantage of emphasizing the complexity of the man while leaving to others the task of integrating this portrait more fully into the history of the Israeli state.

Menachem Begin’s formative years were spent in Poland. Born in 1913 in Brest-Litovsk, historically situated between Russia and Poland, Begin’s education and political activism developed in the context of interwar Poland. It was there where most of his family perished during World War II and where his Jewish identity, combining religious traditionalism with militant Zionism, took shape. By the time he reached Palestine in 1942, his view of the world as well as his emotional reactions to its challenges were well defined. Shilon weaves some of the characteristics rooted in this early period throughout the life story: a personal propensity to mood swings and early activism and assertiveness in the Betar youth movement linked to the Revisionist Party and particularly to its leader, Jabotinsky—a perspective informed by Eastern European realities as well as the Holocaust in ways that made Begin a foreigner in Israeli culture.
The strength of Shilon’s work lies precisely in his ability to trace the consistencies of Begin’s vulnerabilities as well as his strengths as he assumed the roles for which he is best known: commander of the Irgun, leader of the Herut Party, and prime minister of Israel. In doing so, he also helps the reader to go well beyond certain simplifications that had their origins in the rivalries of early Zionist leaders, particularly Ben-Gurion and Jabotinsky, representing alternative paths to a largely common nationalist goal. Begin, often described as a terrorist and presented by Ben-Gurion as a danger to the state, emerges as a man committed to avoiding the outbreak of violence within the Jewish community. At the same time, his political skills were ultimately limited by the contradictions in his commitments, on the one hand, to democratic liberties and, on the other, to a demand for loyalty as well as compliance, which ultimately interfered with his ability to learn even from those within his own political party or coalitions. Irrevocably marked by a worldview that pitted Jews against a hostile world and pervaded by a polarity of good and evil that the realities of the Holocaust appeared to justify, Begin could not adapt his perspectives when he finally became prime minister of a powerful state with significant regional responsibilities. As a result, his great success in signing a peace treaty with Egypt was marred by the failure to recognize the need for resolution of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. His inclusion of Ariel Sharon in his government ultimately reinforced his image as a man linked historically more to violence than to politics, more to authoritarianism and dishonesty than to democracy and justice. Shilon makes clear that this reductionist view is not only a distortion but ultimately interferes with the important historical task of writing the complexities of Zionist and Israeli history. In this perspective as well as in his very engaging writing, Shilon makes a very welcome contribution.

Duke University

Ylana N. Miller


In the foreword, Cokie Roberts discusses how this book strives to “uncover the true story of the first full-scale biography of Dolley Madison, written in two versions by her niece Mary Estelle Elizabeth Cutts, and what it tells us—and fails to tell—about one of the most powerful women in history” (ix). This goal is
pursued by setting out three chapters on context along with the two Cutts memoirs transcribed by Lee Langston-Harrison, Catherine Allgor, and James Connolly. This is not a book for political scholars intent on examining how Dolley Madison used her position as First Lady to further President James Madison’s agenda. There is a recounting of the famous story of her rescue of the portrait of George Washington hanging in the White House during the War of 1812. Cutts’s sympathetic portrayal of her aunt’s actions in the memoir states that “[h]er first thought was to save the public papers, and the Declaration of Independence, the second, to preserve the portrait of General Washington said to be by G. Stuart” (123). A telling indication of the bias of these memoirs is the very different account of the portrait rescue written by Paul Jennings, President Madison’s valet and slave: “It has often been stated in print, that when Mrs. Madison escaped from the White House she cut from the frame the large portrait of Washington (now in one of the parlors there), and carried it off. This is totally false. She had no time for doing it” (68).

An excellent chapter by Holly Cowan Shulman explains how the manuscripts mislead in the recounting of Dolley’s relationship to her slaves, family, and Madison in-laws. Paul Jennings had a critical view of his past mistress, who sold him instead of permitting him to buy his freedom on the death of James Madison, and this was indicative of the widespread criticism of Mrs. Madison by the abolitionists. Not only do the memoirs neglect to discuss Dolley Madison’s views on slavery, but Cutts uses her personal access to Montpelier to romanticize slavery, writing, “None but an eye witness can know of the peace and ease of these sable sons of toil! To retire with health and not a care for the morrow and surrounded by their progeny, on these plantations which remain in the same family over a century!” (157).

Catherine Allgor’s essay correctly describes the Cutts memoir as “an outstanding example of pre-twentieth-century women’s history” (8). The analysis of women’s history is excellent but unfortunately the apolitical description by Mary Cutts of her aunt gives scant insight into the “real” Dolley Madison. Mary Cutts did not live to see her memoirs published. But her own niece, Lucia B. Cutts, using extensive excerpts from the memoir, did publish a biography of Dolley Madison, which has been used as a seminal primary source.

Elizabeth Dowling Taylor provides a concise and useful biographical chapter on Mary Cutts.

*Wake Forest University*  
Kathy B. Smith
The key dramatic moment of any fashionable dinner in eighteenth-century Philadelphia was when the servants or slaves removed the tablecloth to reveal the mahogany dining table. Consumers valued mahogany for its durability, its versatility, and its lustrous appearance. Above all, though, genteel colonial Americans appreciated its social power. A luxurious commodity that evoked the exotic and the refined, mahogany’s “aesthetic qualities coincided with eighteenth-century Anglo concepts of beauty, gentility, refinement, and modernity” (13). Beginning with the premise that all goods only gain meaning through their cultural context, Jennifer L. Anderson’s study traces the changing place of mahogany in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century American society.

_Mahogany_ intersects with histories of Atlantic slavery, commerce, and consumption. Concentrating on one commodity allows Anderson to interrogate how a variety of actors around the Atlantic came together to make consumption possible. Because she is attentive to the ways consumption shaped production and vice versa, her work uncovers the ways places and actors as diverse as Newport merchants, white itinerant woodcutters, enslaved Africans, Miskito Indians, and elite American consumers participated in an entangled Atlantic trade in which all of their actions shaped each other’s experiences.

The book’s nine thematic chapters trace mahogany from the rainforests of Jamaica and Belize, to the ports and workshops of North America, to the parlors and dining rooms of fashionable houses. Although most of the book centers on the eighteenth century, the two final chapters follow mahogany into the nineteenth century to examine the way steam power transformed its production and lowered its cost and the ways the democratization of its consumption refashioned older pieces as antique vestiges of a vanished society.

Though consumption drives Anderson’s project, her work on the cutting of mahogany and the ways that Americans’ insatiable demand for the wood helped transform both the tropical environment where it grew and the working conditions of those who labored to cut the massive trees is most distinctive. Anderson’s depiction of the harsh and violent but “relatively flexible form of bondage” under which woodcutters in the Bay of Honduras (now Belize) worked exposes the costs of luxury even as it reveals the complexities of Atlantic world slavery (157). Because mahogany grew across widely scattered areas, enslaved woodcutters were able to leverage their knowledge of the location of groves to improve their lives. The violence slave masters employed to wring labor and obedience from
slaves who often worked with minimal supervision, however, tempered these opportunities.

In a book that unflinchingly tracks mahogany as it spread through the Atlantic, it is odd that Anderson largely focuses on its consumption in British North America. Were Americans more likely to buy mahogany than Europeans? Did it mean something different to Americans? Perhaps the answer lies in the convergence of colonial America’s consumer revolution with the increasing availability of mahogany and North American merchants’ involvement in the mahogany trade, but Anderson never systematically makes this case.

Wide-ranging and engagingly written, *Mahogany* will be useful to historians of the Atlantic world, consumption, and the decorative arts.

*Towson University*  
Christian J. Koot


This analysis of the relationship between Henry Ford and blacks of Detroit offers a fresh perspective of several important issues, including the antecedents of the New Deal and the growth of the civil rights movement, which burgeoned after 1945. The author argues that Ford’s policy of hiring blacks sparked a transformation in their lives and helped lay a foundation for a labor-oriented civil rights agenda and ultimately a base for the urban, black middle class (3). Ford’s decision to hire blacks for jobs previously denied to them was made in part to combat unions and to some extent because he interpreted his high-wage jobs as a way to offer greater independence and freedom to working men (4). Ultimately, his strategy failed because the expectations of Detroit’s black workers rose, and with the further catalyst of the Great Depression, they were able to sever the paternalistic hold that Ford tried to maintain.

To understand the break between Ford and his black employees, Beth Tompkins Bates delves further back than others have into the 1920s and extends her critical eye to community formation and the political activities of Detroit’s blacks, many of whom were in the first wave of the Great Migration. The role blacks played in the early political career of Frank Murphy, an Irish Catholic critic of Ford, foreshadowed the New Deal coalition that emerged in the next decade. Detroit’s African Americans cooperated with white ethnics to elect Murphy to the local bench in a race that pitted him against the traditional Protestant industrial elite. The close relationship that developed between blacks and Murphy gave them
access to the levers of power and created community networks that were
launching pads for later activism, including the United Auto Workers (UAW)
years later (7).

After the shutdown in 1931–1932 there was a significant shift in Ford’s hiring
policy. In the early years of the Depression, turnover in the foundry, which
contained the hottest, dirtiest jobs at the Ford Motor Company, rose among
whites. High turnover rates were an anathema to Ford, so when the plant
re-opened he began to hire black workers almost exclusively for foundry jobs.
With fewer options for work than whites, black laborers alleviated the problem of
turnover. As more blacks entered the foundry, Ford phased out the premium wage
package. The divide between black and white workers grew, making union
organizing more difficult. The author asserts that “Ford’s new labor policy dimin-
ished the value of equal opportunity and inclusion that his American Plan had
promoted” (166–167).

By the late 1930s, union organizers worked often in the shadows of black
Detroit to avoid detection by Ford’s spies and “stool pigeons.” In 1941 the UAW
succeeded in its efforts to unionize Ford. Coupled with the UAW’s message was a
strong sense of the need for individual action first promoted by Marcus Garvey,
who had a large following in Detroit, and later by other groups, such as the
National Negro Congress.

Framingham State University
Jon Huibregtse

$45.00.)

Hendrik Booraem V has an interesting record as a presidential biographer, having
published studies of James A. Garfield, Calvin Coolidge, and Andrew Jackson.
The intriguing nature of Booraem’s work, however, lies in its emphasis: He
concentrates upon the early years of these figures, attempting to understand how
they, none of whom seemed on a fast track to high office, developed into influ-
ential figures. His latest subject is William Henry Harrison.

Booraem’s study of Harrison demonstrates both the strengths and weaknesses
of his approach. On the positive side, it is refreshing to see a new study of our
shortest-serving (one month) president. Though largely reduced to a historical
footnote and trivia question, Harrison played a major role in the history of the
early Northwest and, indeed, was the first national figure to emerge from this
region. Yet, the problem with studying the early lives of those who lived centuries ago is the lack of original sources. Though Booraem raises interesting questions about Harrison’s development, his conclusions on even the most crucial issues before Harrison entered the army in 1791 can only be speculative.

Despite these drawbacks, this book serves two valuable functions beyond telling the story of Harrison. First, Booraem provides an interesting assessment of the decline of the Virginia tidewater in the latter half of the eighteenth century. The Harrison family and their seat at Berkeley plantation on the James River were among the most storied in Virginia lore. Benjamin Harrison V, signer of the Declaration of Independence and governor of Virginia, had been born into a plantation society at its zenith. Yet, William Henry, his third son, clearly understood in his formative years that this society had peaked and that his own future would be determined in far different circumstances and surroundings. Certainly wartime destruction played a role in these developments, but, as Booraem skillfully describes, this only intensified a decline already in progress.

Of equal importance is Booraem’s discussion of the United States Army on the northwestern frontier. Harrison entered the army in August 1791 and reached Fort Washington, near Cincinnati, as an eighteen-year-old ensign in November, amidst the chaos that followed the disastrous St. Clair expedition. Booraem devotes approximately half of the text to the army under General Anthony Wayne and to the role played by Harrison, who served as an aide to Wayne. Prominently featured is the conflict between Wayne and his second-in-command, James Wilkinson, one of the most controversial figures in the early republic. Booraem takes a nontraditional course in sympathizing with Wilkinson, whom he feels has been victimized by the venom of Wayne and other contemporary critics. Harrison, for his part, was one of the few officers to remain on good terms with both generals, demonstrating a genial nature and enhancing his reputation in military circles.

Booraem is to be congratulated on an intriguing study of the early years of William Henry Harrison. This reviewer looks forward to his next study of the development of another president often reduced to a trivia question—Gerald Ford.

University of Tennessee at Martin

Daniel McDonough

In this book, which is part biography, part narrative history, the author narrates the life and times of a devout eighteenth-century evangelical woman. Locally famous in her own day for her religious leadership, sacrifice, and Christian conviction, Sarah Osborn left behind thousands of pages of writing. Using these and a variety of other sources to contextualize Sarah’s life, Catherine Brekus details the changing faith and practices of eighteenth-century evangelicals.

The author’s deepest interest is Osborn’s life. She lived through public crises such as the French and Indian War and American Revolution. She endured personal struggles including ongoing poverty and the death of a spouse and a son. Most importantly, she responded to the call of God’s sacrificial and suffering love. Throughout her difficult life, Osborn strove to make sense of tumult, suffering, and deep doubt, amidst the promise that God and the created order were good. Brekus carefully draws out the nuance and respects the driving passion of Osborn’s life. “If Sarah Osborn’s voice still has the power to inspire people today, it is because of her vision of the world as flawed, transient, and yet infused with grace,” Brekus writes (344).

Beyond Osborn’s life, though, the author is most interested in the interaction between the Enlightenment and Evangelicalism. Many scholars have observed, as Brekus does, that “[i]n the dialectical encounter between Protestantism and the Enlightenment the influence flowed in both directions” (304). Sarah Osborn was right in the middle of it, as reflected in her views on heaven, progress and American nationalism, slavery and abolition, humanitarian aid, women’s roles in the church, doubt, and a great variety of other topics. Enlightenment emphasis on the authority of experience was especially valuable to Osborn, as her experience of God’s grace gave her an authority distinct from that of educated, ordained clergy and drew crowds to her home for years to hear her words. Brekus asserts, “By combining the Christian language of human sinfulness and divine glory with a new Enlightenment vocabulary of benevolence, happiness, rationality, and empiricism, Sarah Osborn crafted a narrative that was both uniquely her own and distinctly evangelical” (133).

Brekus’s work contributes to the series “New Directions in Narrative History.” The author writes with an imaginative flexibility uncommon to historical monographs, often using what Osborn may have thought as an opportunity to explore cultural development in thought and behavior. This approach works; so far as the reviewer can tell, the author does not outrun her evidence. This study is, in fact,
a melding of evidence, imagination, and rhetorical discipline that exhibits rare talent.

_Sarah Osborn’s World_ depicts the changing world of an eighteenth-century evangelical woman, radical yet conservative, fearful yet bold—an exemplary history of a reflective life lived during a time deeply formative for both modernity and Evangelicalism.

*Union University*  
David Thomas

---


In this insightful and accessible book, Brycchan Carey traces a continuous and evolving body of Quaker antislavery thought from founder George Fox to the decisions of the Philadelphia and London Yearly Meetings to proscribe the slave trade. As he notes, “this book ends at the point where most studies of the abolition movement begin” (217). Previous scholars have seen early Quaker antislavery thought as intermittent and disconnected. Carey, a professor of English literature, analyzes pamphlets, letters, and meeting minutes to illuminate the central themes of Quaker antislavery thought. For over a century, Quakers honed their ideas and became the first denomination to disavow slavery and provide the rhetorical foundation for the transatlantic antislavery movement.

Carey traces an ongoing Quaker conversation that crisscrossed the British Empire, from Barbados to London to Philadelphia and beyond. Fox’s 1657 letter “To Friends Beyond the Sea” established his early concern with the potential problem of slavery for the Society of Friends. His 1671 trip to Barbados, where a number of Quakers had settled, further sharpened his ideas about slavery. Fox argued that whites, blacks, and Indians were spiritual equals and that slaves should be treated as members of the family. Though Fox’s statements against slavery were mild (he suggested that slaves be emancipated after thirty years), subsequent generations of Quakers elaborated on his ideas. One important early antislavery document was the “1688 Protest,” penned outside of Philadelphia in Germantown. Although historians see the “Protest” as isolated, Carey persuasively describes the way the authors built upon Fox’s ideas and sparked discussion in both Philadelphia and London. By the end of the seventeenth century, Carey points out, Quaker antislavery discourse was “remarkably intertextual and remarkably well-developed” (71).
From this beginning, Quakers developed their religious and moral arguments against slavery. Like Fox and the Germantown Quakers, antislavery Friends viewed slavery as a violation of Christ’s commandment to “do unto others,” offering the example of their white Christian contemporaries who feared enslavement by Muslims. Antislavery Quakers also worried that slavery undermined their peace testimony as it required force to acquire and control slaves. They expressed concern that slavery promoted adultery and fornication by separating enslaved families. Carey notes that Quakers sometimes seemed more concerned about the sins of slaveholders, including theft, greed, and laziness, than about the fate of slaves. This last element of antislavery discourse did not disappear, unfortunately, but lasted well into the nineteenth century.

*From Peace to Freedom* is essential to understanding the origins and impact of antislavery thought in the Society of Friends. Though it took time and effort, antislavery Quakers won the internal debate in the Society of Friends. Carey succeeds in contextualizing familiar eighteenth-century radicals like John Woolman and Anthony Benezet in this longer tradition of Quaker antislavery rhetoric.

*Syracuse University*  
Carol Faulkner

---


In this study, public historian Theodore Corbett challenges the long-standing interpretation that the Saratoga Campaign was the most strategically significant campaign of the American Revolution. Corbett’s thesis is presented in six segments—two provide the background, two are focused on the Saratoga Campaign, and the final two highlight military and political events upon the Lake Champlain frontier following General John Burgoyne’s October 1777 defeat.

Unfortunately, Corbett’s treatise is replete with errors that significantly detract from his study. As early as the prologue, Corbett relies on outdated interpretations of Burgoyne’s role in the formulation of the campaign in London during the winter of 1776–1777. He consistently misunderstands Burgoyne’s orders. In chapter 1, he confuses trends and patterns in the relatively well-established Hudson Valley south of Albany with the Hudson and Lake Champlain watersheds north of Albany, which did not see occupation until the end of the Seven Years War. Chapters 4 (the 1776 Campaign) and 11 (the Saratoga
Battles) are so riddled with mistakes that they cannot be relied upon. His
description of the battle of Hubbardton is entirely void of references. Corbett
neglects to discuss the role of the Royal Artillery throughout the 1776 and 1777
campaigns.

Corbett consistently fails to provide sources for the number of Loyalists that he
alleges supported Burgoyne. In the absence of such documentation, chapter 7
remains mere speculation. The author incorrectly interprets German Lieutenant
Colonel Baum’s instructions for the Bennington Expedition, which negates the
assessment of this event in chapter 10.

Corbett is prone to make pronouncements without providing documentation.
He ascribes interpretation to “some” or “most historians” without identifying
them. He frequently engages in open speculation, absent annotations to document
his beliefs. This study relies upon badly dated secondary sources, fails to make use
of other, readily available secondary sources, and overlooks some core primary
sources.

The final segment of the book is the best written and most valuable to
historians, as it comprehensively discusses military and political actions on Lake
Champlain and the Hudson following Burgoyne’s defeat, six years that have
received insufficient attention and study. The one exception has been Canadian
historian Gavin Watt, who has devoted substantial effort to the contributions and
role of the Loyalists from Canada during this time frame. Corbett supplements
Watt’s previous works.

Still, throughout the last section, Corbett fails to comprehend the military and
political difference between a “raid” (a tactic intended to harass settlements and
destroy farms and resources) and an “invasion” (a major military effort to
permanently seize and occupy territory). Following Burgoyne’s defeat in October
1777, the British in Canada could never again launch an invasion against New
York, although they could raid isolated frontier settlements. This misinterpreta-
tion renders the premise of his study null and void.

The Campaigns and Commanders series of the University of Oklahoma Press
has established a reputation of presenting superb military history analysis. Regret-
tably, Corbett’s flawed study fails to exhibit the high standards of scholarship
previously demonstrated by this series.

*Stone Fort Consulting, LLC*  
Douglas R. Cubbison
Donald Stoker recently argued in his iconoclastic survey of American Civil War strategy, *The Grand Design* [2012], that one of the Lincoln administration’s most grievous errors was not capitalizing on its possession of northern Alabama. From April until September 1862, Union forces under the command of Major General Ormsby Mitchel occupied the state’s northern counties as part of a broader thrust against the Confederate heartland. Properly reinforced, Stoker maintains, Mitchel could have taken a lightly held Chattanooga in a few days and changed the course of a shortened war. Instead, the opportunity passed, spare troops went elsewhere, and the entire occupation ultimately proved fruitless when a Confederate invasion in late summer shifted the western war back into Tennessee and Kentucky.

In this volume, Joseph Danielson takes a different course than Stoker but agrees that Mitchel’s neglected campaign merits new scrutiny. According to Danielson, the occupation was a significant, early crucible in which the Union army rejected conciliation for the “hard-war” policies that would characterize the conflict’s second half. The lesson the brass failed to learn was that hard-war practices backfired there, actually strengthening Confederate patriotism.

Although Cooperationists dominated voting in regional polling for the state secession convention, few white Alabamians from the northern counties were ever Unionists. Anxious to protect a booming slave-based economy, most quickly transferred their allegiance to the Confederacy. Mitchel’s arrival failed to dampen those sentiments. Residents fought back with tactics ranging from socially shunning Union soldiers to shooting at them. Although Mitchel’s superior officer, Major General Don Carlos Buell, was a strict conciliationist, Mitchel and his men quickly adopted punitive responses. Danielson delineates two broad categories, which he terms “weak” and “strong.” Among the range of “weak” policies were arrests of community leaders, loyalty oaths, and cotton confiscation. Stronger policies involved more extensive seizures of food and property. Censorship and blocking mail struck at family ties. Confronted with the reality of slavery, sympathetic soldiers meanwhile assisted slave resistance. None of these responses weakened white support for the Confederacy, however, and in some cases they stiffened resolve. The result was a spiral of violence that culminated in the destructive “rape of Athens” in May 1862. Mitchel’s support of the office in command ultimately led to his replacement. When the army left in September, Confederate nationalism was as strong as ever. A later occupation, frequent raids,
and the continuing breakdown of slavery did finally undermine white morale, but the region’s Confederate orientation persisted after the war.

Danielson here follows a path broken in Mark Grimsley’s *The Hard Hand of War* [1995] but implies that Grimsley’s intermediate phase between conciliation and hard war was a brief moment in north Alabama. His conclusions on the ineffectiveness of punitive war meanwhile echo those of Clay Mountcastle’s uncited volume. This reviewer wishes that Danielson had done more with intraregional differences, and the final discussion seems rushed, but this is nonetheless a solid first book that offers much to Civil War historians as well as to readers concerned with more recent military occupations.

*Auburn University*

Kenneth W. Noe


This book comes with a great title, one almost certain to catch any interested reader’s attention. Its author has made a career of writing about American frontier and Western gunmen, gamblers, lawmen, and robbers, Bat Masterson among them. This time he shifts his focus, moving the scene from west to east and the subject matter from physical to verbal conflict. The author pauses along the way to speculate on how William Barclay Masterson became known as Bat. Then he considers the stories and legends of Bat’s career as a Western lawman, gambler, and gunman, debunking most of them effectively. His analysis shows that despite lurid stories narrating Masterson’s killing at least twenty-six men, except when fighting Indians, Bat shot at others only six times. In those incidents three men died, two escaped after being wounded, and one fled unhurt. Clearly his record fell far short of his reputation. Usually Masterson played down the violent stories, although he appears to have enjoyed and used some of the notoriety they brought in his later personal disputes.

The book narrates Bat’s career after he stopped being a professional gambler and follows him for the last twenty-five years of his life, spent mostly in New York City. There he became a writer/reporter for the *New York Morning Telegraph*, writing a lengthy column three times each week for nearly twenty years. The author presents his subject as a man who was personable, usually honest, and who stuck to his personal moral code. At the same time, Masterson is depicted as argumentative, vindictive, willing to harbor decade-long grudges, and guilty of using threats of violence.
Even before moving to New York City or becoming a newspaper writer, Bat became fascinated with professional boxing. In on the ground floor of that sport, he took up promoting matches and worked with leading figures related to it. His interest led him to use his newspaper columns to end fight fixing and to promote honesty at a time when boxing rightfully had a sordid reputation. That effort led him to charge promoters, fighters, referees, and even the New York State Boxing Commission with dishonesty and fraud. Much of the narrative comes back to his never-ending campaign to make boxing a reputable sport.

The lack of any personal papers hinders author Robert DeArment’s effort to write a biography of Masterson. To get beyond that, he uses Bat’s newspaper columns and the writings and commentary of his associates. Because his subject was not a self-reflexive person, DeArment’s job was difficult. While he is able to narrate the major issues in Bat’s life, often the prose is little more than a listing of important boxing figures, Old West friends, New York City politicians—including Theodore Roosevelt—show people, entertainers, and fellow newsmen. To those who want more, this is as close to the man as one is likely to get.

University of Arizona

Roger L. Nichols


Although individual freedom versus community control is a familiar theme in the United States, the problems raised by communicable disease made this dilemma of particular interest to the founders of early American society. How do you protect the population of an urban community without infringing too harshly on the rights of the settlers? Simon Finger deals with this problem by looking at the 130 years of Philadelphia history from its founding by William Penn through the early years of the republic. For Finger, Philadelphia is an important model to understand the complexity of the problem. Soon after its founding, the Quaker city was the largest city in America, second only to London in the empire, and by the Revolution possessed one of America’s most complex medical establishments. The city also had serious health problems while serving as the new capital of the United States in the 1790s. Three yellow fever outbreaks occurred in which over 25 percent of its population died and the members of the new government scattered to their home states.

Finger presents readers with the key figures, from William Penn to Benjamin Franklin to Benjamin Rush, who dealt with how to keep the population safe from
illness. Penn’s answer was to create a garden city with broad avenues and parks so that his urban metropolis would be not much different than the rural backcountry. When disease broke out, Penn’s successors engaged in controversy on how to deal with the deaths that resulted. Some urged the creation of a lazaretto, or isolation hospital, located south of the city on an island in the Delaware River, to prevent immigrants from coming into the city before being thoroughly evaluated by government doctors. Those opposed to such a facility believed it intimidated potential settlers and also violated the detainees’ human rights. In many ways, the controversy continued throughout the city’s early history and reappeared in the nineteenth century over the cholera epidemics and in the twentieth century over how to handle the swine flu, which devastated Philadelphia, and more recently with respect to how to deal with AIDS.

Finger has given readers a very intelligent account of the rise of public health in early America. The material is very well documented, and he has consulted European as well as American sources. This is important because many of the American doctors, such as Rush, were trained in England and brought back with them their ideas and their medical practices. For students of early Philadelphia, the book offers insights into how the founders of the city dealt with one important issue and how this fit into the politics of the city, which was divided between Penn and his descendants and those who were seeking greater democracy from their rule. In the early republic, liberals, who had given Pennsylvania the most democratic constitution in the United States, and conservatives, who eventually repealed that document, came into conflict on how to handle the yellow fever epidemic.

The most significant criticism of Finger’s fine effort is that he sometimes gets bogged down in the jargon. But, on the whole, the work is useful for graduate students and professors working on early urban history and on the origins of public health in the United States.

*Temple University*  
Herbert Ershkowitz


This slim volume, part of a recent resurgence of interest in colonial legal history, examines four cases of banishment from the seventeenth-century Massachusetts Bay Colony. Author Nan Goodman, a leading scholar of law and literature,
employs an interdisciplinary approach to interrogate the legal construction of community through the “distinction between inside and outside” required “to make and keep members” (142). She persuasively argues that events that have been unquestioningly interpreted through the lens of religion can be profitably explored through law—particularly the common law, the allegiance to purportedly immemorial custom “emerging as victorious” at the moment of Puritan settlement (22).

This frame allows Goodman to offer new perspectives on four familiar episodes seldom considered together: the exiles of religious dissident Anne Hutchinson and Anglican *bon vivant* Thomas Morton; the repeated “invasion” and ultimate execution of English Quakers; and the removal, during King Philip’s War, of Christianized Indians to Deer Island in Boston Harbor. The predominantly analytical chapters employ diverse theoretical perspectives to examine closely the texts and legal rhetoric these controversies produced. All four incidents, Goodman suggests, offered challenges to the Puritans’ legal project “to map a religiously bounded community onto a geographically bounded one” (160). Entertaining all comers, Hutchinson and Morton asserted the norm of hospitality against official boundaries of inclusion and exclusion. Williams, earlier apprenticed to eminent jurist Sir Edward Coke, advanced the unsettling jurisdictional claim that civic community could not rest on religious homogeneity and must encompass diverse peoples. The Quakers extended this argument: Their invocation of “liberties” and “due process” against Puritan prohibitions envisioned a community grounded on a “notion of partial allegiance” in which members could dissent from aspects of the dominant order (25). Finally, as Christianized natives transported to Deer Island were stripped of territorial affiliation, they assumed new identities as common-law agents through military service.

Goodman’s explorations yield valuable insights. The banished, she suggests, succeeded in making law: Massachusetts adopted a settlement she terms the “Half-Way Contract” that, like the Half-Way Covenant, recognized gradations of belonging rather than a simple dichotomy of membership. And, by drawing attention to legal disputes involving norms such as hospitality drawn from the early modern law of nations, Goodman underscores the importance of the international legal context for the development of the common law, even in a colony as isolated as Massachusetts. This emphasis on contests over multiple sources and conceptions of law contributes to the growing literature on early modern legal pluralism. Goodman is on less-sure ground with her account of natives, which obscures context by focusing on a narrow set of texts: As historians of Native
New England have traced, Indians’ common-law “agency” reflected colonizers’ success in the long-running contest for jurisdiction coupled with the persistence and savvy of Native claims-making. But she rightly finds deep resonances between her account and later histories. Banishment, she astutely points out, was not an odd quirk of colonial law; our present-day deportation regime far surpasses anything the Puritans constructed.

University of Pennsylvania

Gregory Ablavsky


This superb book is an original and vital contribution to the literature on the Cold War and its legacies in the United States. Combining deep and diverse research with clear, impassioned prose, Gretchen Heefner traces the genealogy of the one thousand Minuteman intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) installed below the American Great Plains in the 1960s. Although her text is populated by a range of compelling characters, from “missileers” to ranchers, Heefner’s subject is ultimately the missile itself—the technology that has become the depoliticized “stuff of monument.” But by stressing both geography and political economy, Heefner has produced a more complicated account of Cold War “victory” than those offered by official narratives or nostalgic boosters.

The Missile Next Door proceeds chronologically, but Heefner’s focus shifts from the Minuteman’s designers, marketers, and operators—featured in the book’s first half—to citizens forced to accept the presence of a missile on their property. This imposition was not merely an inconvenience; it also meant that one’s home had essentially become a target in the uncertain drama of Cold War deterrence. As Heefner notes, having planted these terrifying devices (and associated infrastructure) “amidst the population,” the military then “expected life to go on as usual” (2). Even the name Minuteman, suggesting a defender who responds “only when provoked by tyranny,” aided this normalization (31).

Although she is influenced by recent scholarship on the “militarization of everyday life,” Heefner’s great accomplishment is to invigorate and complicate this useful concept. Deftly using interviews and family document collections and traveling far beyond the urban settings of civil-defense histories, she captures with unusual precision the lived nature of militarization. But the intimate scale of her research and writing also allows Heefner to document the varied consequences of this process for certain people and places.
Despite spirited, scattered resistance to the Minuteman in the Great Plains, the story of states like South Dakota (Heefner’s central case) is ultimately one of imposition and consent, leading to a tragic reliance on military money and the embrace of war as a national principle. Although fascinating and valuable, the history of activism is granted slightly too much space in this work, at least in comparison to the more banal and less specific history of acceptance. Adding an important dimension to scholarship on the region, Heefner convincingly demonstrates that an exception made for (and by) the Pentagon, and national security more generally, ensured a largely passive approach to the persistent presence of destructive weaponry. Skepticism toward Washington, Heefner explains, could thus comfortably coexist alongside reverence for the military—a split that continues to be tremendously consequential.

In the introduction, Heefner indicates that she will use the Minuteman to examine “defense dependency,” the explanation and justification of a contradictory “national security apparatus,” and the overwhelmingly smooth and speedy integration of this apparatus into American daily life (7). Just pages into his reading, the reviewer scribbled a note in the margin: “if this is done, it will be impressive.” The author succeeds, and the result is an inspirational text for students of militarization and its historical geographies.

University of Toronto

Matthew Farish


This newest book by an eminent diplomatic historian is the culmination of years of research in archives in the United States, France, and Britain. Peter P. Hill’s book ably complements his other studies on the delicate years of political intrigue, economic uncertainty, and state-sponsored negotiation among key European states and the fledgling American nation. Hill’s forte has been to study figures, like William Vans Murray and Joel Barlow, who remained in the shadows of the presidents and political giants of the early American republic but whose efforts were significantly important in international diplomacy. A related strength of Hill’s work has been his attention to the French side of diplomatic relations between Britain and the United States. Hill has repeatedly shown that the French, Napoleon particularly, were justified in their pique against the Americans for their continued attention to retaining positive diplomatic relations with Britain at the expense of openness and mutuality with France.
Joel Barlow’s exuberance, optimism, and love of everything French—even during the Reign of Terror—makes him an apt subject for Hill’s skills as a diplomatic historian. The study fleshes out the portrait of Barlow presented in Hill’s earlier book on Napoleon. Attentive to Barlow’s ability to create fast friends, to forge open and clandestine commercial ties and treaty negotiations, and to hold on to hope when despair came knocking loudly at the door, Hill draws an engaging portrait of this important national poet-cum-diplomat whose wanderlust was matched by his ability to assist the formal and informal ties between the United States and its European rivals and allies. Born on a farm in Connecticut, Barlow attended Yale College during the American Revolution, served as a chaplain during the war, wrote poetry when no one had money to pay for volumes of poetry, and then engaged in a brilliant career as a negotiator on behalf of American prisoners in Algiers. He was a chief supporter of general public education, an entrepreneurial ally to scientific tinkerers (including Robert Fulton), and a stalwart diplomat (for Madison) in the face of troubling circumstances with Napoleon in Russia, circumstances that cost him his life. Diplomacy in the era required open and secret negotiations, reliable representatives and spies on negotiations, and significant funding to support whatever alliances seemed most expedient at any given time. Barlow understood this, as Hill shows us again and again.

Those who have come to admire Hill’s clear explanation of confusing political shenanigans and behind-the-scenes negotiations will find much to credit in his study of Barlow’s diplomacy in Algeria and his untangling of the difficulties in the work with Napoleon and especially Napoleon’s Russian campaign. Hill’s concerns and strengths are clearly in the realm of diplomatic history. For those more interested in social history and a richer picture of Barlow’s life as a litterateur and husband, Richard Buel’s biography of Barlow (Joel Barlow: American Citizen in a Revolutionary World) will likely be more satisfying. In truth, however, Hill’s and Buel’s books form complementary pictures of an interesting, under-studied figure whose presence was crucial in the history of diplomatic relations of the United States.

Pennsylvania State University, University Park

Carla Mulford


Hannah Arendt is hot. The fiftieth anniversary of the Eichmann trial and the recent release of Margarethe von Trotta’s biopic on Arendt has returned her to the
headlines, and, among scholars, her work has never ceased to spark admiration and anger. Amazon.com lists more than twenty books on Arendt published in 2013 alone, and they are but a small portion of a mountain of writings on all aspects of her thought and life.

Irving Horowitz’s slim volume runs the risk of scarcely being noticed amidst the massive competition. Nor is it immediately the most appealing of books. Combining eight essays and book reviews published between 1964 and 2012, the collection has little apparent unity. Horowitz’s claim that Arendt was a “radical conservative,” though not without interest, is not developed in detail, and the book is marred by lax proofreading and editing. In his conclusion, Horowitz mentions the “awkward formulations, prosaic writing style, and unsteady images” that can be found in Arendt’s works, and the same may be said of his book (98).

But it would be a mistake to ignore these essays. Horowitz was an eminent—if increasingly curmudgeonly—American sociologist, and this was his last book; he died in March 2012 just as it was published. The essays testify to a lively, admiring, but by no means uncritical engagement with Arendt’s thinking over the course of forty years, and Horowitz has valuable things to say. His appreciation for Arendt’s analysis of totalitarianism and his claim that it is central to Arendt’s oeuvre is perceptive and thoughtful, though no surprise to anyone who has read Margaret Canovan’s study. Horowitz is at his very best, though, in the two opening essays, both from 2010, which respond to the inflammatory charges that have circulated ever since the publication of Eichmann in Jerusalem in 1963 that Arendt sought to “blame the victims” and mitigate German guilt for the Holocaust. Those accusations obviously are anchored in strong emotions, and continue to circulate in part because Arendt scholars often prefer to avoid involvement in the bitter polemic.

But Horowitz never lacked combativeness, and here that quality serves him well. Focusing on writings by Bernard Wasserstein, Elzbieta Ettinger, and Richard Wolin, Horowitz properly rejects portrayals of Arendt as tainted by anti-Semitism or corrupted by her youthful love affair with Martin Heidegger as “grotesque” misreadings that amount to “unmitigated if ingenuous slander” (11, 9). Horowitz acknowledges Arendt’s mistake in accusing the Jewish Councils in occupied Europe of “cooperating” with the Nazis in the Final Solution, so he can hardly be dismissed as a devotee of what Walter Laqueur has called “the Arendt Cult.” But he combines a lifelong familiarity with Arendt’s writings with a commitment to accuracy that enables him to demonstrate again and again how allegations of Arendt’s alleged Germanophilia or anti-Semitism are wholly specious. One could
wish that Horowitz’s trenchant critique was matched by a scholarly apparatus that provided exact references to the works under discussion, but this collection is a worthy final roar from one of the lions of American academia.

Illinois College

Robert C. Kunath


Since the publication of Talal Asad’s Genealogies of Religion [1993] many prominent scholars have begun to interrogate the ideological and material conditions that enable people to convince themselves that they are religious or not or somewhere in between. Works by Asad, Charles Taylor, Saba Mahmood, Tracy Fessenden, Michael Warner, and Jonathan Sheehan, as well as websites such as The Immanent Frame have contributed to a wholesale shift in how secularization is understood—demonstrating, among other things, how secularization is a prescriptive discourse rather than an empirical description. Indeed, such works have exposed the incoherence of using the religious or the secular as stable analytic categories. They have also directed attention toward the making of the religious/secular binary—its deployment, its politics, and the practice that it precipitates.

In her new book, Susan Jacoby ignores the entirety of this conversation. Instead of considering the historicity of her own inquiry, she tells a story—in the generic form of the “new atheism”—about the courageous dissent of lawyer and orator Robert Ingersoll.

Ingersoll was a central figure in the establishment of atheism as both a style of reasoning and a cultural formation in the late nineteenth century. Instead of just situating Ingersoll within the development of the secularization thesis—its concepts, its conflicts, and its effects—Jacoby adopts it wholesale. In her triumphal account, critical questions are set aside, complexities eschewed, and inconsistencies momentarily pondered rather than rigorously examined. Drawing much from Ingersoll’s speeches and published works, Jacoby correctly portrays Ingersoll as tirelessly promoting the cause of reason as he exposes the frauds and injustice committed in the name of religion. And Ingersoll, of course, would have been pleased with such attention.

Jacoby, as she was in her Freethinkers: A History of American Secularism [2004], is dedicated to establishing the tradition of atheism in American history. Ingersoll, in this vision, provides a usable past to the tradition she espouses.
Ingersoll, according to Jacoby, knew atheism to be the true telos of America long before techno-modernity made it obvious to anyone paying even a modicum of attention.

Born decades before cities were illuminated by electricity, before the role of bacteria in the transmission of disease was understood, before Darwin’s revolutionary insight that humans were descended from lower animals was fully accepted even within the scientific community, Ingersoll was the most outspoken and influential voice in a movement that was to forge a secular intellectual bridge into the twentieth century for many of his countrymen (5).

As someone who embodies the “real story and identity of the nation,” Ingersoll is representative not merely because he was a popular draw on the lecture circuit, not merely because he was a successful attorney who defended corporations accused of corruption, and not merely because Jacoby agrees with him (9). Ingersoll was representative because, unlike religious phonies of every stripe, he spoke and appeared as himself (12).

In the end, Jacoby’s agenda is neither historical nor philosophical but political, perhaps even therapeutic. In her well-crafted and genial story, Jacoby seeks to persuade those on the fence between faith and reason to side with Ingersoll. This is where freedom, courage, and reality are to be found (in contrast to slavery, weakness, and illusion). And because freedom, courage, and reality are given, and not artificial, there is little, if any, need for a radical assessment of the fence or of how its making is integral to Ingersoll’s story, how this story sheds light on what goes unacknowledged when the world is blithely divided into binaries—religion vs. science, faith vs. reason—and then narrated as such and bemoaned for the “unnecessary” conflict that such binaries foment.

*Franklin & Marshall College*  
John Lardas Modern


The authors of this work are political scientists, and it is likely that many readers of *The Historian*, more accustomed to the notation conventions and writing style of academic historians, may be put off by the political-science orientation of this study of two centuries of speakership elections. This is not a verdict on the worth of the book but a word of warning to potential readers. Even many political historians might find that Jeffery Jenkins and Charles Stewart provide inadequate
discussion of the basis of their quantitative analysis—Poole/Rosenthal “NOMI-
NATE” scores, which are familiar and readily available (from http://
www.voteview.com), to be sure, but deserving of further elucidation, especially as
these scores have not been calculated by Jenkins and Stewart from scratch.

Using spatial analysis of these scores and other methods (including good
old-fashioned historical sources), the authors trace the growing role played by the
act of organizing the US House of Representatives in forging coherent, disciplined
political parties. The book examines, as Jenkins and Stewart put it, how the
necessity of creating a majority party “organizational cartel” that could elect a
speaker and other officers eventually (but by no means immediately or inexorably)
led to a “procedural cartel” that could control the legislative agenda in the
interests of the majority party.

Concentrating on the nineteenth century, Jenkins and Stewart demonstrate the
unexpected consequences of the switch from electing a speaker by secret ballot to
viva voce voting (recorded, public roll-call balloting). Intended to tighten party
cohesion by ensuring that members would face the consequences if they failed to
cast their public ballot for their party’s candidate, the new system, in practice, also
opened members to greater pressure on cross-cutting issues, such as slavery
expansion and other sectional matters, as sectionally radicalized voters could be
expected to punish members who supported a candidate deemed “unsound” on
the slavery issue. After a few prolonged speakership deadlocks, the binding-party
nominating caucus developed after the Civil War to pull intraparty splits over
speakership candidates off the House floor and into the caucus room, safely out
of sight of the public and the opposing party, leaving twentieth- and twenty-first-
century Congresses with minimal organizational drama but tighter majority-party
control.

It is more praise than criticism to say that Jenkins and Stewart, despite their
sophisticated and, to some readers, daunting quantitative methodologies, offer
few new and startling conclusions; they instead appear to provide solid and
graphic validation of the conclusions of political historians on most matters—
although this reviewer cannot assess their congruence with the interpretations of
political scientists. In any study covering two centuries, there will always be points
where analysis seems a bit simplistic, and specialists may question some conclu-
sions on specific periods, but this is, overall, a sound and illuminating analysis.

University of Virginia Bookstore

R. Scott Burnet
This study is about the individuals and the complexities of their relationships in early Chicago in the period before, during, and after the War of 1812. Ann Durkin Keating also attempts to make the engagement on August 15, 1812, the “Battle of Fort Dearborn” in the book’s title, a centerpiece, or at least a pivot, of the story. Keating achieves the former but tries too hard with the latter. The end result is a flawed effort that nonetheless offers an important addition to local Chicago history and an intriguing lesson for historians as a whole.

The contribution to local Chicago history is quite obvious as Keating exhaustively chronicles the people and events of the early settlement. It is here that Keating provides the most value in the book for general historical understanding. As she indicates, “We must begin to see the region . . . not as empty, uninhabited space . . . but as an ever-changing weave of native villages and colonial outposts” (7). There is a tendency to see such border areas as simple and vacant, but Keating convincingly shows the enormous complexity of native, Metis (half-native, half-white), French, English, and American individuals intermingling, intermarrying, and interworking. However, in order to illustrate this complexity, Keating’s narrative becomes extremely intricate as she provides genealogies and relationships of an amazing number of individuals. It is difficult reading at times (some sort of chart linking the names would have been helpful), but as difficult as it is, one is not sure what else Keating could have done. If the argument is that these cultures have been treated as too simple (and they have), then in order to prove the complexity one has to present that complexity.

Central to that intricate web were the half brothers John Kinzie and Thomas Forsyth. Kinzie and Forsyth were Indian traders who had to maintain strong relationships with natives while at the same time surviving in an intricate and perilous world of conflicting and dangerous factions, namely the British, Americans, and Tecumseh’s nativist movement. The story of Kinzie and Forsyth navigating this minefield is the true center of the story and is well presented.

So what to make of the “Battle” of Fort Dearborn that the title indicates is the real center of the story? This is a bit of a puzzle. Keating addresses the local controversy about whether this should be treated as a “massacre” or a “battle.” She convincingly dismisses the notion of a “massacre,” but the argument that the “battle” (really a skirmish) was a centerpiece is not convincing, especially as the
action disappears in the second half of the book, reappearing only at the end. This is strange for something that is supposed to be central to the story.

Keating presents an excellent addition to the interpretation of Chicago’s early history while at the same time providing a reminder to all historians that early border societies were very complex. Although a hard read at times, it is well worth the effort if the reader is interested in either of these issues.

Mount Ida College

Steven C. Eames


Until 1955, John Chapman, the man who became known as “Johnny Appleseed,” was little more than a collection of wilderness tales, Disney animations, and a popular camp song (“The Lord is good to me”), all of which combined to create an American hero who was “St. Frances [sic] of Assisi and Santa Claus wrapped into one bundle” (2).

In that year, the University of Indiana published the results of Robert Price’s seventeen-year study, Johnny Appleseed: Man and Myth. For many years, Price’s work was the definitive treatment. But Price’s resources were limited (especially when microfilm was the cutting edge of research technology), and many questions about Johnny remained unanswered.

Described by some as an American Dionysius who carried the gift of fermented cider to the new West, and by others as an ascetic who spurned creature comforts, the question of whether Johnny Appleseed was a man who loved a good party or a monk who preferred solitude has remained unclear. Other questions, such as how he made it across the Alleghenies, why he never married, and how he discovered the writings of Emanuel Swedenborg, have also remained matters of conjecture.

In Johnny Appleseed and the American Orchard, William Kerrigan answers these questions—and many more—with the reliability of a trusted historian and the style of a literary scholar. For example, in describing the removal of seed from pomace, Kerrigan depicts Johnny as “pressing his hands down into the still slightly moist pulp and liberating the seeds, his only company the buzzing wasps drawn to the sweet and sour aromas of the fragrant, rotting pile” (40–41).

As the book follows Johnny across Pennsylvania, through Ohio, and into Indiana, readers are invited to participate in the struggles of pioneer life—not the
romanticized versions of popular fiction but the unvarnished cultural history of the American West, as pioneers transformed the rugged wilderness into a world of fruitful orchards. Along the way, readers witness the emergence of American religion with its soul-stirring revivals and the rise of American commerce with abundant opportunities to discover whether or not it is true that “all men are capitalists” (81). In the midst of it all, the loveable but enigmatic Johnny Appleseed remains the focal point and perhaps even a Rorschach test of sorts. As Kerrigan puts it, whether people saw Johnny as a ragged eccentric or a pioneer saint, they were in truth “talking about their own concerns” (4).

Readers who are seeking new insights into America’s cultural history through the lens of the American orchard, or just hoping for a refreshing look at Johnny Appleseed, will find that this book is replete with new information culled from over fifteen years of meticulous research in county courthouses, historical societies, and Swedenborgian archives. They will also be delighted to discover that the tastelessness of an overproduced, overgrown, chemically dependent apple is absent; instead, they will find the invigorating crispness and freshness of a sun-ripened, pioneer apple, eaten at leisure with one’s back against a sturdy tree.

Ray Silverman

*Bryn Athyn College*


In this study, the author uses the biographies of the first two secretaries of the treasury to explain the extraordinary prosperity of the United States. “Hamilton and Gallatin,” he writes, created a “hothouse for the germination of business” enterprise and paid close attention to produce the bounty of a capitalist economy (357). Thomas K. McCraw makes two distinct points when describing Alexander Hamilton’s economic policies and their confirmation by Albert Gallatin. The most forthcoming is his insistence on the critical role played by immigrants in setting economic policy. Hamilton and Gallatin were among a host of ambitious, bright, well-educated outsiders who contributed a distinctive perspective to the economic problems of the early republic. McCraw’s second theme connects the retreat from a nationally regulated economy to Gallatin’s departure from office.

McCraw places Hamilton and Gallatin at the center of the debates over monetary and manufacturing policies to explain their public positions and the
significance of immigrant contributions to economic development. Because of his wartime experiences, Hamilton came to see the necessity for a national bank, while Gallatin’s residence in several different locations and his investment schemes led him to see the economy from a national perspective. In describing Hamilton’s position on banks, McCraw provides perhaps the clearest short analysis of the function and operation of the banks of North America and the United States in regulating the money supply and promoting liquidity. Similarly, Gallatin’s conversion to Hamiltonian policies demonstrated the wisdom of their continuation. The demise of the Bank of the United States over Gallatin’s objections led to illiquidity, the increase of wildcat banks, and the inability to finance the War of 1812.

McCraw’s approach diminishes the complexities of how economic policies were formed and overstates the influence of immigrants. The early republic’s economy was highly volatile, and the solutions to its ills were hotly contested by the offspring of native-born and immigrant alike. Hamilton was neither the originator of the concept of a national bank nor an effective administrator of one. Robert Morris was more important to the founding of the Bank of North America (BNA) and thus in shaping the Bank of the United States, and Philadelphia-born Thomas Willing was more instrumental to the success of both. Ulster-born William Findley was one of the BNA’s most virulent opponents and a key figure in the revocation of its charter in 1785. Boston-born Pelatiah Webster’s magisterial treatises on money, finance, and governance framed many of the debates over solutions to the problems of the money supply that were discussed by, among others, John Witherspoon (Scotland) and William Barton (Philadelphia).

In rushed closing chapters, McCraw concludes that Hamilton and Gallatin’s policies and actions established the foundation for the “quintessential capitalist nation.” Seeing Hamilton as the architect and Gallatin in the role of builder fused long-term, broad economic strategies into “the basic capitalist framework of the American political economy” (349). Prosperity followed, McCraw argues, because the United States rarely strays from frequent, uncoordinated intervention in mostly free markets by governments at all levels. That may be the case, but he has written a book that effectively argues for the instrumentality of government in producing economic growth.

University of Massachusetts-Boston

Jonathan M. Chu
This ethnohistorical study is an addition to a growing literature on “daily politics on the ground” at an interesting and challenging moment: the decades after conquistador Francisco Pizarro and his men had touched Andean territory. Uncovering new sources and reinterpreting old ones, the author illustrates multilayered processes underlying and resulting from the resettlement of the “Andeans.” His story begins prior to the arrival of Viceroy Toledo [1569–1570], proposing a reading of the Andean resettlement at three levels: the conversations between the imperial state and the emerging colonial administration in the colonies; the translation of imperial thinking into colonial reality; and the dialogue between “Andeans” and colonial administrators (viceroys, inspectors, encomenderos, and corregidores).

What stands out in Jeremy Mumford’s reading of these interconnected conversational levels is Andeans’ ability to adapt while sticking to what was best for them. Demographic decline and an abrupt terrain conditioned Andeans’ responses in dialogue with Spanish authorities.

The chronological accent of Mumford’s research lies in the short-lived Toledan “era,” preceded by “bids” offered to the King of Spain by encomenderos and caciques, each trying to assert “autonomy.” This bidding war, framed by the servicio-merced mentality (“I offer” = servicio; “you, king, reward me” = merced) and somewhat an extension of the Incan reciprocity-redistribution logic, led Andeans toward a Spanish action-logic. Priests were instrumental in this learning process. As mediators between encomenderos and caciques, corregidores de indios were put in place. Each corregimiento encompassed four to five repartimientos. Encomenderos and caciques resisted. Caciques claimed equality as vassals; encomenderos claimed perpetuity and legal jurisdiction. Corregidores prevailed; caciques and encomenderos were gradually displaced.

Although not new, Toledo’s resettlement stood out for its comprehensiveness. His “general inspection” and “general resettlement” foresaw six hundred reducciones. The author provides some fascinating examples of resettlement: Moromoro, Cherrepe, Condesuyos, Yanquecollaguas, and Millarea. Mumford says that “Toledo loudly called for transforming the Andean way of organizing space, in the broad outlines, while quietly preserving it in the details” (116). Still, Toledo’s resettlement impacted the Lima and Charcas audiencias, less so the Quito audiencia.
Aside from encomenderos and caciques, mitimaes and forasteros had a particular role in the resettlement attempts. Mitimaes had existed during Incan times, being resettled populations because of their special skills and/or to disrupt ethnic identities. Colonial interventions were inconsistent: Sometimes Indians stayed where they were, sometimes they returned to their original Incan communities. Forasteros, Andeans escaping colonial impositions, migrated when “the burden of tribute and mita simply outweighed the benefits of land and kinship networks” (58). In tandem, reducciones “de-populated” and scattered anexos multiplied. “Andean society was stubbornly centrifugal” during post-Toledan attempts at resettlement/nucleation [1598, 1613, and 1622] (160–161).

In spite of Mumford’s enticing assessment of “on the ground politics,” his conclusion alerts the reader to the centuries-long exclusion of Andeans, notwithstanding their earlier struggles to be part of the colonial project, prevailing in organizing their space, adapting, learning, and negotiating along the way.

University of California, San Diego

Christine Hunefeldt


George Rogers Clark summarized his campaigns in the Illinois country by writing, “Great things have been affected by a few Men well Conducted [sic]” (4). William R. Nester expands on this by vividly recounting Clark’s efforts to secure the lands beyond the Appalachian Mountains for the United States in this new book. Possessing a keen understanding of human psychology, great strength and stamina, and raw courage, Clark motivated his troops and intimidated his enemies—both Native Americans and British forces led by Henry Hamilton. This allowed Clark to capture Kaskaskia, Cahokia, and most dramatically Vincennes, in addition to leading incursions into Ohio to protect Kentucky. Nester concludes that Clark’s performance ranks him among the great commanders of the American Revolutionary War.

Nester does more than chronicle Clark’s military career. An amateur inventor and natural scientist, Clark corresponded with Thomas Jefferson, and in 1783 the future president proposed that he head an expedition to the Pacific. Clark reluctantly declined the offer, opening the way for his brother William to receive that honor twenty years later. Still, the author portrays Clark as a flawed, almost tragic individual who had achieved his greatest successes by his midtwenties. Mired in debt and convinced that his achievements were underappreciated, an angry,
disillusioned Clark sank into alcoholism and reckless filibuster schemes against Spanish holdings in the West that bordered on treason. In these regards, his story is reminiscent of Benedict Arnold and Aaron Burr. To some extent, Nester puts Clark on the couch to identify what drove him. He comments on Clark’s seeming need for a father figure throughout his career and the absence of relationships with women in his life, with one exception. In the end, Nester concludes that extant records do not allow any definitive answers, only speculation.

Nester’s work also reveals the international dynamics in the Illinois region. French inhabitants proved more willing to support Clark’s efforts against their traditional enemy, the British, when they learned of the 1778 American alliance with France. Similarly, Spanish gunpowder and provisions, funneled through New Orleans and St. Louis, proved crucial to Clark’s success. This dependence on Spanish aid reveals the difficulties Clark faced in securing the inhabitants’ “hearts and minds.” His English-speaking, Protestant Virginians—chronically short of everything—resorted to requisitioning provisions or paying for them in devalued paper scrip. Nester also notes that Americans practiced a harsher form of slavery than the French, which further undercut the inhabitants’ support for their “liberators.”

The author closes his book by evaluating the importance of Clark’s victories. He argues that although Clark helped preserve American settlements in Kentucky, his efforts did not materially affect the 1783 Treaty of Paris. American negotiators did not know the details of each campaign, but they understood the need to pay enlistment bonuses to troops with lands north of the Ohio River. Britain, conversely, did not realize the value of this region and so proved willing to concede it.

Nester draws heavily upon the writing of participants and utilizes some of the current scholarship on the frontier. The book contains illustrations of the principal figures, but it would benefit from additional maps to clarify Clark’s activities. The author also occasionally employs odd phrases such as a description of Jefferson as a “button-downed intellectual” and calling Clark a “late eighteenth-century version of a coach [sic] potato” (259, 296–297). Still, George Rogers Clark: “I Glory in War” is a worthwhile and aptly titled account of a natural soldier.

Kutztown University of Pennsylvania

Michael P. Gabriel
The author of this book presents an interesting case study of Local 65 in New York from the Depression years through the 1960s. This “renegade union” attempted to organize and improve the lives of low-wage workers (often African American and Jewish men and women). These “invisible” workers were part of small service, distribution, and warehouse processing industries often treated unfairly by employers and forgotten by larger unions. Unfortunately, according to the author, Local 65’s success was questionable at best. However, its story could provide lessons for organizing in today’s low-wage, service-industry world.

Local 65 pursued economic equality, primarily with regards to wages and hours, for its members. It sought to inspire and dignify the lives of these invisible workers who were unable to advance in the workplace, thus blocking the achievement of any American dream, especially during the Depression years. Known for its left-leaning position, the union confronted the capitalist system. It was seen as a system full of contradictions that caused misery for the working class. Just as important, the author notes that Local 65 was in the forefront of the civil rights revolution, perhaps a natural outgrowth of its inclusion of African American men and women closed out of other unions, and was instrumental in organizing the March on Washington in August 1963.

Yet Local 65 faced never-ending challenges. Its leaders, especially Arthur Osman and David Livingston, tended toward overbearing control. The union took on the difficult task of organizing very socially diverse workers. In addition, Local 65’s embrace of Communist ideology faced an extremely hostile post-World War II Cold War environment.

The most intriguing part of this work is the union’s battles amidst these severe challenges. Local 65 and its leaders had to contend with pressure from the government. During intense House Un-American Activities Committee hearings, its members were confronted as Communists. Even the strongly anticommunist CIO condemned its activities. The NAACP was slow to support Local 65 because of its Communist leanings. In one passage, Arthur Osman notes that during the McCarthy period, “we felt that our days might very well be numbered.” However, in retrospect, he goes on, “we exaggerated the dangers. We overestimated the dangers of McCarthyism” (137). This passage raises questions about the actual hold of anticommunist efforts over the nation even as its perceived strength damaged Local 65.
In the conclusion, the author argues that Local 65’s history provides lessons in understanding how labor might, or might not, organize in the low-wage “Walmart” era. The author might think about investigating interorganizational network theory through a political economy lens to perhaps illuminate other findings from the rich materials presented here. There is a growing literature in this area, including articles in the *Public Administration Review*. With the multitude of actors and interactions, not to mention the complex actions within Local 65, the book is difficult to follow at times. The author does provide a list of acronyms, which is helpful. Overall, the book is meticulously researched, offers a unique case study, and is very well worth a close reading.

*Ursuline College*  
Timothy K. Kinsella


The author of this study has written more than a dozen books on contemporary politics and American history. In his latest monograph, *1775: A Good Year for Revolution*, Kevin Phillips views the beginning of the American Revolution through the same analytical lenses that he used in his debut study, *The Emerging Republican Majority* [1969]. It was in 1775, asserts Phillips, that crucial national foundations were built. Before Thomas Jefferson’s Declaration of Independence, Americans had already “achieved a de facto independence that put slow-moving British counterrevolutionary intentions at a distinct disadvantage from which they never recovered” (540–541). This, however, has not been recognized because “much of ‘the history’ of the American Revolution suffers from distortion and omission tied to the twentieth century’s excessive immersion in 1776 as a moral and ideological starting point” (ix).

Phillips’s analysis of the period immediately before 1776 does not break new ground. Other studies, including T. H. Breen’s *American Insurgents, American Patriots* [2010] and David Ammerman’s *In the Common Cause* [1974], have placed great emphasis on 1774–1775 for understanding the movement toward independence. Moreover, Phillips’s analysis of pre-Declaration developments covers a “long 1775” that began in the summer of 1774 and ended in the summer of 1776. Spanning approximately twenty-four months, it reduces the significance of 1775 as a single, pivotal year. More importantly, his assertion that historians have excessively focused on 1776 is not supported by the extensive historiography of the Revolution.
To explain why American insurgents seized control in the two years before independence was declared, Phillips analyzes the motivation for revolution. Despite acknowledging that fears of government conspiracies against the people’s liberties might have influenced many colonists, Phillips challenges the scholarship of the past half century that has stressed the importance of republican ideology as a motivating factor in the coming of the Revolution. “[I]t is too parochial,” he states, “to root the American Revolution in the potting soil, however rich, of radical pamphleteering” (199).

Though citing constitutionalism and incipient nationalism as factors that potentially shaped the revolutionary mind in America, Phillips primarily stresses social, cultural, religious, and economic differences for dividing the colonists into Patriots and Loyalists and for creating the conditions for a civil war within the American Revolution. Synthesizing the work of neo-Progressive historians, Phillips asserts that “economic constituencies in the American Revolution must weigh in any practical analysis” (131). But he sees religious and ethnic issues as most divisive. “Taken together,” Phillips declares, “religion and ethnicity offer the best yardsticks of how Americans chose sides in the political and military clashes that became the Revolution” (67). But he does not show how the American Revolution was caused by these sociocultural issues, rather than by the constitutional and ideological debate over the new imperial order that Britain established after 1763. And therefore 1775, despite offering a lively and very readable account of social and cultural tensions in revolutionary-era America, is an unconvincing explanation of the American decision for independence.

_Baldwin Wallace University_  
Steven E. Siry


For many, the profound changes brought on by the Civil War—emancipation, triumph of the free-market system, and a more proactive government, if but for a fleeting moment—mark a definitive change in America. Cleaving the nation’s history, the war symbolizes the end of an antiquated period and the beginning of what would bring about modern society. In this brief study, Jonathan Rees surveys the astounding and transformative changes brought on by industrialization in the second half of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Acknowledging the constraints on his work, the author approaches the era topically rather than chronologically, which better illustrates the “subtle changes” that define
modern America. Thus, the author argues, industrialization and its effects are the “one underlying development from this period that affected everything else that happened” (vii).

The book has nine chapters, the first chronicling “Varieties of Industrialization.” Rather than enumerating countless factories, the author instead examines how “the principles related to industrialization” applied to all industries, whether conglomerates, such as Carnegie Steel, or more localized businesses, such as the Triangle Shirtwaist Company (5).

The subsequent eight chapters examine the effects of industrialization on labor, immigration, urbanization, the West, environment, transportation, politics, and reform. In each, the author connects the underlying concerns about industrialization. A couple of examples will suffice. With industrialization and the loss of skill, workers became simply another piece of machinery. To preserve wages, improve working conditions, and reestablish bargaining power with managers, industrial workers unionized. “Joining a trade union helped immeasurably when workers confronted their employers,” according to the author, and “[t]he division of labor made many individual workers easily dispensable” (18). As Rees shows, despite the consensus toward industrialists, the labor movement had great dissension within its ranks. Disputes ranged from whether to enter politics and what issues to address to whom to unionize (skilled or unskilled) and whether to embrace capitalism or advocate for a socialist/communist “utopia.”

One of the more interesting and informative chapters for students will probably be the one about the environment. Whether through extraction of resources or “costs not reflected on a company’s balance sheet that society ends up paying instead,” known as an externality, industrialization had an adverse effect on the environment (68). Industrial runoff, the clear-cutting of old-growth forests, and smoke pollution soon became synonymous with progress: Billowing smoke meant manufacturing output. At the very time industrialization reached its zenith, however, concern for the environment began to develop. For example, in Pittsburgh, labeled the nation’s dirtiest city, disparate groups began championing more efficient factories and cleaner air for the city.

Although the author neglects the importance of the country’s natural conservatism (even when it moves in progressive/liberal ways) and its effect on the themes in the book, this work is an enjoyable read, and this reviewer highly recommends it for any student interested in this most pivotal period.

East Central University

Christopher B. Bean
In his fine and aptly titled new book, Washington attorney David Roll makes excellent use of some new primary sources to show how Harry Hopkins, Franklin Roosevelt’s friend, confidante, houseguest, advisor, and wartime emissary, played a major role in creating and maintaining the crucial wartime alliance between world leaders who had very little reason to trust each other: British Prime Minister Winston Churchill, Soviet dictator Joseph Stalin, and American President Franklin Roosevelt. Hopkins emerges as a man who had a unique “touch” in the field of personal diplomacy and who played a key role in the defeat of Nazism.

Hopkins, a progressive reformer, New Dealer, and skilled administrator, gained a reputation as a public servant who got things done. These assets, along with his close relationship with President Roosevelt, coalesced into a successful campaign to ensure that, in 1941, a besieged Britain would get as much help as possible from America, a nation that quickly turned itself into an Arsenal of Democracy.

Roll asserts that Hopkins’s political canniness and his strengths as a behind-the-scenes envoy influenced both military and political decisions from 1940 to 1945. As a result, the reader gets a good understanding of why Hopkins, who held no elective office and had no official title, played such an important role on the international scene during the desperate war years. In early 1941, he flew to London during the Blitz and laid the groundwork for FDR’s special relationship with Churchill; later, he managed to calm the troubled waters that divided Stalin from the Western allies. Hopkins, whom FDR trusted implicitly, was perfect for Roosevelt’s penchant for personal diplomacy. Roll rightly presents Hopkins as a committed internationalist who knew well before the attack on Pearl Harbor that victory over Fascism in Europe could only be attained through military and economic cooperation among the Allied Powers—America, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union. In addition, Roll contends, Hopkins fully realized that the political and ideological differences among the Allies had to be temporarily ignored. Though the consequences of Hopkins’s presence at FDR’s side during the war were monumental, his diplomatic touch was indeed delicate.

Hopkins worked tirelessly to maintain the often-wobbly wartime coalition, to reconcile these powerful leaders whose egos sometimes got in the way of the Allies’ goal: the defeat of Fascism. He succeeded in this brilliantly. However, his relentless efforts took a toll. In early 1946, he finally succumbed to an illness that had debilitated him for almost a decade.
There are a few errors in emphasis to which Hopkins’s scholars might take exception. Hopkins was too sick for too long to carouse as much or as often as Roll contends. Living and working in Washington, DC, during the Depression and the war years actually left little time for him to indulge in the high life. Roll’s attempt to humanize the man may have been excessive. Nevertheless, this book is a welcome contribution to the literature on Harry Hopkins and World War II.

Armstrong Atlantic State University

June Hopkins


The Jacksonian Era has long been the subject of intense historical study. At one time, politics represented the chief interest of historians, and studies of individual states were also long the vogue. It became clear, however, that economics, sectionalism, race, land, class, gender, and a variety of other topics were essential for a complete understanding of these years. Such a thematic approach followed, but too often interrelationships among these various locales and societal themes were not clearly demonstrated.

The main value of this book is that it brings a variety of events and occurrences together. The author has produced a book that ties aspects of this period together and thus provides an excellent insight into the state of Mississippi as an exemplar of the Jacksonian frontier. Joshua D. Rothman uses this state to demonstrate the change, fear, and tumult these years produced not just in the Southwest but in the nation as a whole.

The book’s title provides excellent insight into Rothman’s argument about the age. Mississippi indeed experienced “flush times” during the 1830s, and these years were also socially filled with “fever dreams,” resulting in economic ups and downs and pandemonium, which produced mayhem, brutality, and death. Such was the case, too, throughout the nation.

Rothman discusses the lives of two frontier individuals, Virgil Stewart and John Murrell, within the context of ambition, greed, and conspiracy. Murrell, an alleged slave stealer, and Stewart, his chaser, represent the chaos of the Jacksonian frontier. The public’s reaction to the story of these two men and to the age itself created the chaos. Rothman argues that it was not in the urban areas of this period but at the frontier where Jacksonian drama was played out. Rothman discusses loss of hope and fears of an antiproperty conspiracy. He describes slave upheaval
and mob violence in the Southwest, much of it particularly evident in Mississippi. He argues persuasively that this activity on the frontier provides a better explanation of Jacksonian society than contemporary events in the cities.

This is an insightful book that casts a penetrating light on the Jacksonian era and is worthy of the careful reading of both specialists and students.

*Ulysses S. Grant Presidential Library,*

*John F. Marszalek*

*Mississippi State University*

---


This monograph adds a fresh perspective to recent studies of indigenous communities in nineteenth-century Mexico as it explains why peasants in Oaxaca’s Mixteca Baja “repeatedly supported conservatism, despite the attraction of other reformist or radical ideological currents” for more than two centuries (6). Three reasons, Benjamin T. Smith argues, account for such behavior: 1) the survival of the moral economy forged during the colonial era; 2) constant negotiation between representatives of popular and institutional religion; and 3) the development of provincial conservatism—a more malleable variation of the national norm—intent on preserving order and security.

This reviewer particularly enjoyed Smith’s analysis of General Antonio de León, the Mixteca Baja leader best known for his heroism against US forces at the September 1847 Battle of Molino del Rey. Smith sheds light on León’s lesser-known side: that of a regional chieftain who promoted social and political order from the 1820s until 1847 by encouraging indigenous villages to purchase land, by treating military auxiliaries fairly, and by skillfully managing opposing political forces. Thereafter, the “incipient Catholic nationalism” that developed among the region’s inhabitants during the war with the United States stimulated resistance to liberal anticlerical policies and attacks on community property through 1867, and in the process helped cement conservatism (141).

Smith next goes beyond conventional wisdom about the restored republic and Porfiriato to examine “the multiple ways in which local peasants, industrial workers, and regional chiefs experienced the period and, by extension, the myriad responses to the Revolution of 1910” (161). Residents of the Mixteca Baja showed a distinct belligerence toward the 1910 uprising and the postrevolutionary state, a
hostility ingrained in the failure of radical liberal political culture to take root, the prevalence of communal landholdings, and a vibrant Catholic revival exemplified by Bishop Rafael Amador y Hernández. This turn of events makes clear why regional leaders and peasants largely resisted the post-1917 efforts by Mexican governments to rebuild the country. Elites steadfastly opposed land reform, yet they joined peasants to halt programs like socialist education that sought to minimize the authority of the Catholic Church.

Although national religious and political authorities managed to carve out a *modus vivendi* by the late 1930s, Smith’s concluding chapter points out that devout Catholics in the Mixteca Baja actively opposed the Revolutionary Institutional Party (PRI) during the next two decades. The ensuing tensions, coupled with anti-Communist fears brought on by the Cold War and the 1959 Cuban Revolution, culminated with the last Cristiada, a little-known 1962 rebellion launched by militant Catholics. In the end, however, government forces crushed the uprising and then harnessed the opposition with the old Porfirian formula of *pan o palo* (bread or the stick).

Smith’s text is meticulously researched and makes insightful comparisons to other regions in Mexico as well as to indigenous groups in Europe and Latin America. Its broad chronological and thematic sweep, coupled with its nuanced analysis of national, regional, and local affairs, makes it a “must read” for scholars interested in peasant politics and indigenous religious culture.

*California State University, San Bernardino*  
Pedro Santoni

---

**Worse Than the Devil: Anarchists, Clarence Darrow, and Justice in a Time of Terror.**


The author of this book retrieves an episode in Milwaukee that presaged the Red Scare of the post-World War I period. On the third Sunday of a modest campaign to proselytize for Protestantism in one of the city’s Italian neighborhoods, a group of immigrants confronted the proselytizers. Having just left a meetinghouse where they had heard a talk about anarchism, they were offended by the religious and patriotic statements being made. A brawl broke out and shots were fired by both the immigrants and some police officers who had been deployed in anticipation of some sort of trouble. Two of the immigrants died, and eleven were charged with riot-related charges that were later escalated to conspiracy to commit assault with intent to kill.
The prosecution would have been relatively routine but for an incident that occurred while the defendants were in jail awaiting trial. Someone deposited a bomb outside the proselytizers’ church. A staff member found the package and took it to a nearby police station. The bomb went off as the police officers were trying to figure out what to do, and ten people were killed. As Dean Strang points out, this was the largest loss of life of police officers in a bombing prior to September 11, 2001. Prosecutors and the public readily inferred that the defendants’ supporters had planted the bomb, though, as Strang emphasizes, responsibility for that was never determined.

Strang shows how the trial for assault became a trial of anarchists who were somehow responsible for killing police officers—even though the bomb’s target was the church and the officers died after a person trying to be helpful transported the bomb to the police station. Strang’s sometimes too-novelistic narrative demonstrates that the defendants were not committed or deeply ideological anarchists. They were, rather, Italian immigrants with vaguely anarchist sentiments and attitudes, unlikely to do anything more serious than disrupt patriotic demonstrations, though in a setting where such disruptions were likely to spin out of hand.

A practicing attorney and university lecturer, Strang describes the practice of criminal law in the early twentieth century quite well, better on the defense side than on the prosecution. Clarence Darrow came into the case, probably, Strang argues, at the urging of Emma Goldman to present the defendants’ appeal. The Wisconsin Supreme Court ultimately vacated the convictions of most defendants, holding that the record failed to show that they had conspired to assault.

In what might count as a sensationalizing discovery, Strang describes a later grand jury investigation of corruption in Milwaukee in which one credible witness testified that Darrow and the prosecutor’s office had discussed doctoring the record to ensure reversal. The most that the evidence, when fairly read, shows us is that the prosecutor probably proposed that course of action to Darrow and Darrow did nothing to dissuade him. Yet, coupled with Darrow’s questionable actions in connection with the Los Angeles trial of the McNamara brothers, after which he was charged with, though not convicted of, jury tampering, the incident shows that Darrow was sometimes willing to skirt close to the line of unethical behavior, and perhaps to cross it.

Mark Tushnet

Harvard Law School

David George Surdam, professor of economics, explores how the National Basketball Association (NBA) survived its humble origins to develop into something resembling the professionally organized league that it is today. An expert on the economics of professional sports, Surdam focuses his study on the business of basketball, or, more precisely, how entrepreneurs in the years following World War II—between 1946 and 1962—turned the game of basketball into a business.

Drawing upon extensive statistical research that he organizes into thirty-three separate tables in the book’s second appendix, Surdam discusses how team owners sometimes deftly, and other times clumsily, managed to turn franchises that routinely ran in the red into a stable league by the middle of the 1950s.

The NBA began as the Basketball Association of America (BAA) with teams in major cities like Boston, New York, and Philadelphia. A rival league known as the National Basketball League (NBL) focused on smaller cities like Toledo, Fort Wayne, Youngstown, and Oshkosh. Before the 1949–1950 season, the BAA absorbed five teams from the NBL, forming the NBA. Surdam shows that despite the differences in the sizes of their markets, all teams faced a similar set of economic strains related to player salaries, attendance, potential revenue sharing, arena rental, and transportation.

Surdam’s study reveals how NBA owners managed to maintain a certain level of stability against a number of odds. Owners sold, folded, or relocated teams with dizzying frequency during the 1950s. Also, despite the league’s reserve clause, good players often preferred to play in industrial leagues that promised training for a career beyond basketball. Once the league became racially integrated before the 1950–1951 season, it still faced competition for top African American players from Abe Saperstein and his Harlem Globetrotters.

Surdam’s book provokes interesting questions about professional basketball. For example, one is left wondering if owners or players were more instrumental in its ultimate success. The twenty-four-second clock, an owner idea, seems to have worked, but Surdam shows that its effects were only gradually felt. If integration was a bigger factor in developing a more popular style of play, then the players probably deserve more credit for changing the game. Certainly, team owners who resisted integration, or those like New York’s Ned Irish who shied away from televising games and opted to play his Knicks in the tiny Sixty-Ninth Regiment Armory so as not to interrupt crowds coming to see the circus in the larger Madison Square Garden, sometimes got in the way of prosperity. In fact,
owners benefitted greatly from various ways so that they were hardly challenged legally from restraining trade from regional drafts to the salary-suppressing reserve clause.

Surdam’s book is well written and entertaining. It would be an excellent one for a variety of sports history courses, particularly ones that focus on the economics of sports.

Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania

John Bloom

**ASIA AND THE PACIFIC**


The long nineteenth century [1780–1914] was a heyday for the global small arms trade. During this period, vast quantities of weapons were transported from Europe to Africa and Southern Asia, bolstered by the rapid expansion of European empires, the introduction of new military technologies, and a sustained appetite for arms and ammunition. Although much has been written about global warfare during this period, little attention has been paid to the increasingly mechanized production and complex flow of arms to and within the Indian Ocean basin. The book under review is a comprehensive analysis of this global small arms trade and is based on an impressive array of archival and secondary sources. One of the book’s principal themes is the tension between the interests of private European arms manufacturers to sell weapons to those in the periphery—Africans and Asians—and the desires of European governments to prevent the spread of sophisticated weaponry that might challenge colonial rule. The book’s focus is on British manufacturing and distribution networks, but the author includes Belgian and other continental countries’ efforts to participate in and also contain the small arms trade.

After a general introduction and first chapter, devoted to a broad assessment of arms trading both before and after the period under discussion, the heart of the book begins in the second chapter. Here the author, Emrys Chew, examines the growth of British arms manufacturing in London and Birmingham and traces the rise of competitors, especially those in Liège, Belgium. The third chapter concentrates on the arms trade in the Western Indian Ocean—or Eastern Africa and South Asia—and argues that a robust trade in slaves and ivory created a
market for European weapons. As European control was more firmly established in these regions, readers find changes in the nature of the trade and in European governments’ reactions to the threat posed by the uncontrolled distribution of arms. This pattern is repeated, although in different form, in the Eastern Indian Ocean, which is the subject of the fourth chapter. The final chapter examines the surprising effectiveness of indigenous arms technology.

The book’s principal strengths include its comprehensive scope and meticulous approach. It is an important, sophisticated, and well-researched history of the arms trade in the long nineteenth century. Its main weakness is that, despite all the data collected, there are relatively few extended and in-depth examples. One exception is a section on what was known as the “Baluchistan Affair.” This refers to the occasion when a privately owned ship called the Baluchistan, carrying small arms and ammunition manufactured in Britain, was searched by Omani forces with the backing of the British government, sparking a dispute between arms traders and the government. On the whole, however, the data is used to create an aggregate impression, and the result is a style of writing that is dry and detached.

Middlebury College

Ian Barrow


This thoroughly researched and erudite study turns the history of Chinese opera, often treated elsewhere as an esoteric subject, into a key venue for broad social and cultural inquiry into the evolution of Chinese urban politics and culture in the second half of the Qing era.

The author’s interpretation, revolving around two powerfully explicated themes, unfolds in five chapters. Three focus on gender-related issues, ranging from literary expressions of the homoerotic gaze cast by “connoisseurs” of Beijing opera upon the performers, to the development of gender ethics and politics in a “cult of sentimentality” and romanticism reflected in the textual-historical evolution of the opera Feicuiyuan, to representations of sex and violence in household and societal relations in the “I, Sister-in-Law” operas. These material-driven chapters provide in-depth critical readings of texts that abundantly tease out gender nuances in Beijing opera culture. Two other chapters, concentrating on developments in the world of metropolitan opera that reflected the evolution and contestation of political power and influence over culture—especially between the Manchu court and Beijing’s largely Han literati community—deal more directly
with social issues and historical milieus. These imaginative, analytical narratives vividly interweave the lives, thoughts, values, and politics of the metropolitan literati, actors, their social and political patrons, and an increasingly self-conscious urban bourgeois public.

This book’s major strengths are Andrea Goldman’s highly original interpretive vision and her extensive primary-text scholarship; the shortcomings are subtler. A nonspecialist reader may find the reading slightly daunting, and Goldman’s preoccupation with the lens (opera history and literature) may actually distance the real object of the discourse (urban culture and politics) from such a reader. The reader would also benefit from having a more concentrated discussion of the study’s social and political history issues situated nearer the beginning of the volume. Furthermore, despite the strong scholarship, a significant historical issue—the exclusion of women from opera audiences—is discussed only perfunctorily, and there is an undeservedly off-handed treatment of extant scholarship on the “contestation” between the yabu and the huabu genres (83, 117; and 301 [note 7, m ch. 3]).

This study is much stronger and more detailed on the period from 1770 to the 1830s than with the last third of the time period that it claims to cover. With this relative neglect of the latter half of the nineteenth century, Goldman fails to shed light on critical issues of cultural and social development in the final decades of the Qing era, such as the impact of colonialism and political and social crises.

This volume is an important addition to the scholarship on late imperial Beijing society, politics, and culture. Previous full-length English-language treatments (with the exception of Joshua Goldstein’s Drama Kings [Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2007]) lack Goldman’s depth of perception and adroit application of critical theory to the subject. Goldman’s study opens up a refreshing vista on late imperial Chinese artistic and cultural life and its social meanings and politics, pushing us toward a horizon of understanding this history through new perspectives and in unexpected locations; its limitations remind us that the horizon needs, and is sure, to be stretched further.

Northern Arizona University

John Kong-cheong Leung


This is a good analytical study of religious syncretism as perceived at the dargah of Pir Imam Shah [d. 1520] in Pirana village near Ahmedabad in Gujarat, India.
Though originally a tomb to the Muslim saint, over time it began to show distinctly Hindu motifs and values. Since its inception, it was associated with ginans (devotional poetic texts) considered essential to the ritual of the Satpanth (the true path) practiced there and open to peoples of all faiths.

The Aga Khan case of 1866 (linked to the Satpanth and the ginans) raised the issue of how the Khojas (flourishing traders in Bombay and from a long line of early disciples of the dargah in Pirana) were legally declared to be Shi’i Ismailis (against their determined stand) during the court process of their opposing the Aga Khan’s claim to being their leader and hence worthy of their tithes. “He is not a Khoja,” they argued, “but actually an outlaw from Persia and his presence in Bombay is a mere accident and coincidence.” They were Sunni, they claimed, while he was Shi’a. But for the British in India, the Aga Khan was the imam of the Shi’i Ismaili Muslim sect and, more importantly, their ally as they worked to take over Persia.

Teena Purohit describes convincingly the steps to how the religious identity of the Khojas was finally established and its importance in deciding the property disputes. Arguments were laid out to show how the Khojas were converts from Hinduism to Ismaili Islam and how their ginans were Nizari (Persian) in origin but transmitted in Hindi to attract Hindu converts. The Khojas actually had customs drawn from both Hindu and Muslim traditions and considered themselves at times either Sunni or Shi’a. Under the British, they were declared definitively to be Ismaili Muslims, showing their clear separation from Hindu, Sunni, or Satpanth positions. Unfortunately for them, they did not have a consistent or coherent narrative about their own religious identity at the time to argue their case to their own advantage.

*The Aga Khan Case* discusses first the conflicts within the Khoja community beginning in 1830 up to the landmark judgment of the British judge, Erskine Perry, in 1847 upholding Khoja inheritance rights and maintaining the Dasavatar (Persian poem of the ten incarnations) as their central religious text. But by 1866, this same text was used to prove that they were indisputably Shi’a Imami Ismailis and that payments to the Aga Khan (the *sirkar-sahib* or *pir* of old) were legally and scripturally in order. It was pointed out how the Dasavatar called for a prophetic continuity after the death of the Prophet. The Shah (deliverer) was seen as making his appearance in India in the form of the Aga Khan.

On the Hindu side, Swaminarayan [1781–1830] played a role similar to that of the Aga Khan as he and his sampradaya (movement) worked to rid the society of his day of its immorality and decadence, insisting on moral, devotional, and proper dietary behavior. In the process, they were able masterfully to co-opt the
spirit and rulings of the Satpanth at the Pir Imam Shah dargah solely in the
direction of Hinduism. The real losers, if one could say so, turned out to be the
Khojas, pulled away as they were from the ginans and the Satpanth, as these were
then uniquely understood by them, and drawn into polemics in favor of the Aga
Khan.

Purohit covers much ground in her book, analyzing a case of tithing in a
community from some crucial points of view and in the process studying how
various strands and values come to define religious identity. More specifically, she
pushes for an understanding of the ginans as conduits of Quranic and Sanskritic
thought if one is to understand Islam as a global phenomenon with an internally
heterogeneous character.

Loyola University
Charles Borges

Sui-Tang China and Its Turko-Mongol Neighbors: Culture, Power, and Connections,
580–800. By Jonathan Karam Skaff. (New York, NY: Oxford University Press,
2012. Pp. xix, 400. $85.00.)

Many people should read this fascinating, richly documented, and theoretically
informed work of comparative Eurasian history. Jonathan Skaff argues that
medieval states based in North China and Mongolia “had ‘entangled histories’
resulting from centuries of diplomacy, competition, and incorporation of pas-
toral nomads in North China” (4). Whereas the rhetoric of Chinese and steppe
sources delineates difference, Skaff argues that “medieval Eastern Eurasian
powers deployed strikingly similar elements of ideology, diplomacy, and politi-
cal networking to seek hegemony over each other and the smaller Turko-
Mongol tribes inhabiting the intervening borderlands” (4). Up to about 800
AD, Chinese and Eurasian nomads interacted in ways that produced or revealed
shared “uniformities” of practice and ideology “from Korea in the east to Byz-
antium and Iran in the west” (4). From the tenth century forward, however,
having lost control over the borderlands, the Chinese began defining themselves
more self-consciously against the steppe and their neighbors to the north and
west.

Skaff lays out his “interdisciplinary, multi-perspective, and synchronically
comparative approach,” siding with “integrationists” who counter the “frog in
the well syndrome” of viewing Chinese history and identity as “unique products
of internal evolution” (4). Part 1 paints the historical and geographical setting:
The “medieval period was a high point of interaction and conflict in the
China-Inner Asia borderlands,” produced by intense competition of empire builders on both sides of the borderland (52). Maps, charts, and tables mine data from Chinese histories to establish spatial and temporal patterns of interactions. Examining discourses in the sources over frontiers, “barbarians,” and ethnicity, Skaff observes that Confucian literati tended to elide “ethnic or racial differences” and thus obscure the role (or contributions) of non-Han actors (71). Indeed, for the Sino-Inner Asian actors analyzed here status usually trumped ethnicity, rendering the kind of excavation that Skaff performs crucial to restore the ethnocultural complexity of Sui-Tang and steppe imperial enterprises.

Part 2 proceeds, using thick description, to analyze interactions through patrimonial political networking, ideology and interstate competition, and rituals of diplomacy. Part 3 explores the negotiation of diplomatic relationships through investiture, kinship (fictive and real), the horse trade, and severance of ties. The gallery of characters appearing throughout these pages diversifies the usual cast of Silk Road actors—monks, merchants, and diplomats. Thus, urging readers to “move beyond” the Silk Road, Skaff analyzes agents of cultural transmission, networks of exchange, and receptivity to “alien culture” (294–300). Here agents included Turko-Mongol slaves and peasant women in North China, as well as elites (Turko-Mongol imperial guardsmen, royal Chinese wives of steppe rulers). The north-south routes linking China and its borderlands with the Mongolian plateau were of greater strategic import than the east-west routes. Receptivity often meant “creative one-upmanship” by rulers, such as Tang Taizong’s use of the title “Heavenly Qaghan” (124–127, 298).

Beyond confirming that control over the North China borderlands tipped the Eastern Eurasian balance of power, Skaff extends Tom Allsen’s work on the Mongol Empire to link (Chinese) cosmopolitanism or cultural openness, the hallmark of such control, with a deliberate strategic priority. This is a very suggestive move.

Kenyon College

Ruth Dunnell

*Courtly Encounters: Translating Courtliness and Violence in Early Modern Eurasia.*


The author of this book, a noted specialist of Indian history, has long been involved in studying the interaction of Indian, European, and Islamic West Asian actors and ideas. Throughout the book under review here, based on the 2009
Mary Flexner Lectures at Bryn Mawr University, Sanjay Subrahmanyam defends the notion that polities, groups, and individuals from these different backgrounds were not necessarily “incommensurable”; they adapted to each other and in the process exerted strong mutual influences. However, encounters were often limited to certain segments of society, such as the princely court.

*Courtly Encounters* includes a substantial introduction outlining Subrahmanyam’s position, three core chapters, and a short conclusion focusing on the court. The first, “Courtly Insults,” deals with conflict and alliance among the courts in South India. The Deccan sultanates, strongly influenced by Persianate Shi’ite Islam, joined forces against the Hindu Vijayanagara ruler, an alliance that led to the defeat of Vijayanagara in the 1565 Battle of Talikota. Through close reading of sources in local languages, Persian, Portuguese, and Italian, Subrahmanyam shows that the interaction among these principalities was far more complicated than the simple religious-political divide suggested (83). A second chapter on “Courtly Martyrdom” moves eastward to Malay and Aceh. Carefully examining an array of sources, Subrahmanyam reconstructs the martyrdom of Portuguese soldiers, notably the death of Luis Monteiro Coutinho, who was blown up on the mouth of a cannon in 1583 or 1584. Heroic stories of martyrdom, Subrahmanyam argues, were relevant in this situation where defection to the side of the infidels powerfully attracted individual Portuguese soldiers. A final chapter deals with “Courtly Representation.” Here, Subrahmanyam focuses on the cross-fertilization of Mughal and European painting, considering the early impact of European painters on Mughal court styles around 1600, shared idioms and ideas of court painters at European courts and at the Mughal court, and the increasing visibility of Mughal art in Europe from the 1640s onward, as well as the role of print. The author suggests that there is a need to examine the actions and actors “producing commensurability” rather than merely charting influences.

Subrahmanyam’s command of languages and sources is impressive; moreover, he consistently locates his specific stories in global contexts. *Courtly Encounters* admirably shows the relevance of producing commensurability, provides rich detail, and makes numerous lucid observations—yet it also leaves the reader with hesitations and questions. The author frequently disputes interpretations by other scholars, sometimes obscuring rather than supporting his argument. Notwithstanding the title of this book, the court is not discussed at great length anywhere, and there is not an extended comparative examination of either courtliness or violence. Finally, though *Courtly Encounters* confirms Subrahmanyam’s position as a pioneer in global history, it provides little guidance to a new generation of
scholars exploring the thorny path between global questions and local sources. But then, can we reasonably expect this from any scholar?


The author of this book sheds light on the 1971 South Asian conflict that led to the breakup of Pakistan and the creation of Bangladesh. This is a book that makes no pretense to academic insight or objectivity. Mohammed Yunus was a member of the Pakistani Foreign Ministry during the war and was eyewitness to many key developments as they unfolded at the top of Pakistan’s power establishment. He presents in this slim volume a brief account of his recollections of what happened, pinning most of the blame squarely on General Yahya Khan, the martial law president of Pakistan at that time, whom Yunus castigates as an “uncouth drunk.”

The bulk of the book, though, is devoted to edited reproductions of notes that Yunus took of diplomatic meetings held between various (Muslim) heads of state and Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, who took over the presidency from Yahya Khan. Bhutto toured a number of countries in the aftermath of military defeat at the hands of India in order to establish a sense of legitimacy, to feel out his allies (all of whom had abandoned Pakistan during the war), and to ask for some time and assistance to get Pakistan’s house in order. Though the notes can be a bit repetitive, recounting relatively similar encounters with multiple leaders, there are a few takeaways. Yunus’s Bhutto appears generally reluctant to accept any responsibility for the war or for Pakistan’s loss, instead claiming an Indian conspiracy of some kind. More broadly, one gets a sense for the doublespeak of modern diplomacy and the sneers that lay behind every insincere smile. And most sobering, the notes make clear that policymakers are often quite in the dark, especially in crisis situations, flailing about with guesswork as they decide the fate of millions.

Though all of this is worthy of further reflection, Yunus provides but a piece of a much larger puzzle, the scope of which is indicated by a few other recent publications. Naeem Mohaiemen has raised some important issues in his *Economic and Political Weekly* essays on Sarmila Bose’s book and on the role of the media in the war. Yasmin Saikia has reminded us of the ordinary people, particularly women, who were hurt by the war, and of the limits of using
nation-states as the lens through which we see the issues. And Srinath Raghavan promises to provide a more detailed account of the international relations of 1971 in his forthcoming book on the subject.

So the conversation is begun. But the basic problem is that for too long, the history of the postcolonial subcontinent has been hidden behind a veil of secrecy, shrouded by sealed records and sub rosa operations. Though a book like Yunus’s is helpful, one should hope that he will additionally donate all of his private papers to an unrestricted public archive, or several, and that this in turn will encourage others to do the same. Only when historians have had a chance to debate fully the open record will we have a comprehensive sense of the political, economic, social, and cultural consequences of 1971.

Manu Bhagavan
Hunter College and the Graduate Center-
The City University of New York

Europe


Anyone interested in medieval Europe’s environmental history must cheer the publication of John Aberth’s newest book. Until Richard Hoffmann’s survey appears, Aberth’s is the only attempt in any language to “adequately sum up the environmental history” of Europe in the Middle Ages or at least to “chart the course of the most important shifts in attitudes toward the environment” in that period (233). To achieve this, Aberth discusses many texts, mostly literary ones from 1100 to 1400, and although he acknowledges that the “more scientifically minded” may find his work “anecdotal and impressionistic,” he thinks it will be “a more entertaining, as well as informative read” through its avoidance of “hard” data (10).

Curiously, the main argument of An Environmental History of the Middle Ages rests on the “hard numbers” of famine and plague: Aberth sees a real ecological crisis in the 1300s, centering on the Great Famine plus the Black Death (though a “Great Wind of 1362” apparently also mattered), that radically reconfigured how Europeans, literate and not, conceived of their place in nature. The huge mortalities of 1315–1322 and 1348–1349 evidently produced a new awareness of how economic activity caused ecological harm and sparked natural disasters. As a result, people saw themselves as part of the community of nature, not
lords over it. As usual in environmental historiography, the past (here the cultural shift of the 1300s) is claimed to be directly pertinent (and teleologically related) to the present. Aberth, a Vermont forest restorer, animal rescuer, and college professor, thinks contemporary ecological events are changing popular culture by forcing choices on modern Westerners like those that late medieval Europeans confronted. Barbara Tuchman’s “distant mirror” shines again.

There are three sections to this survey. Part 1, ostensibly about the medieval elements air, water, and earth, actually skims over ancient and medieval cosmology, the reception of Arabic scientific works in Europe, medieval popular weather belief and modern climate history, energy-harnessing technologies of the high Middle Ages, and the intellectual history of purity and contagion in the 1300s. Part 2, perhaps the most Anglocentric section in an Anglocentric book, discusses woodland use, arguing for much greater stability between Roman and early modern times than believers in the “Great Clearances” have allowed. Here, Aberth also defends the English royal forest and its administration as forces for ecological good, despite their effects on peasants’ access to resources. The longest portion of the book is part 3, on medieval people’s interactions with animals. Current “post-humanism” and the related rise of animal studies (Aberth mentions neither academic fashion) makes this part of An Environmental History likely to engage the most readers. The author describes medieval pastoralism, the use of animal traction, and animal companions. An extensive discussion of hunting overlooks the social hierarchies articulated through exchanges with animals. It is followed by a fine and original treatment of animal diseases and their understanding by medieval Europeans, as well as more-perfunctory essays on the (mostly postmedieval) phenomenon of animal trials, on bestiality, and on animals in that most human of constructs, magic.

Aberth never satisfactorily explains the relations between the learned, textual world available to the historian and the ecological cultures of medieval Europe’s illiterate majority. Certainly the notion that the literary peasant Gottschalk represents farmers’ outlook is unconvincing, and the claim that the Middle Ages first saw grassroots consciousness of human codependence with nature remains unproven (47). Nevertheless, Aberth’s synthesis is useful. It is a tool for historical understanding of environments and particularly their impact on medieval written culture.

University of Michigan

Paolo Squatriti

This book is a study of the twin monasteries of Stavelot-Malmedy and their relationship to the environment of the Ardennes in the period from their foundation ca. 650 to about 1150. Historians have tended to emphasize that all monasticism is founded upon a paradox—flight from the world into a desert, which, however, must be managed to provide an economic base for the community. In this book, Ellen Arnold examines the way in which monastic culture resolved this enigma by stressing both the challenges of their forest environment and its fecundity, which was symbolic of spiritual success. She defines this approach in chapter 1 and demonstrates how it is possible because of the rich documentation that these houses have left, notably in the voluminous correspondence of Abbot Wibald [1130–1158]. At one level, Arnold is following the well-established tradition of microhistory, examining the life of a particular house. In this respect, the lack of any reflection on the impact of the monastic reform of the eleventh and twelfth centuries is a disappointment. However, the real focus of this work is an understanding of the monastic approach to landscape, that, in the words of Paul Groth’s “Frameworks for Cultural Landscape Study,” which she quotes approvingly, “denotes the intersection of people and places” (174).

In chapter 2, Arnold explains how the monks exploited the assets of their forest environment, contesting the notion of medieval people as reckless destroyers of the natural environment. In a real sense, her monks cultivated the forest, notably by coppicing, in a way that preserved it. Preservation, of course, involved competition with other landowners and is discussed in chapter 3. Literary production, notably in the lives of the founder, the Vitae Remacli, asserted the sanctity of the monastery’s possessions. Monastic charters invoked spiritual as well as legal sanctions against violators. The monks set up monastic ownership as a model, disparaging secular lords whose hunting rights threatened their community. Tension between Stavelot, which became the dominant partner, and Malmedy is a powerful theme in chapter 4, and both sides developed literature to assert their control over the landscape, claiming that “violations of monastic land rights and imbalances in the natural order could be punished and rectified by the saints and the monks” (146). In chapter 5, “The Religious Landscape and Monastic Identity,” Arnold shows how Stavelot-Malmedy recalled its role in the Christianization of the Ardennes and the establishment of sacred places as a means of asserting its control over its environment.
This is a fine book, but it has certain problems. Its very analytical form leaves one wondering how and to what extent “identity” varied from time to time. Moreover, we encounter the monastery’s dependents—the ordinary people who farmed its lands—only in passing. However, Arnold writes with admirable clarity and makes her case with vigor. As a volume it is well finished with a good index and an excellent bibliography.

Swansea University

John France


In a detailed narrative based on a perceptive reading of a wide range of primary sources, Malcolm Barber argues that the twelfth-century crusader states were viable, rejecting as teleological the assumption of their inevitable destruction in a jihad led by Zengi, Nur-al-Din, and Saladin. Such an assumption simplifies a complex power struggle for hegemony over Syria and Palestine while underestimating the importance of contingency in the history of the crusader states and their adversaries.

According to Barber, the Franks adapted successfully to life in a region with a long history and diverse population, a success visible in their distinct identity and culture. Yet Barber’s characterization of their principalities as states is problematic, implying more institutional strength and cohesion than actually existed. Their survival depended more on consensus politics, military victories, and understanding the region’s geopolitics than on institutionalized government. Rivalries among Frankish leaders often threatened the crusader states with disintegration into autonomous lordships, though lack of money and manpower limited the king of Jerusalem’s ability to reward his men and wage war successfully. Still, Barber’s occasional comparison of Frankish and Western methods of government opens further avenues of inquiry in the effort to understand medieval states apart from modern paradigms.

Barber’s argument against the crusader states’ inevitable decline and fall is convincing. Despite major setbacks, including Zengi’s conquest of Edessa and the failure of the Second Crusade, the mid-twelfth-century kingdom of Jerusalem remained secure, although lack of resources soon drove Kings Baldwin III and Amalric to attempt the conquest of Egypt. Amalric’s successive campaigns drew Nur-al-Din and the Byzantine Emperor Manuel Comnenus into a regional power struggle, which ended unpredictably with Saladin’s takeover of Egypt and Syria.
At this critical juncture, political turmoil weakened Constantinople while Jerusalem was ruled by a fatally ill king, Baldwin IV, who became involved in factional strife over policy and succession to his throne. Consensus politics broke down entirely when a powerful faction engineered the succession of his sister Sibylla’s husband, Guy of Lusignan, despite grave doubts about his leadership. When Saladin attacked once again in early July 1187, King Guy mobilized all available Frankish forces without leaving any in reserve, a decision suggesting to Barber that Guy never intended a major battle against Saladin. Apparently Guy changed his mind during the night of July 2, with fatal consequences. Had he not fought, the internal stresses in Saladin’s army and his dwindling supplies might have led to his withdrawal. As it was, even Saladin could not be certain of victory at Hattin until he saw Guy’s tent collapse after six long hours of battle.

Barber’s book ends with the Third Crusade, as if King Richard’s failure to recapture Jerusalem ends the history of the crusader states. Despite this unexplained, even abrupt ending, The Crusader States offers important insights into an often misunderstood episode of medieval history.

Mary Alberi


Manumission of slaves was a peculiar institution in the Roman Empire. The designation “freed slaves” was and is, however, not a very precise term. Freedmen had not only very different social and economic conditions but they could also have different legal status depending on different methods of manumission. In recent decades, freedmen have been the subject of renewed scholarly interests, especially their self-representation in art and their social mobility. This is also illustrated in this volume, which contains contributions by nine authors. The writers are, in alphabetical order: Sinclair Bell, Barbara Borg, Carlos Galvao-Sobrinho, Marc Kleijwegt, Eleanor Leach, Teresa Ramsby, Pauline Ripat, Michele Ronnick, and Koenraad Verboven. These names guarantee a multidisciplinary and multifaceted discussion of the impact of freedmen in the Roman Empire.

Multiauthored volumes often lack homogeneity, and this book is no exception. The introduction by the editors and the response essay by Leach frame the scope and the results of the collection. The remaining seven articles discuss various aspects of the social and economic conditions of freedmen in Roman Italy, using
literary and epigraphical sources as well as archaeological evidence and comparative perspectives. The lengths of the contributions vary from fifteen to forty-six pages, including endnotes and bibliographies, which makes reading difficult. Some have many figures, others none. It should be noted that Borg’s essay, “The Face of the Social Climber: Roman Freedmen and Elite Ideology,” was originally published in Germany in 2000. The translation has an updated bibliography and an epilogue in which the author adds further thoughts in the light of recent research. It is an important contribution, but a new article on these important examples of freedmen in Roman art would have benefitted the volume and emphasized the interesting discussion by Galvão-Sobrinho on the collective sepulchers of the imperial and senatorial households in Rome.

One of the editors, Ramsby, provides a subtle analysis of the most famous text on Roman freedmen, Petronius’s Cena Trimalchionis, in which she draws attention to the stonemason Habana. Ronnick’s contribution on the first generations of teachers in Latin and Greek to students of African descent is fascinating but tends toward name-dropping. The two most innovative articles are by Kleijwegt on freedwomen and by Verboven, who suggests that the economy of Roman Italy should be renamed to “freedman economy” instead of “slave economy.”

This reviewer wishes that he could praise the book as well produced, but this is not the case. The quality of the pictures in black and white is poor, and it is especially a shame for Borg’s article. However, the merits of the book are obvious. The articles highlight the social and economic importance of freedmen and show methods to circumvent the prejudices against them in Latin elite literature.

University of Southern Denmark

Jesper Carlsen


Every year brings the release of new books on the Roman military that are designed for general readers of diverse backgrounds. The Complete Roman Legions is one such book, and it is well illustrated and written to appeal to any reader interested in the Roman military. What sets this book apart from the crowd of typical works is the quality and clarity of the authors’ discussions and their effective use of images and graphics to illustrate their treatments. Although it does not offer extended discussions, the numerous illustrations and the authors’
familiarity with and ease in presenting the archaeological material makes for a successful volume, useful for a broad audience.

The book is divided into three parts, the first of which covers the legions of the republic. Because, as the authors note, legions during much of the republic tended to be temporary units, this section is necessarily brief. The authors provide an overview of the republican military and the evolution of the legions. The summary is accurate and reflects recent historiography.

The second part of the book covers the legions during the empire. After an introduction on Augustus’s reforms, this section is organized geographically based primarily on Tacitus’s *Annals* (4.5): Rhine and Gaul, Britain, Spain, North Africa, Egypt, the Eastern Frontier, the Balkan and Danube provinces, and Italy. The organization may seem odd to those expecting it to follow Strabo or the *Barrington Atlas of the Classical World*, but it is consistent with the authors’ use of Tacitus to open the introduction.

Each legion’s catalogue opens in an off-color box with the particulars including unit title (*cognomen*), emblem, main base, and primary campaigns. There is then a brief description of the legion’s history with some focus on any major events in which the unit participated. The authors also provide evidence for placing each legion where they do. Each legion’s section includes several images relevant to that legion or its campaigns. There are numerous clear maps and site plans to augment the artifact and landscape images. The whole is a pleasant introduction to each of the imperial legions about which we know anything substantial.

The third and final part of the book is a brief treatment of the legions in the late empire. The authors cover the reforms of Diocletian and Constantine briefly, giving the reader a good sense of the changes and some of the impact they had on the military. As a result, the legions effectively ended, and so this section of the book is the shortest.

The book includes a chronology of Roman history, a glossary, further reading (organized geographically), and a useful index. Overall, the selection and production of images and graphics are superb so they provide useful augmentation rather than mere eye candy.

This book is not a history of the Roman military. There are many units and aspects that could not be included, but readers seeking an introduction to the legions will find this quality work useful.

Controversial figures, particularly those forged in the crucible of the Reformation, polarize us, and Thomas More’s biographers (and other writers) are no exception, although the range of partisanship is not perhaps so great as that surrounding Henry VIII (cf. Charles Dickens’s comment on the king in A Child’s History of England [chapter 28]: “The plain truth is, that he was a most intolerable ruffian, a disgrace to human nature, and a blot of blood and grease upon the History of England”). From Roper’s genial ironist to Marius’s tormented zealot to Guy’s inscrutable, self-fashioning player, the “perp walks” of Mores across the stage illustrate the various ways his biographers have addressed the shift in More’s appearance from the jocular humanist of his early years to the stern or even strident visage of the polemicist of the crisis years to the wry and resigned humorist in the Tower of London.

Travis Curtright traverses this familiar ground with brisk and companionable strides, taking as his premise not a fractured psyche but a sensitive and unified intellect born of More’s “intellectual integrity” and culminating in his “artful defiance” as a prisoner of conscience (12, 200). More’s undisputed ironic camouflage, seen in his early works and continuing through the polemics, reveals in this telling an underlying firmness of resolve underpinned by an unwavering fidelity to principles of political reform and a newly reenvisioned Christian humanism.

Curtright’s many strengths are best seen in his method of addressing More’s various commentators and biographers by grouping both thematically and chronologically. He opens with an impressive tour of the difficulties facing those who would attempt a defensible sketch of More—pace John Guy’s understandable skepticism—that does justice to his human complexity while making sense of the conflicting strands of evidence on which that sketch must rest. The book’s five chapters survey More through five signal periods of his life, largely through his major literary works from The Life of Pico della Mirandola to the legal controversies with Christopher St. German. It culminates in a defense of More’s Tower letters that, far from evincing an attempt to evade his ethical responsibilities to speak plainly in defense of the truth, combines “the moral imperative to speak truly . . . with the teaching on adaptable speech” (198).

The sheer difficulty of resolving the various strands of More’s complex character through the myriad ad hoc polemical, literary, and personal writings of his career, the testimony of his peers and family, and his well-known public performances may well lead us to see More as impossible to reassemble. He lived in a time that
embraced the reality of a universal Truth that was threatened when any part of the perceived order was shaken—political, theological, or moral. Clearly that world is not ours, and we find its insistence on a rigid universality so alien that we might well deny the integrity of anyone who so holds that belief. Curtright does an admirable job of persuading readers to persevere, suggesting that there is a More, largely retrievable, with a consistent set of principles, even if they are not entirely ours.

Mount Angel Seminary

Seymour Baker House


The author of this study has been one of the Dutch Republic’s most prolific historians for more than three decades. Using in innovative ways often previously unexplored sources, in particular diaries and other egodocuments, Rudolf Dekker has crucially added to our understanding of the early modern period and especially of the Dutch Golden Age and its aftermath. Dekker has likewise been a trailblazer in exploring new themes in history such as female transvestism, the lives of children and childhood, and the role of humor. And, different from rather too many Dutch historians, many of his works have been published in English. His exploration of the seventeenth-century diary of Constantijn Huygens [1628–1697] is Dekker’s latest contribution (a less scholarly, albeit far cheaper, Dutch version was published as well in 2013).

Somewhat bowdlerized, Huygens’s diary was originally published during the 1870s and 1880s (available through the digital library of Dutch literature: http://www.dbnl.org/auteurs/auteur.php?id=huyg007). Dekker’s investigation of this work offers a welcome insight into the life of one of the most outstanding members of the Dutch elite and the society in which he lived. From 1672 to 1696, Huygens served as the secretary of the stadtholder William III of Orange [1650–1702], who eventually became King William III of England. Through Huygens’s diary, Dekker allows his readers to ponder the Glorious Revolution, the uneasy Dutch-English relations (after three wars in recent years), the enigmatic king-stadtholder, and the role of the royal court. And this is of some significance: As Dekker writes, the events of 1688 were a “turning point in the history of England, Europe and the world” (1). In addition, Huygens appears as an early modern art connoisseur and bibliophile. His writing reveals much about sexuality, family, gender relations, and class. Dekker discusses through Huygens’s writings the

This work is a collection of twelve essays (with an introduction) that address mainly eighteenth-century English views of conception, life, and death. Anthologies of interdisciplinary material often lack cohesion, and because the contributors to this volume include scholars of English, art history, and history, it is a pleasant surprise to discover just how unified it is. The essays by Helen Deutsch, Jonathan Kramnick, and Kevin Chua, for example, contribute interconnected insights into eighteenth-century views of the relative values of life and death, many of which
were informed by Epicurean philosophy. Deutsch notes Epicurus’s influence (through Horace) on Pope’s and Leapor’s verse epistles in her essay on this subject; Kramnick addresses the hard problems of consciousness and mental causation that arose in a materialistic worldview of the sort shared by both Lucretius and many eighteenth-century thinkers, while Chua’s exploration of “the linked problem of mortality and immortality” in Girodet’s 1793 painting The Sleep of Endymion resonates with both.

Other essays in the volume are similarly connected. Eighteenth-century views of conception and inheritance are addressed by Raymond Stephanson, Mary Terrall, and Corrinne Harol in their essays on Tristram Shandy, “medical and philosophical reflections on the conception of new life, and the transmission of physical and moral resemblances from parent to child,” and the Whig claims that James Stuart was not a legitimate heir to the English throne (111). The essays of Simon Chaplin and Anita Guerrini also dovetail neatly, for both address the lives and works of eighteenth-century anatomists.

Yet Vital Matters is far more than merely a cohesive collection of new work, for the papers that it contains are almost uniformly exceptionally engaging. Indeed, despite being an academic anthology, this study would fascinate anyone with even a passing interest in either the eighteenth century or the perennial issues of life and death that it explores. Minsoo Kang’s essay on automata imagery is especially noteworthy here, addressing the oft-overlooked question of how the image of man as a machine can be both positive, carrying connotations of great productivity, and negative, implying soullessness. And it also contains wonderful snippets of information: Nonspecialists are unlikely to suspect just how valued dormice were as preparers of human display skeletons or would guess at the postmortem use to which the rectum of Thomas Thurlow, the bishop of Durham, was put. (Not as perverse as one might think!)

Although this is a superb collection, the absence of any paper by a philosopher is striking, especially because (as many of the contributors recognize) philosophical contributions to understanding the self and its place in the world were at the forefront of eighteenth-century discussions of these matters. Had a philosopher been involved, the editors might have been saved from repeating in their introduction Dr. Johnson’s basic misunderstanding of Berkeley’s immaterialism. But because Vital Matters is a wonderful contribution to the literature of eighteenth-century thought, this observation is less of a criticism than a request for more work on the compelling issues that this book addresses.

*College of New Jersey*  
James Stacey Taylor

Beginning with Alexander’s role in the coup against his father and concluding with the legend that he feigned his death in order to devote his life to religion, this absorbing biography investigates the enigma around Tsar Alexander I and achieves a new interpretive synthesis of his life. Prior works on Alexander I’s reign [1801–1825] have divided it into periods of liberal reform and then harsh reaction accompanied by religious mysticism, yet Alexander’s tempering of reform initiatives during his early reign and later utopian experiments undermine this rigid dichotomy. Some have attempted to reconcile such contradictions by claiming that Alexander hypocritically employed the Enlightenment’s liberal language and professions of religious faith and enthusiasm in order to strengthen his hold on power and the position of Russia abroad.

To remedy the flawed, conventional depiction of Alexander I that has accumulated and rigidified through successive biographical interpretations, Marie-Pierre Rey returned to memoirs by Alexander’s contemporaries and to the Russian archives, where she discovered rich material in the emperor’s correspondence with family members. She found other revealing documents in Vatican and Jesuit archives. These neglected sources led her to conclude that Alexander was a visionary who sincerely sought to reform Russia along liberal lines but was forced to restrain his idealism when confronted with reality: a nobility jealous of its privileges, a population unprepared to absorb Enlightenment thought, and an institutional framework incapable of adapting to liberal politics. Nevertheless, he and his advisers accomplished some progressive measures, including administrative reform, expansion of higher education, and emancipation of Baltic-territory serfs. Although she is sympathetic toward Alexander, Rey does not neglect his more negative characteristics, such as a willingness to employ anti-Semitism for political purposes.

Rey dramatically depicts the contest between Napoleon and Alexander I in this biography, offering fascinating insights into the psychological warfare between the two men and the broader military strategies and geopolitical goals guiding their decisions. Her book treats the Napoleonic invasion of Russia in 1812, and especially the burning of Moscow, as the spiritual watershed of Alexander I’s reign. Buffeted on all sides by criticism of his decision to spurn negotiations with Napoleon, whom he perceived as an evil force that had to be purged, Alexander came to feel that only God stood with him in his recalcitrance toward the French emperor. Thus, he journeyed from Enlightenment
Deism to the fervor of a new convert. After the defeat of Napoleon, Alexander’s desire to reform Russia merged with his new spiritual mission; accentuated by his unrelenting stubbornness, this campaign brought harsh repression against those who resisted or challenged his utopian vision. In addition, Rey teases from the archives illuminating detail about the women who influenced Alexander and helped shape his political decisions. Susan Emanuel’s lively and clear translation makes this important work accessible to the general reader and a suitable choice for book clubs.

LaSalle University

Barbara C. Allen


Brass bands in nineteenth-century Britain were a unique musical phenomenon, one whose popularity continues today. The proliferation of these bands was aided by several factors including the invention of the valve; the Industrial Revolution; inventions of Adolph Sax; and an interest for towns, industry, churches, and temperance movements to provide music to the masses. Enter the trumpet player John Distin, who, with the aid of his sons, played a profound role in advancing the interest in brass performance during this era.

Distin was a highly regarded trumpet player who, by including his sons, formed a brass quintet that performed throughout Great Britain, continental Europe, the United States, and Canada. They were prolific performers whose audiences, at times, included the nobility of Europe. Upon meeting Adolph Sax in Paris, the Distins became the sole distributors for the saxhorn (not the saxophone!) in the British Isles. Saxhorns were valved instruments of like timbre pitched from soprano to bass. The identical timbre of this family of instruments, coupled with the relative ease of playing and reasonable price, created a marked interest across Britain to form brass bands—more so than anywhere else in the world. The Distin family became the chief proponents for such an ensemble through their nonstop performance schedule. Eventually all ties with Sax were severed, and John (later his son Henry) started what became a large manufacturing company selling their own line of horns from a clone of the saxhorns to Henry’s invention of the “ventil” horn. In time, their empire led to publishing extensive amounts of brass music as well as encouraging local and national competitive contests between bands.
The author, Ray Farr, is a professional trumpet player who has extensive experience with brass bands. He tells the story of the Distin family with the idea of proving they were the primary force behind the brass band movement. Although this reviewer does not feel that this premise was proved, the story is nonetheless well told with only minor inconsistencies. To his credit, the author strikes a balance between the claims of the Distin family, who arguably were wont to stretch the truth to suit their needs, and the actual truth of the moment. A most extensive timeline at the end of the book provides the opportunity to observe the careers of this unique family through news accounts, etc. Though the timeline is impressive, it would have been beneficial to provide more information comparing the Distin Empire with other publishers and manufacturers of the time.

Farr’s book is recommended for those who have an interest in the history of music in Great Britain in general, and specifically to those interested in the evolution of brass instruments in the nineteenth century as well as the impact the Distin family had on this most unique moment in British music history.

Lipscomb University

Stephen L. Rhodes


The author of this work adroitly challenges assessments of Hitler as a provincial, hostile outsider forcing his way upon a cosmopolitan Weimar Berlin. Hitler hated the democratic Weimar government, but the author dismisses long-established characterizations about Hitler’s hostility to its shining Berlin metropolis. Hitler biographer Joachim Fest relied on what Thomas Friedrich describes as superficial readings of Mein Kampf, a defect remedied by instead digging into Hitler’s many statements and actions in the capital (xi, 16). Rather than seeing his own family, Hitler visited Berlin and its museums several times during the First World War while on leave, making a total of six visits by 1921, which is strange behavior for someone who supposedly hated the place (27). The author’s new assessment can be unsettling, as it is more comfortable to see Hitler as a barbaric outsider. Yet readers encounter a modern Hitler who enjoyed cinema, airplanes, and fast cars. Not just a yokel from Austria, Hitler was a confident operator manipulating Stormtrooper (SA) street violence, sophisticated propaganda, shrewd political maneuvering, economic opportunities, and luck.

Though it focuses on elites, this work also has the gripping level of detail and explanatory power of the best microhistory, like William Sheridan Allen’s classic
study *The Nazi Seizure of Power*. Friedrich guides readers through rich and illuminating, but often contradictory and deliberately false, primary source material. Berlin was a laboratory for the brutal bullying tactics of the Nazi seizure of power, with wanton killing and bloody street fighting, usually provoked by the SA in working-class districts hostile to the Nazis. Hitler, having failed once in his 1923 Munich Beer Hall Putsch, thereafter ostensibly emphasized constitutionality, publicly restraining the threat of SA violence to intimidate politicians and opponents in a Nazi protection racket. This study anchors Hitler’s activities in the capital to key landmarks like his hotel residences, first at the moderate Sanssouci and then the more regal Kaiserhof, as well as Sportpalast, the site of many speeches, redesigned in 1925 by Jewish architect Oskar Kaufmann (139). Readers also get a sense of the political geography of Berlin, from the middle-class, pro-Nazi suburb of Steglitz to the Red streets of pro-KPD (Communist) Wedding.

This is an important work for its use of sources, for its challenge to the existing historiography, and for its documentation of the bruises Berlin still carries from its Nazi past (372). The era of Hitler’s rise to power is the focus of this work, as only the last chapter briefly examines Berlin after 1933. Josef Goebbels, as *Gauleiter* (regional leader) of Berlin from 1926 onward, plays as large a role as Hitler throughout much of the book. Yet Friedrich argues that Hitler himself, the once-aspiring artist and lifelong architectural aficionado, had direct influence shaping Nazi Berlin—down to the size of the pillars in Olympia stadium (356). Provocative, this work is of value to specialists as well as to graduate or undergraduate students interested in a nuanced, gritty, and detailed exploration of Hitler and Nazi activities leading into the Nazi era, centered in the hub of the Weimar metropole.

*Florida Atlantic University* 
Douglas T. McGetchin

*Poverty and Sickness in Modern Europe: Narratives of the Sick Poor, 1780–1938.*
Edited by Andreas Gestrich, Elizabeth Hurren, and Steven King. (New York, NY: Continuum, 2012. Pp. v, 278. $34.95.)

This new study is excellent scholarship and very topical. Unfortunately, these two qualities seem likely to clash. Contemporary policymakers who could profit greatly from reading the book will be intimidated by the very scholarly approach, for example the historiographical review in chapter 1. This is a shame but does not detract from the quality of the book itself.
The articles in the book look at the interrelationship of poverty and illness from a variety of perspectives. Several consider the issue of class. The so-called “shame-faced poor,” who had slipped downward from higher levels of economic success often through no fault of their own, were found to be reluctant to seek assistance since doing so might expose their pretense of continued status. Another instance of class issues arises from literacy, which often suggests at least some economic success. The language used, however, indicates a range of education and thus probably economic classes as well. Nonetheless, the rhetoric of appeal shows that a variety of people were faced with physical and emotional disabilities and needed, even demanded as a right, public assistance.

Gender also affected issues of welfare and how families might cope with the impact of illness. In many places, women handled family finances, and it was left to them to figure out how to maintain the family in the face of illness. Codes of masculinity made it difficult for men to admit weakness even in the face of serious illness, leaving wives to seek assistance. Victorian families faced with mental illness, however, were quicker to seek help, especially when the problem seemed intractable. Providing long-term maintenance, especially at lower levels of income and even with the entire family contributing, could be ruinous. As there was less sense that the charitable assistance was a right, the requests were less demanding and threatening and more likely to be made via or with the support of some upstanding member of the community. Venereal disease carried a variety of moral baggage, as is still the case. Treatment, sometimes coercive, and assistance were affected by the gender of the sufferer as well as his or her class.

Reaction to epidemics, a measure of a society’s response to the public disaster as presented here, drew differing reactions depending on previous experience and social stability. In Aachen, the initial reaction to cholera was to improve conditions, but the cost and the assumed fecklessness of the poor quickly led to the reversal of that policy. The upper class, less affected and comfortable that there would be little or no social upheaval, largely ignored the medical problem and attempted to live as usual. The suffering of the poor was attributed to their own character flaws. In Barcelona, where the earlier yellow fever was remembered and the lower classes were most feared, attempts to help were made but foiled due to the very limited infrastructure. In the end, those with means left the city, losing the moral high ground over the poor and affecting their ability to make policy in the future.

Poverty and Sickness does have some problems. Chapters have a broad geographical sweep—Germany, Austria, Denmark, Sweden, the British Isles, Spain—and span a century and a half. They also deal with a variety of social, economic,
and political forces. Individually each chapter contributes to knowledge of disease and poverty and of their effects on society, but the reader is largely left to find the common threads among those chapters. An overview either at the beginning or the end would have been a welcome addition. This is not an uncommon flaw in anthologies, however, and overall the book is a worthwhile contribution to the historiography of modern Europe and to the understanding of disease as a social factor.

_Fort Valley State University_  
Fred R. van Hartesveldt


This book comprehensively covers the interaction of English society and government during the Wars of the Roses. Moreover, it puts the conflicts into perspective on the wars of France as well as the changing scene in not only England but also Wales and Scotland. As the former director of the Prince Madog Center for Welsh Studies at the University of Rio Grande in Ohio, this reviewer would point out that David Grummitt grasps the importance Wales and the Welsh played in the wars in France (Hundred Years’ War) as well as in the Wars of the Roses. Indeed, the political problems with which English monarchs struggled had much to do with the wars in France.

The monarchs were an important part of the Wars of the Roses. Grummitt aptly shows that being a king during the Wars of the Roses was difficult at times, but the wars ultimately brought out the best and the worst of some of the monarchs. In addition, the power of the Church, especially bishops, was evident throughout the wars. As members of the upper class, these churchmen had an important position in the war.

The constant power struggles were tied to the question of legitimacy and the Magna Carta. The role of Parliament became an important part of the power struggles that ensued. For example, Henry IV had to work with Parliament as well as his trusted servants. He could not rely on the powerful nobility who were a narrow base for support that had to be rewarded with grants of land and money. When Richard, Duke of York, tried to take the throne from Henry VI, it was not a simple matter. Lords, bishops, peers, and other Englishmen became involved in an intricate struggle that touched on legitimacy.

The wars also affected society. New forms of taxation were developed. Indeed, as the wars progressed the Commons gained a new political consciousness.
Townsmen furnished soldiers for the wars. Moreover, they had to augment their defenses to survive the wars.

The final battles involved Henry Tudor, who fought Richard III at the decisive Battle of Bosworth Field. Henry won on the battlefield, but he also used conciliation and threats in a diplomatic way that brought him to the throne as Henry VII. The Tudors would rule England until 1603 with the death of Elizabeth I. Indeed, Grummitt uses warfare to bring out the changing government of England that brought the English into the Renaissance and Reformation.

The various battles, the people involved, the negotiations, and the successes and failures are all presented in detail. The participants, their motivations, their machinations, and their goals are woven together in this magnificent treatise. It is an excellent book because it looks at all facets of the Wars of the Roses in a unique and interesting way.

*University of North Florida*

Marcella Biro Barton


The Diggers caught public attention in the late 1640s as a curious, anomalous, and threatening group of activists among the radicalisms of the English Civil War with the charismatic leadership of Gerard Winstanley, a group most famous for occupying the common land of St. George’s Hill and Cobham, Surrey. They gained the attention of historians in the last century and have been claimed as precursors to communism, socialism, anarchism, and, more recently, the Green movement and Occupy. This work attempts to place the Diggers in context on a number of different levels: locally, nationally, politically, and intellectually. The aim is to improve our comprehension of the Diggers in their time and place without having Winstanley dominate the account; this is a laudable change of focus, as a prolific radical theorist can skew the analysis.

John Gurney duly opens with a careful reconstruction of the social and economic context of Cobham, establishing the complex tensions of customs and rights to land, timber, and the shifting power networks shown in court tussles, which established rivalries, resentments, and grievances from the late sixteenth century to the outbreak of civil war. Names and families encountered here recur in the late 1640s. This is followed by a close reading of the impact of the hostilities
in the area, with Cobham having the disadvantage of being on a major road to London and hence worth fighting over.

At this point, Gurney moves from Cobham to bring Winstanley into the picture. Careful detective work places him convincingly in a position of relative economic security with sufficient family connections to aid both aspiration and geographical mobility. Along with the careful and cautious work comes a similar reading of his early writings, putting them in context, identifying common ground without suggesting derivation, and never losing the sense of specificity.

One theme, followed throughout the study, is the changing emphases and tropes in his work, sometimes more eschatological, sometimes employing “traditionalist” tropes, with adaptations according to audience, time, and circumstance. The chapters that follow reap the benefits of context, especially in the differences between the opposition to the two camps consequent upon differing local involvement. The finale of the work comes with the end of the Cobham camp and the establishment of camps in Buckinghamshire and elsewhere, which, however, could be seen as much as part of a changing, developing movement as an end.

To see the lessening of Winstanley’s guidance as the “end” of the movement rather runs contrary to a study that shows the benefits of resisting the temptation of having him as the focal point. The contracted “Aftermath” devoted to the interesting connections with the likes of Lady Eleanor Davies and Thomas Tany is fascinating but serves as a preface to a reading of Winstanley’s most famous work. A better decision would have been to maintain the wider web, tracing the common ground and activity with the Quakers.

University of Edinburgh

Tom Webster


Through its visual and verbal traditions, alchemy lends itself to being used for a variety of purposes other than its two main aims: producing gold from base metals and creating elixirs to cure illness and prolong human life. Author Jonathan Hughes takes his readers on a journey through the political and religious life of England under Edward III and Richard II. Hughes seeks out what he sees as the increasing role of alchemy and the other occult sciences in formulating and advertising the peculiar nature of kingship in ways that were reminders of a divinely directed drama being played out in both court and kingdom with the
monarch as symbol, actor, and focal point. Alchemy’s central image of a sun king and a moon queen united in marriage and giving birth to a son stronger and purer than both, as well as its emphasis on the regenerative and redemptive powers of alchemical sulphur and mercury, suggests parallels with Christian theology and symbolism. This is not necessarily an exaggerated or unlikely notion, since medieval Europe was happy to reinterpret the chemical processes of alchemy along magical or prophetic lines. Hughes thus has an interesting thesis, and he has consulted manuscript materials as well as published texts and secondary authors in pursuit of support for his contentions.

Unfortunately, however, his efforts are largely negated by his frequent reliance on Jungian theory to interpret his medieval texts, his careless use of terms such as “scientific” and “the occult” without explanation of what these are supposed to mean in relation to the Middle Ages, a determination to see alchemy under every bush, carelessness in interpreting some of his material, and a standard of proof-reading that is abysmal. He suggests, for example, that the red-and-white color symbolism of alchemy may have impressed itself on English visitors to Andalusia when they saw the red-and-white decoration of a mosque and a palace near Cordoba (20). Since the local sandstone is red and limestone is readily available for white relief, the presence of these two colors is scarcely remarkable or, indeed, unusual in the area.

Hughes reproduces a picture of a floor mosaic in the nave of Siena’s cathedral, showing a central authoritative figure handing an inscription to two subordinate figures. Hughes tells us the nave was dedicated to Hermes Trismegistus (self-evident nonsense) and that the central figure is Moses placed above an inscription saying, “Take up the laws of Egypt” (21). The inscription actually identifies the figure as Hermes Trismegistus, and the other inscription being handed to representatives of the East and the West reads, “Oh, take up the literature and laws of the Egyptians.” Why, one may ask, would Moses of all people recommend such a thing?

Text, notes, and bibliography are filled with garbled names, titles, and other information—Malificius Malificarum, 1481, when Hughes means Malleus Maleficarum, 1486, is only one example—none of which inspires confidence in the reliability of the author’s scholarship. So while there is certainly an interesting and useful book to be written on this subject, this version, unfortunately, is not it.

University of St. Andrews

P. G. Maxwell-Stuart

This work is an important contribution to an underresearched period in the history of English policing and to the history of working-class culture in general and is built on previously neglected resources from police archives in England’s three principal provincial cities. The book is well structured, allowing the reader to follow the careers of the constables from entry to the force, through the experience of learning the ropes; their experience of discipline; the camaraderie, conflict, and cooperation that created a body of working men aware of their common interest; their relations to the public; their domestic lives; and ultimately to their final career trajectories. Aspects of this story are well known, such as the process of unionization and the formation of the Police Federation between the 1890s and 1919, but even these elements are illuminated with new detail on the factionalism, favoritism, and unevenness of experience within and between police forces and the limited effect the Federation had in some forces (110–166).

Joanne Klein also has important things to say about generational change within the organization, with the Police Acts of 1890 and 1919 transforming policing from a casual working-class job into a skilled occupation with an educated and disciplined workforce but at the same time erecting barriers between different generations of policemen with different abilities and approaches (8–9, 114–121).

Nonetheless, despite the improvement in the quality of constables, it is central to Klein’s argument that police forces remained resolutely working class in character, with all police officers up to chief superintendent, and even some chief constables, beginning their careers as officers on the beat (4–5, Appendix). The idea of a working-class police force has considerable implications for the idea that the police represent a body for the “social control” of the working class by the bourgeoisie, given that not only were the police themselves drawn from the working class but they also enforced working-class norms on the population they policed and within their own organizations (222–284). If the police received rough treatment from some elements of the working class, many more working-class men still saw policing as an acceptable opportunity for good employment, and they were often encouraged by their families to apply for the force (167–196, 11).

Indeed, Klein argues that it was actually the fact that policemen were drawn from the working class that made them able to interact with the public because they shared a common culture and therefore common values (42). The police
became somewhat distanced from the public, it is argued, not because they lost their class identity or because of any fundamental and irreconcilable hostility from the working class but because of the changes to their role wrought by the advance of technology between the two world wars, which increasingly took men off the beat and isolated them from the regular interactions that had marked out earlier forms of policing (61–71).


This new book, based on years of dedicated research, is an important contribution to our understanding of early modern Ireland. It is the study of 311 peers from ninety-one families between 1603 and 1685, which is a remarkably small group of people whose influence demonstrably increased in the period with their combined land holdings accelerating from 18 percent to 26 percent in the critical midcentury period. Narrative and thematic chapters, backed up by excellent maps and tables, consolidate a wealth of information. The importance of credit in the aristocratic lifestyle; the costly business of lobbying, bribing, and ingratiating at court in London; the dynastic issues of marriage negotiations and settlements; the begetting and bringing up of children in the primogeniture system; the perpetual problems of religion in Ireland; and the labyrinthine conveyancing of property through the crisis-ridden seventeenth century are all comprehended as never before. There naturally is a focus on certain families because of their influence and because of the survival of their archives—the Butlers of Ormond (the first duke especially, who is rehabilitated here), the Boyles (in particular that dynasty’s remarkable founder, Richard, Earl of Cork), the Burkes of Clanrickard, and the MacDonnels of Antrim—but lesser families, such as the Annesleys, Forbes, Conways, Prestons, and Sarfields, among others, are also studied in detail to create a total picture.

As evinced by the book’s title and general subject matter, Jane Ohlmeyer, in a mild fashion, takes issue with Nicholas Canny’s recent study, Making Ireland British, 1580–1650 [Oxford, 2001]. It took colonization (most thoroughly expressed by Edmund Spenser) as the driving transformative force in early modern Ireland, but Ohlmeyer here opts for something more general: the creation of an Anglicized elite in that capitalist colonial setting. The problem is that although “Surrender and Regrant”—begun in the mid-sixteenth century with the aim of
transforming Gaelic and Gaelicized Ireland—contained the germ of this idea, it was never really fully articulated as a theory nor subjected to so much debate over the whole period as plantation. This development could, in fact, only happen once the conquest had been completed in 1603 and once the notorious Court of Wards, which forced a number of heirs to key estates into state Protestantism, had been established. But one wonders whether it was not in fact a perpetuation of the policies that James VI had begun in Scotland when he assumed personal rule in the early 1580s, henceforth forcing the old aristocracy to come to Edinburgh whilst at the same time adding new upwardly mobile crown servants to the mix. Thus, though its effects were indeed Anglicizing, its origins may have been British after all.

Another consideration is whether the concept of “honor,” discussed here as having its highest ideal in serving the king, was simply an empty vessel. During the civil wars, the Irish aristocracy—Protestant and Catholic, old and upstart—all broke their vows of loyalty to the Crown when self-interest dictated otherwise. The Duke of Ormond did so when he surrendered Dublin to Parliament, and Irish Protestant nobles did so wholesale when they abandoned James II after the Prince of Orange landed at Torbay. What is more interesting from Ohlmeyer’s study is the new elite’s concerns for itself as a class, with Protestant peers trying to help Catholic ones regain their lands or ensure their rights to sit in Parliament. Indeed, with her examination of marriage and credit patterns, the author shows just how cohesive this group was despite the fierce sectarian tensions of the time. However, this was plainly a necessary part of the newcomers’ integrative strategy, best exemplified by how the ever-calculating Earl of Boyle moved to take over the Geraldine factional network by the marriage of his daughter to the bankrupt Earl of Kildare. Ohlmeyer concludes neatly by comparing her Irish results with the contemporary establishment of a Catholic Habsburg landed aristocracy in Bohemia and Upper Austria, indicating the wider significance of her study in the consolidation of Europe’s Ancien Régime.

Hiram Morgan
School of History, University College Cork


This engrossing new study should erase the stubborn notion of a static relationship between the most famous of biographers and the most iconic of biographical subjects. Although James Boswell’s Life of Johnson “makes it easy to imagine
continuity and coherence in their friendship,” John B. Radner sees rather “an evolving, multifaceted collaboration,” which was subject to stresses, even threatened disruptions, only to be reconfigured time and again into something deeper (though even more complex) than before (4, 6).

Charting their relationship from their meeting in 1763, past Samuel Johnson’s death in 1784, to the publication of the biography in 1791, Radner tallies and analyzes the days Johnson and Boswell spent in one another’s company, keeps track of letters written and received when they were apart, and—like a meticulous accountant—scrutinizes their personal balance sheets for credits and debits, evaluating expressions of love and admiration, examining feelings of injury or neglect. Whether or not such ups and downs comprise a “biography of friendship” itself, Radner invests little in the implied thesis of his subtitle other than to hope that he has laid bare “the dynamics of most sustained friendships, with their breaks and reconnections, their silences and fresh intimacies, their continuities and transformations” (354).

But the friendship between Johnson and Boswell, never more convincingly investigated than by Radner, was unique—tempered by radical differences (in age, class, nationality, personality, and fame) and binding affinities (love of conversation, intellectual curiosity, emotional neediness, and the habit of literature). If Boswell’s “veneration and love of Johnson clearly coexisted with some hostility,” Johnson’s regard for Boswell, which he said was “greater than I can (almost) find words to express,” likewise was troubled by a wariness of Boswell’s failings (75, 198). From the outset, the younger Boswell craved the judgment of the older Johnson, asking him to direct his life, but the scales were evened by Johnson’s growing recognition that he himself would be (and was being) judged by his biographer. Though each internalized the perceptions of the other, Radner explores an underappreciated—in fact, usually unnoticed—dynamic: Johnson’s need of Boswell.

Similarly, Radner does justice to Johnson’s high opinion of Boswell as a fellow writer. During their tour of Scotland in 1773, Boswell let Johnson read his journal, giving him a foretaste of his own biography. As with the observer effect in physics, which holds that observation results in changes to the phenomenon being observed, Johnson thereafter was more conscious of being “Johnsonian,” and the collaboration that started as a project to shape Boswell’s character became “a collaboration to write Johnson: to record his past, to describe him in the present, and even to chart his future” (141).

At every turn, Radner’s richly textured argument offers fresh angles of interpretation, yielding insights into the various interests of Johnson and Boswell,
their circle of friends, their proposed travels, and their writings, including parts of the *Lives of the Poets* written by Johnson primarily with his biographer in mind. The book is a must read for anyone interested in Johnson, Boswell, eighteenth-century friendship, or the theory and practice of biography.

*Saint Mary’s College, Notre Dame*  
Thomas F. Bonnell


Among the strengths of the author in this study is her refusal to judge her subjects—essayist Thierry Maulnier, novelists Robert Brazillach and Louis-Ferdinand Céline, and literary critic Maurice Blanchot, among others—under the retroactive “specter of Auschwitz” (119). Instead, Sandrine Sanos grounds her Far Right intellectuals firmly in the historical and discursive world of France in the 1930s that shaped them. Thus, instead of engaging in the bitter historical debate over how far the progenitors of French fascism might be implicated in Nazi crimes, Sanos’s book treats her subjects on their own terms.

Not that she lets them off any historical hooks. For example, Sanos indicts the postwar Céline and Blanchot for seeking, in light of the Holocaust, to obscure the venomous politics of their youths. And while distinguishing the various anti-Semitism of her subjects carefully from that of the Nazis, she argues that racial anti-Semitism was “foundational” to their political vision (252). For Sanos, the political ideals of the “Young New Right,” as she labels her protagonists to distinguish them from such precursors as Charles Maurras, were fundamentally aesthetic. That is, “the realm of beauty, art, and literature” represented for them the means of restoring a France that had succumbed to “abjection,” dissolution, and feminization owing to communists, homosexuals, and above all, Jews—as personified recurrently by the socialist prime minister, Léon Blum. Their aesthetic vision, moreover, was profoundly gendered: The political recovery of France, empire included, required the “restoration” of “a whole bounded and normative masculine self” (6). Thus, in journals with titles like *Combat* and *L’insurgent*, as well as such incendiary pamphlets as Céline’s *Bagatelles pour un massacre* [1938], they decried the degeneration of the “real France” and called for a sometimes fascist but always “virile” politics that might yield a separate legal status for the Jews. They attempted, in sum, “to map the conditions for normative conceptions
of the male body, of heterosexual virile masculinity, and of a racialized notion of Frenchness” (249).

Sanos’s argument is strong, meticulously well supported, and original. She is right that historians have generally remained “oblivious” to the discourse of gender and sexuality that fairly saturates the texts of the Far Right (254). The reviewer’s objections to *The Aesthetics of Hate* are in fact nearly all aesthetic. Sanos routinely offers her evidence well after making her claims and, as a result, ends up frequently restating them; time and again, we read such locutions as the afore-cited “whole bounded normative masculine self,” “abjection,” and “virile politics.” Equally distracting is that she seeks to validate herself historiographically not only in her introduction and conclusion but in nearly every chapter between. Such defensive overkill is understandable given that Sanos is entering a hotly contested arena occupied by heavyweights such as Zeev Sternhell and Robert Soucy. But its upshot is unfortunate: A work that might have fascinated anyone interested in the travails and transgressions of twentieth-century France unfolds instead as a somewhat dense read that is addressed primarily to specialists.

*Laurence University*

Paul Cohen


This clearly written, lavishly illustrated volume presents an account of Egyptian pharaohs in their multifaceted roles in a manner that breathes life into the more conventional, monotonous depictions. The author, who holds a Ph.D. in Egyptology, has undertaken the important but often neglected task of making the subject comprehensible and useful to the nonspecialist reader. Ancient records in translation and specialized box discussions further the author’s goals.

The work is organized into eight chapters. The first presents key concepts in the evolution of the ideology and insignia of Egyptian kingship, while chapter 2 presents a brief history of ancient Egypt. The third chapter, “Becoming Pharaoh,” primarily follows the process whereby a royal prince was transformed through training and ritual into a king; accession by usurpation or assassination is also touched upon. Chapter 4, “Being Pharaoh,” concentrates on the daily life of a pharaoh, including such things as the royal wardrobe, breakfast and morning audiences, the king as lawmaker and judge, and royal banquets. Attention is given to the royal women and the health of various kings as well as royal pets. The fifth
chapter follows the king as a military leader, organizer, and campaigner. The layouts of the battle at Kadesh help to follow the course of Ramesses II’s not-entirely-successful war with the Hittites (134–135). Garry Shaw gives proper attention to the diplomacy that followed in that king’s twenty-first and thirty-fourth years. Chapter 6 deals with what we know of the royal cities throughout Egyptian history. The seventh chapter surveys the variety of arrangements made for the pharaoh in the next life: tombs, sarcophagi, funerals, and mummification. The final chapter takes the story through the Greco-Roman period, an era not infrequently neglected in such works. The book ends with a king list of which a selected group get pharaonic “brief lives” (204–211). The bibliography is ample and useful as is the list of sources of quotations (212–218).

Although the book is generally reliable, it would be surprising were it entirely free of errors and some significant omissions. This reviewer notes only a few. It is common to hold that Egypt is “a naturally isolated country”; in fact, few invaders ever had any difficulty penetrating Egypt from any direction (9). When one goes from the Mediterranean Sea to Aswan, one goes upstream, not “down” (15). The reference to the important concepts Hu and Sia needs rather clearer explanation (19). The author has reversed the positions of the last two components of the royal titulary; his etymology of the nesu-bity title is doubtful, as is his definition of the royal ka, which was created at the same time as the royal body, cf. Hatshepsut and her ka at Deir el-Bahri, and was likely unique to each pharaoh (20).

The book is highly recommended to the general reader.

Binghamton University (SUNY)  

Gerald E. Kadish


For historians of previous generations, Carl Schorske’s Fin-de-siècle Vienna [1980] shattered existing paradigms and provided a foundation for talking about relationships between politics and culture that raised Central European historiography to new heights. Lisa Silverman, in looking at the period between the wars and with a scope that extends beyond Vienna, has performed a similar service with her extraordinarily eloquent and incisive study, Becoming Austrians: Jews and Culture between the World Wars. Schorske’s work was notable for integrating Jews as imagined opponents of those who sought to expel or harm them, as well as Jews’ roles as catalysts of cultural creativity. Silverman rises to a new level of sophistication and intellectual dexterity in illuminating relations between Jews
and non-Jews in the Austrian context. She convincingly argues that there was much more to the Jewish-Gentile dynamic than that which was expressed overtly, on the one side, as anti-Semitism and, on the other, as the defense of Jewish rights and interests.

Focusing on a series of crucial but often overlooked flashpoints in Austrian history, Silverman shows how events, cultural products, and personalities were “marked as Jewish,” which acted as a distorting lens making its subjects appear more leftist, liberal, libertine, commercially voracious, and universal, versus a negative view of Jewish people and corporate concerns that privileged authoritarianism, the church, and an exclusive sense of what being Austrian was and ought to be. Jews tended, however, toward greater interest and enthusiasm for “becoming Austrians” than their non-Jewish compatriots, and a rather large share of non-Jews cast a suspicious eye on what they thought “the Jews” were up to.

_Becoming Austrians_ would be an excellent choice for inclusion in upper-division undergraduate history courses because it is a superb investigation of Austrian and Jewish history, both of which are often marginalized. The book also is one of the most successful realizations of interdisciplinarity—encompassing film, popular literature, and theater—to which historians often aspire in their teaching and seek to impart to students as an especially fruitful way to interrogate history. For graduate students in the humanities and social sciences, this book should immediately find a home on seminar reading lists. It is in a class all its own in interweaving, in a most subtle way, the relevant theoretical considerations and historiography without sacrificing the voice of the author with its remarkably clear and forceful presentation of its brilliant arguments and conclusions.

Although it is no fault of the author, the book is disappointing in one respect: the photographic reproductions, which are critical to the work, are shoddy. Clearly Oxford University Press has cut corners in the production process, which has shortchanged its readers and even the author. Despite this poor performance on the part of the publisher, Silverman has written a fabulous book that, like Schorske’s classic, should have a decisive, salutary impact on the field for ages to come.

_University College London_  
Michael Berkowitz

Half a century ago, analyzing the French was a popular turn for journalists and professors. Freed from the bleak grip of military catastrophe, German occupation, and aspects of civil war, the French were suddenly in the ascendant again, shining in the arts and humanities, modernizing their economy, and bidding to help unify a fractured Europe. Already, however, the shadow of the expanding American hegemon had begun to move over the world. In the view of Barnett Singer and others (especially, though rather differently, Richard F. Kuisel), the encroachment led to a certain Americanization of France. In this very personal account of the phenomenon, Singer’s vivacious essays propose the remaking of an older, more tragic France into a less “serious” Americanized country that has recklessly tampered with the qualities and values of traditional French society.

The immediate occasion of this transition was the unsuccessful post-1945 attempt to maintain the French Empire. Here Singer celebrates (as he and his coauthor, John Langdon, did in their study Cultured Force: Makers and Defenders of the French Colonial Empire) the officers, proconsuls, and civil servants who were ultimately let down in their “noble” struggle, fighting in Asia and Africa and pursuing a growing Algerian immigrant terrorism at home. Drawing on an abundant literature, the archives of Haute-Savoie, and his own contacts (especially those with the “spymaster” Emile Vié, national director of the Renseignements Généraux, and André Rossfelder, pied noir writer, scientist, and activist), he sketches the fierce struggle against “FLN thuggery,” casting it as harbinger of a nascent Islamic conflict with the West. The interest is in the compelling details of his story and the passion with which he presents the tragic mission of these warriors. Following “betrayal” by the intellectuals at home, the end came, of course, with Charles de Gaulle’s turnabout and abandonment of Algeria, at Evian, to a “corrupt new state” (100). As Singer sees it, a “wounded” France turned away to domestic preoccupations less “serious” but no less revolutionary.

The increasingly prosperous society of the 1960s, fixated on consumerism and new-found leisure, searched now for “happiness.” The old balladeer Charles Trenet gave way to the Americanized “coy, cute, virile, strong, vulnerable, dangerous” Johnny Halliday, “the French boy next door” (130). Films such as Les Parapluies de Cherbourg and Le Bonheur reflected a hedonistic ethos. Among aspects of the “magical” America that the French apparently discerned and
emulated was the passion for sports and the wilderness, embodied in such icons as the mountaineer Maurice Herzog and the high-risk skier Jean-Claude Killy.

Singer’s spritely essays draw on an admirably eclectic reading, observation, and experience. Some may find his overall conclusion severe: “[T]he average French person . . . has now bought into current American trends with a vengeance” (169). Kuisel’s qualifications and reservations are not echoed here. And, without disregarding Singer’s keen analyses, one is struck by his feisty dictum that “this authentic, widespread, class-traversing Américanophilie poses a grave threat to France’s civilizational health and future, and not least, to its democracy” (175).

The baby boom generation is pronounced guilty. Such strictures aside, Singer’s new book delivers an engaging account of his own enthusiastic encounters with, and reflections on, the ever-attractive French.

*University of Toronto*

John C. Cairns

---


The first thing to observe about this book is that it is not a contribution to the controversy over the scandal about Charles Dickens’s sex life. It is instead a history of the treatment of that scandal. Michael Slater provides a careful account of all the evidence put forward from Dickens’s time to the present concerning the scandal. Because Dickens burned much of his correspondence and John Foster, his first biographer, was reticent, not much documentary evidence survives. Thus most of such evidence consists of recorded versions of conversations by persons more or less positioned to know something more than others, though often this spoken testimony was given long after Dickens’s death. Some documentary evidence is available—such as records of payments for houses, especially by one Francis Tringham, which was a supposed alias that Dickens used to hide his activities.

It might be fairer to refer to the topic as the Dickens scandals, since, even during his life, there was disapproving talk of his relationship with his sister-in-law, Georgina Hogarth. Only after his death did interest focus more clearly on Ellen Ternan. Subsequently, Ternan has been the chief subject of the supposed scandal. Dickens’s son Henry Fielding Dickens and daughter Kate Perugini seemed to concede that their father had indulged in an affair with Ternan. But despite the slow accumulation of supposedly damning evidence, it is still possible
to exonerate Dickens from any sexual intimacy with Ternan (in some accounts resulting in at least one offspring, who died). It is not impossible to believe that a man of Dickens’s temperament might have developed a strong friendship with Ellen Ternan without ever attempting to seduce her. This reviewer knows of people today who are capable of such strong relationships.

But Slater does not take sides. He presents what evidence is available on both sides of the argument and seems to conclude that historians shall never have decisive material to make an absolute judgment about this case. Slater’s restraint is admirable. One wishes that Yale’s book jacket designers had been equally restrained. Instead they employ a crude imitation of a Victorian sensationalist style that seems to suggest a greater revelation than the book provides.

Wayne State University

John R. Reed

_Habsburg Communication in the Dutch Revolt_. By Monica Stensland. (Amsterdam, Netherlands: Amsterdam University Press, 2012. Pp. 236. $45.00.)

It is commonly believed—and frequently true—that the evangelical movements of the Reformation Era made far better use of print than their conservative opponents. What was true of Luther and his supporters in Germany also largely holds good for the Low Countries. Notwithstanding strenuous efforts by Charles V and Philip II to preserve their patrimony for Catholicism, their opponents made imaginative use of printed media both to spread the Protestant faith and later in the century to justify their rebellion. To acknowledge this is not, however, to argue that the Habsburg rulers were ignorant of the power of communication in the hands of government. What is certainly true, as Monica Stensland quite reasonably affirms, is that until this point the communication of orthodoxy and obedience has received far less scholarly attention.

This book addresses the issue with a fine, systematic, and often insightful study of the strategies adopted by the rulers of the Low Countries to persuade their subjects to eschew heresy and rebellion. These efforts, it must be said, met with only indifferent success. In the first years of the rebellion, after 1566, the Habsburg public relations campaign got off to a shaky start, with multiple public executions ordered by the Duke of Alva, sent by Philip to reduce the provinces to obedience. The victory of Lepanto in 1571 offered a more uplifting opportunity to celebrate a great Catholic victory, and evidence from contemporary diaries suggests these celebrations found considerable public resonance. This is the first of
several occasions on which Stensland makes use of such materials to assess public reaction to printed media, and it is one of the strongest aspects of the book. With the renewal of the conflict in 1572, Alva continued to favor terror over reasoning or persuasion. One of the few officially sponsored publications of this period was a broadsheet giving the widest possibility to the sack of Mechelen, widely regarded at the time as a shocking atrocity.

In many ways, the flat-footedness of the regime in public relations terms was quite extraordinary. Thirty years before then, Charles V had made the case for war with France very effectively in print. But Philip II’s agents seemed unable to stoop to the politics of persuasion when it came to dealing with rebels. Instead they relied on censorship, but in a literate nation with a dispersed print industry this was bound to fail. In the years between the renewal of the fighting and the pacification of print, William of Orange and his allies ran rings round loyalist officials. Only after 1579 do we see the beginnings of effective use of print by royalist forces. The hero of the hour—in this as in the military campaign—was the Duke of Parma. Loyalist pamphlets celebrated the reconciliation of the major southern towns, and they spoke with one voice, preaching neither vengeance nor blind obedience but reconciliation and forgiveness. But the highpoint of the campaign of reconquest, the fall of Antwerp in 1585, was also the high-water mark of regime propaganda. Within a couple of years, the focus had switched elsewhere, to the Armada campaign and events in France.

Stensland says important things in this book, particularly when she tackles the previously exaggerated importance attached to arguments of sovereignty. Loyalist propaganda was not damaged by its relative lack of sophistication; indeed, in this respect the pleading sophistry of the rebel discourses was a sign of weakness, not strength. What mattered was that words should be aligned with deeds, and promises honored. Parma achieved this with his policy of reconciliation; the archdukes promised peace and also delivered. In the case of the archdukes (as recently explored with magisterial authority by Luc Duerloo), their promise of Catholic restoration meshed with the patent sincerity of their piety. As always in early modern society, good leadership counted for a great deal. All the media in the world could not compensate for a cause, or policies, that did not command public support.

_University of St. Andrews_  
Andrew Pettegree

When this reviewer was in college, Etienne Gilson used the “hook” of “Christian existentialism” to attract readers to Thomas Aquinas. Now, a long generation later, Denys Turner offers the hook of “materialism,” the idea that matter bears meaning, to gather new readers to the Angelic Doctor. In both cases, a current popular terminology was seized on to highlight something distinctive to Aquinas, in the first case the centrality of the act of being to his thought and in the second the importance of his use of the concept of matter. One hopes that the book has an impact on our times like Gilson’s had on his. Turner’s book is that of a mature scholar, a biography that treats its subject as an integrated human being in whom mind and soul, prayer, and the exploration of the range of reason are united.

An introduction presents this book as a “caricature” (Turner likes to use such striking and startling terms) that omits much about Aquinas, to the point of stressing the union in him of mind and soul, behind which is an almost invisible saint. This is partly the result of Turner’s attempt to present an Aquinas not specifically for scholars but for the general reader. Chapter 1 explains the differences between a Benedictine and a Dominican life and Thomas’s difficulties with his own family, who expected him to pursue the kind of ecclesiastical ambitions open to a Benedictine. Turner shows very well how Aquinas’s developing idea of theology was a response to the commission his Dominican superiors gave him “to reform the theological training of Dominican preachers” (30). Though Thomas in effect showed that there was more than one way to study theology, by conceiving this as a university subject he also revealed the inadequacies in all the ways twelfth-century theologians had treated theology. Turner shows how Aquinas’s lucidity flowed from his humility—from his never showing off—and how in turn his lucidity rose from his realization that theology aims at that which always dwells in silence: God himself. In this regard, he gives a very satisfactory account of the silence of Thomas’s last three months, his return home “to the house of contemplative silence” (43).

The entrance into Turner’s very important discussion of Aquinas’s “materialism” is through a couple of the propositions condemned in the years immediately following Aquinas’s death by the bishop of Paris and the archbishop of Canterbury: the proposition that God could not create matter without form, and the proposition that there is only one substantial form in humans, the intellectual soul. The latter especially was taken to embody an unspiritual view of humans. Turner proceeds by explaining Aquinas’s view that we know God from his effects.
The chapter “The Soul” makes clear why the doctrine of the immortality of the body is so central to Christianity. Chapters on “God,” “Friendship and Grace,” and “Christ” are followed by a stunning exposition of the Eucharist as bringing together many of the themes of the earlier chapters.

University of Utah

Glenn W. Olsen


Archaeologists have a preoccupation with artifacts for studies of chronology, trade, social relations, ritual, ethnicity, and other aspects of human behavior. Peter Wells, an Iron Age specialist, brings into archaeology ideas of scholars who study neuroscience and ecological psychology, which are rarely encountered in that discipline. His work will inspire archaeologists to look at artifacts from a totally different perspective. It should be noted that he finds the usage of the term “artifact” inappropriate. Wells speculates how ancient Europeans viewed the external world as reflected by objects such as pottery, fibulae, scabbards, swords, and coins. All archaeologists do a lot of speculating about the past, since very little is clear in the archaeological record. He states his approach clearly, writing, “We can also use nonverbal and nonpictorial objects from the past to help us to understand peoples’ perceptions, practices and experiences” (8). It is evident that peoples’ perceptions of their surroundings were different in the past. It is questionable if contemporary archaeologists can enter the mindsets of Bronze Age or Iron Age Europeans. It is to Wells’s credit that he attempts to show how objects can reflect not only style, function, and other aspects but also how Europeans perceived their world.

Wells limits his survey to the Bronze Age and the Iron Age, roughly two thousand years, from 2000 BC to 50 BC. Since writing appears in Mediterranean Europe during the Iron Age, or even the Bronze Age in Greece, he focuses his study on barbarian Europe or temperate Europe, especially western and central Europe. He notes that these Europeans had a different outlook on the world than the literate societies in the Mediterranean area.

Wells’s analyses of objects involve a detailed description of form and their usage. For example, he describes the uses of pottery in daily household activities, burials, social relations, and the supernatural world. He extensively describes bowls, cups, and especially jars, as any archaeologist would do in a site report. He
argues that jars evoke fields and that they “in the Early and Middle Bronze Age were individualized in a way bowls and cups were not, each deliberately made different from others in order that the household that owned it could mark it” (74). It seems that at the end of the early Iron Age “the visual emphasis of pottery shifts from relations with the landscape and food production fields to relations between persons and groups” (97). The late Iron Age societies were more complex politically and it is not surprising that there was more emphasis on specific individuals.

Wells presents thought-provoking ideas about Bronze Age and Iron Age Europeans. This book will stimulate further research on a very challenging topic, that is, the mindset of past populations. The extensive bibliography is very useful for archaeologists interested in this type of research.

State University of New York at Buffalo

Sarunas Milisauskas


Landscape history has a long and respected history in the United Kingdom. Its practitioners have constructed a detailed and deep sense of the changing patterns of human settlement in the British Isles. Tom Williamson’s latest contribution to this tradition uses its many approaches and theories as a base for a reinterpretation of the dominant force in settlement dispersion and evolution. Past explanations, Williamson argues, have paid too much attention to human structures and not enough attention to the older and less mutable structure of Britain itself. He writes, “patterns of regional variation in early-medieval England were largely a function of environmental factors: of climate, topography, geology, and soils” (234).

Following the introduction, in which he lays out his main goal of revising the ways that the social patterns of settlement within the Anglo-Saxon landscape are understood, Williamson divides his book into nine topical chapters. Most of these address different historiographical questions within British landscape history, such as the geography of free peasants, village development, the role of woodland in shaping settlements, and the ways (if any) that shifting ethnicities altered settlement patterns. Generally, each chapter opens with a framing of the question and a lengthy discussion of the work of other landscape historians and geographers. Williamson hopes that his book will spur scholars to pay more attention to
the ways that land, soil, and water are the underlying determinants of human settlement.

Williamson is very aware of the history of the field; he provides an excellent and balanced overview of the major works, theories, and conclusions of medieval English settlement history. This book will prove useful to scholars interested in the details of settlement, the history of landscape studies, or agricultural systems within the United Kingdom. However, it will likely reach a limited audience.

Though reflecting the best qualities of insular landscape studies, including a thorough knowledge of written and material evidence and an intimate connection to the land itself, Williamson’s work also reflects the greatest limits of that tradition, most notably its insularity. There could be many fascinating comparisons between his work and projects in other parts of Europe, but he has made no attempt to connect to other places or other styles of landscape history. His extensive bibliography is almost exclusively British (even excluding Ireland). There are no works on the broader nature and concept of landscape and none from the larger field of environmental history. Most noticeably missing are works from continental contexts and scholars that would enhance his claim that “[l]andscapes are the consequence of human agency, but agency exercised knowledgeably, in a real world” (4).

Williamson acknowledges his argument may strike many as “old-fashioned,” by which he means his focus on soil and landforms. Unfortunately, his diagnosis is a bit too true but in perhaps unintended ways. First, his definition of “landscape” is very traditional and does not address the more theoretical and cultural aspects of landscape. Second, the maps (almost all made by the author) are also out of step with newer works, which is unfortunate given Williamson’s obvious interest in and familiarity with Geographic Informations System (GIS) technology. His arguments would have been clearer and more direct if he had devoted more space to innovative mapping that could overlay settlement on landforms, soils, etc., or if he had incorporated newer trends in the digital humanities by developing a web presence for the book to include more integrated and navigable maps. Short of this, more direct discussion of the maps in the text and a methodological discussion of historical mapping would have also deepened the value of this work.

Finally, Williamson’s own argument and voice get drowned out by his extensive reviews of other theories and previous works about landscapes. This is a shame because the arguments he makes are important. Landforms, river courses, water tables, soil depth and quality, and other natural features did and will continue to shape human choices. As he argues, medieval people did not have a
“blank slate” to shape and form however they culturally or politically chose. Williamson’s argument should be discussed and considered; however, it is far too buried under the strata of other people’s ideas. This book would be more effective if it were less concerned with a dialogue with narrow historiographical debates and more broadly engaged with methodologies, mapping, cartography, and soil and landscape histories.

Ohio Wesleyan University

Ellen Arnold


This biography of Adolf Hitler has generated a maelstrom of controversy. Among the negative and neutral reviews was one by historian Richard Evans that savaged A. N. Wilson’s book in the 12 March 2012, issue of the *New Statesman*. After deploring Wilson’s sloppy and inadequate research, questioning his ability to read German, listing a plethora of factual and interpretive errors of omission and commission, and accusing him of almost every academic crime imaginable, Evans opined, “It is hard to think why a publishing house that once had a respected history list agreed to produce this travesty of a biography.” Evans concluded that the book contained nothing new or provocative about Hitler: “neither in the stale, unoriginal material, nor in the banal and cliché-ridden historical judgments, nor in the lame, tired narrative style . . . he’s put very little work into writing it and even less thought.”

Wilson attempted to defend his book in the same journal, but was refuted, point by point, by Evans. In a subsequent issue, Wilson attempted to turn the course of the debate by concluding, “Thanks, Evans, for pointing these errors out, though they were all minor. I am writing this from Roxburghshire, where I am staying with some delightful friends and the sun is shining and pied wagtails are dancing over the lawn. All is joy. The war is over. Hitler is dead. Get a life, poor Evans. There is no need to be so cross.” Evans responded with an even more detailed criticism of Wilson’s book. This review will not recapitulate the long list of factual errors that Evans catalogued, but it does uphold his judgment on the quality of Wilson’s work.

Wilson’s aim of producing a useful short biography of Hitler is a laudable one. A brief biography that is reliable and grounded in the corpus of historical research would be a boon to teachers and generalists trying to grapple with the phenomenon of Hitler. Unfortunately, Wilson does not succeed in providing such a resource.

Wilson’s problems with interpreting important historical events stem primarily from his lack of familiarity with the basic German and English sources that discuss historical problems on a substantive level. In many cases his judgments seem visceral rather than analytical. For example, he does not appear to understand either the economic or the political aspects surrounding the legal French occupation of the Ruhr in 1923. Historians have discussed the complexities of this crisis in detail, yet Wilson erroneously writes: “With the paralysis, or effectual confiscation, of German means of production, there was even less chance of meeting the cruel French demands for payment” (37). He often states his unsubstantiated opinions categorically, as if no refutation of them was imaginable: e.g., “Japan was an ally of Hitler, but he never really saw how it could be useful to him” (145). Surely, Wilson must realize that Hitler at least understood the usefulness of Japan’s world-class navy.

Perhaps the most unfortunate aspect of Wilson’s work is its unprofessional documentation. His endnotes contain almost no primary sources, and many of his citations are irresponsibly incomplete. At times he attributes offensive opinions to individuals without documenting his source. For example, Wilson includes no citation after the following observation: “Indeed, when being interviewed in 1968 by the journalist Colin Cross, Sir Horace [Wilson] confessed that he could understand Hitler’s feelings about the Jews. ‘Have you ever met a Jew you liked?’ asked Sir Horace” (118).

Similarly, Wilson cites journal and magazine articles without including their authors and/or titles, sometimes even when he attributes a quote to a specific individual or to a group of people. To illustrate, Wilson cites comments made by Hitler’s World War I comrades that characterize him as a “strange bird” and adds that they “mocked his physical incompetence” (18). The endnote supposedly documenting these observations not only omits the names and units of the men but also does not include the author of the article or its title. It reads, “Guardian, 20 August 2010” (191). This sort of negligent documentation—citations that

3. Although Wilson includes a few German sources in his endnotes, almost all of them are available in English editions.
would be unacceptable in an undergraduate term paper—is scattered throughout Wilson’s book.

Finally, Wilson’s prose is replete with arch, mean-spirited comments. Especially inappropriate are his derogatory observations concerning several individuals’ personal appearance. He writes, “There was Julius Streicher, whose shaven head was an ugly pink sea urchin,” and characterizes Josef Goebbels as an “extraordinarily unpleasant person who physically resembled Nosferatu the Vampire of film legend” (38, 53). In additional verbal sniping at Goebbels, Wilson writes, “The fact that he was only five foot in height4 did not deflect his energy as a determined amorist,” or that saving lives was “not a consideration which seems to have worried Joseph Goebbels as he limped about on his club foot and called for more and more Jews to be slaughtered” (54, 141).

Although Wilson’s book is replete with errors and misinterpretations, it does contain some flashes of insight. He cogently analyzes both Hitler’s ability to manipulate crowds, and his understanding of the importance of the spoken word (26). He also has an uncanny ability to reduce political analysis to what amounts to an academic sound bite that illuminates while it illustrates: e.g., “To all these people Hitler offered the most tempting of Class A narcotics, that is, Hope” (36). Nonetheless, despite these interesting observations, the book fails on almost all scholarly levels.

A. N. Wilson’s *Hitler* may not be the worst biography of Hitler ever written, but it certainly is a contender for that title.

*Middle Tennessee State University*  
Nancy E. Rupprecht

---

*Pope and Devil: The Vatican’s Archives and the Third Reich*. By Hubert Wolf.  

The relationship between the Vatican and the Third Reich remains one of the twentieth century’s enduring controversies. Publications on the subject can end up in one of two camps: apologetic or accusatory. While on the one hand, some historians have portrayed the Vatican as a bulwark against the racialist Nazi state, on the other hand, many have painted Rome as, at the very least, inattentive to the abuses of the Third Reich, particularly against the Jews. In effect, the former position limits moral liability while the latter accentuates it. Into this polemic mix comes Hubert Wolf’s *Pope and Devil*.

---

4. Most sources estimate Goebbels’ height at 5’4” to 5’5”.
One of Wolf’s strengths is his familiarity with the primary documents that have become available since 2003. Utilizing these papers, which cover the period 1922–1939, Wolf explores the Vatican’s assessments of the German state and the evolving discussion amongst the most important Vatican personalities on German affairs. He arranges his chapters chronologically: the early Vatican prescriptions for Germany [1917–1929]; the battle in the Vatican over anti-Semitism [1928]; the Reichskonkordat [1930–1933]; the Roman Curia and the persecution of the Jews [1933–1939]; and finally, the Catholic worldview and Nazi ideology [1933–1939]. The central figure in the narrative is Eugenio Maria Giuseppe Giovanni Pacelli, the future Pope Pius XII.

A central thesis of Pope and Devil is that Pacelli’s experience as the papacy’s de facto nuncio for Germany between 1917 and 1929 greatly influenced his attitudes and actions towards the Hitler Reich in the post-1933 era. For example, the earlier Kulturkampf of Otto von Bismarck was still widely recalled with fear by German Catholics in the 1920s, since large numbers had been deprived of pastoral care and the sacraments. Wolf hints that Pacelli and the Vatican’s subsequent unwillingness to confront Hitler directly on issues, such as anti-Semitism, was due to their overriding duty towards the German flock and a desire to avoid another Kulturkampf.

In all of this, it is the tension between the Vatican’s pastoral care responsibilities in Germany and calls for strident confrontation with Nazism that weaves its way through the story. Though the vantage point of retrospect, Vatican responses to National Socialist policies might suggest accommodation or even complicity, context is everything. Wolf is no apologist, but he does have a knack for the complexities of the situation at the time and getting into the minds of the participants. Although this in no way exonerates the Vatican, it does open the way for a more believable reading of the past. For this, Pope and Devil is to be applauded.

Wolf’s contribution to the discussion is that he brings solid analysis to a wealth of newly released documents. Along the way, he introduces the reader to a series of mostly engaging individuals who were thrust to the forefront of events during one of history’s darkest hours. Yet work remains to be done on the period 1939–1945. This may be why the concluding chapter of Pope and Devil does not contain a full summary of the book’s contents or a strong conclusion. Rather, Wolf leaves the door open for another volume to complete the tale.

Massey University

Adam Claasen

This study is a fascinating piece of social and cultural history that examines the development of modern concepts of childhood and innocence within the context of jurisprudence and with attention to evolving social and cultural sensibilities. For most of human history, the use of children for sexual gratification was recommended by some segments of the medical community as the antidote to all manner of male sexual dysfunction. Libertines like Casanova and the Marquis de Sade bragged openly and proudly of their sexual exploits, many of which involved the degradation and abuse of children. But, as Larry Wolff points out, by the late eighteenth century there was a growing discomfort with the notion of childhood sexuality, even if modern notions of abuse had yet to evolve. Wolff painstakingly reconstructs the story of how eight-year-old Paolina Lozaro came to be in the bedroom of sixty-year-old Gaetano Franceschini and how, ultimately, the affair came before the Venetian Bestemmia. The author unravels the Bestemmia’s dilemma in dealing with the case given that having sex with a child was not, technically speaking, a criminal offense.

The case of Paolina and Franceschini is significant precisely because it occurred at the intersection where old views of sexual license and new libertine conceptions were coming into conflict with modern notions of childhood and new appreciation and respect for the fundamental innocence of children. Just about everyone involved in the case—from the mother who claimed she was providing a future for her child, to the housekeeper who was all too familiar with Franceschini’s sexual appetite, to the priest who cautioned Maria Lozaro not to hand her child over to Franceschini—knew that there was something not quite right about Franceschini’s sexual interest in the young girl. And yet, the legal system as it existed at the time had no authority to charge Franceschini with a crime against Paolina specifically. He was charged with causing a “scandal,” the closest the Bestemmia could come to labeling child sexual abuse a crime without having the authority to do so explicitly.

Though Franceschini might have identified with Casanova and the Marquis de Sade, his community and, indeed, the broader society were less forgiving of the idea of an older man seeking sexual gratification from a child. While Casanova and the Marquis de Sade flaunted the sexual exploits that involved young children, Rousseau’s shifting attitudes toward children and childhood reflected the problematic nature of “Paolina’s innocence” in late eighteenth-century Europe. Rousseau initially admitted to sexual attraction to girls on the verge of puberty but, as he pondered the nature of childhood and began to see childhood and
innocence as intrinsically linked, he saw the error of his ways. It was this equation of childhood with innocence that caused such concern in the case of Paolina Lozaro.

Wolff deftly weaves together the various facets of Paolina and Franceschini’s story to show the intersection of culture, religion, jurisprudence, and changing sensibilities around questions of innocence and childhood. This book makes a valuable contribution to the history of childhood but also offers critical insight into changing social, cultural, and legal attitudes as Europe transitioned into its modern phase.

University of Arkansas at Little Rock

Moira J. Maguire


This new edited volume on the life and works of Mary Wollstonecraft [1759–1797] is a welcome addition to Ashgate’s International Library of Essays in the History of Social and Political Thought. This important series gathers scholarship, old and new, on a leading theorist (as, for example, Aristotle, Hegel, or Habermas) in one volume. Wollstonecraft is the second woman to be so honored—following Hannah Arendt. She is eminently worthy of such a distinction and has been increasingly recognized, especially by second-wave feminists, as a major figure of both the Enlightenment and the Romantic Movement.

Wollstonecraft’s Vindication of the Rights of Woman [1792] has long been seen as a cornerstone document in modern feminist theory. But there is much more to Wollstonecraft than her defense of the French Revolution and feminist response to Edmund Burke’s romanticism in both the Rights of Woman and her earlier Vindication of the Rights of Man [1790]. She was also the author of two “experimental fictions,” as Jane Moore terms them: Mary: A Fiction [1788] and Maria, or, The Wrongs of Woman, (published by William Godwin in 1798 after Wollstonecraft’s death), both of which are now seen as significant signposts in the history of the English novel (xiii). Wollstonecraft also wrote on the education of women, on manners, and on moral conduct, and she published translations in addition to a self-revelatory travel account of Scandinavia and numerous literary reviews. In short, she was a political and social theorist, a novelist, a feminist, a humanist, a philosopher, and a deeply religious writer as well. When Janet Todd and Marilyn Butler published her entire corpus in 1989, her writings filled seven volumes.
The strength of this collection lies in its wide-ranging selection of scholarship on Wollstonecraft, covering all areas of her life and work—from her personal letters to her thoughts on slavery to her tragic death in childbirth. It also illuminates the evolution of Wollstonecraft’s reputation, brought to a nadir by Godwin’s publications of her “memoirs”—complete with the stories of her affairs, child out of wedlock, and suicide attempts—and its slow revival at the pens of no less than George Eliot, Emma Goldman, and Virginia Woolf. There are some truly outstanding works of scholarship here, including two by Regina Janes: firstly, her 1978 piece on the reception of *Vindication*, which squarely places it in its historical context, explaining just why *Vindication* was so favorably received when it first appeared and why it has continued to influence feminist discourse; and secondly, her brilliant comparison of Wollstonecraft and Mary Astell [1666–1731], who anticipated so many of Wollstonecraft’s ideas on female education. There is also a very fine piece by Janet Todd that speaks to Wollstonecraft’s rhetorical strategies and Romanticism in her *Letters Written in Sweden, Norway, and Denmark* [1796], and there are others such as those by Vivian Jones, Mary Poovey, Barbara Taylor, and Moira Ferguson. This reviewer’s one critique of this volume is simply that the font size of each selection differs, and some are very tiny and difficult to read. This also gives the collection the appearance of being bound together “on the cheap,” as it were. Nonetheless, students of Mary Wollstonecraft will find this an invaluable resource.

*Purdue University*

Melinda S. Zook

**GENERAL, COMPARATIVE, HISTORIOGRAPHICAL**


For students of anarchism, this rich dual biography of Alexander Berkman and Emma Goldman offers an opportunity to hear once more the unmatched scholarly voice of Paul Avrich. Before his death in 2006, Avrich was a professor at Queens College and the foremost authority on anarchism in the United States. After his death, his daughter, Karen Avrich, took up the task of completing the book. The result is a fascinating account of a half century of anarchist activism wound around the spindle of two unique, intertwined lives.
One of the book’s great strengths is the inclusion of Berkman on equal grounds with Goldman. Berkman was a talented writer and a skilled organizer; hopefully, this book will encourage other scholars to explore Berkman’s contributions to the global anarchist movement. The early chapters are particularly rich in detail of Berkman’s attempted *attentat* (political assassination) of Henry Clay Frick. The book explores the relations among the small group who planned the unsuccessful action, Berkman’s trial and imprisonment, and the subsequent legacy of Berkman’s act for the movement.

Ms. Avrich does not exaggerate when she notes, “the scope and depth of my father’s scholarly effort is nothing short of extraordinary” (ix). This is a work of towering scholarship, based on Paul Avrich’s decades of interviews and intimate knowledge of key archives—notably the International Institute of Social History in Amsterdam, the Labadie Collection at the University of Michigan, and the Tamiment Collection at New York University—although unaccountably little use is made of the rich collection and multivolume publications of the Emma Goldman Papers Project at Berkeley. The radical and popular press of the time are thoroughly plumbed. This thoroughness allows the authors to follow up on the subsequent lives of individuals who move across Berkman and Goldman’s stage, allowing readers the satisfaction of learning their fates.

A further strength of the book is its attention to the rise of fascism. Despite the prohibition on “political” speeches during her lecture tour in the United States in 1934, Goldman warned American audiences about the imminent danger of fascism. She similarly sounded the alarm in Canada, England, and Europe. Both Berkman and Goldman felt war coming in the 1930s, and they consistently linked the death and destruction under the Bolshevik regime to that unleashed by Hitler, Mussolini, and Franco.

As the book progresses, key situations are compressed. The anarchists’ time in Russia and Europe and Goldman’s work in Spain are slighted. Sometimes an account of events replaces an analysis of the political thinking that Goldman and Berkman brought to those events; for example, readers learn about the anticonscription movement but little about the anarchists’ succinct analyses of war’s relation to capitalism, religion, family life, and empire. Overall, this is an engaging and satisfying book that will interest both seasoned scholars and new students of anarchism.

*University of Hawai‘i*  
Kathy E. Ferguson
This book represents a pendant to Philip Bell’s recent *Twelve Turning Points of the Second World War*. Like that volume, Ian F. W. Beckett’s is addressed to the general reader. It seeks not only to identify prominent “key moments” in the First World War but also to provoke debate by highlighting “less familiar episodes that also changed the course of history in the shorter or longer term” (2–3). Twelve such moments are the topics of the essays that make up the book. The emphasis falls on military, diplomatic, and political developments in which the “impact of personality and contingency” is most marked (7). These episodes include the flooding of the Yser River in October 1914, Turkish entry into the war several days later, the landing of Australian troops at Gallipoli, Lloyd George’s appointment to the Ministry of Munitions, the death of Emperor Francis Joseph, the German declaration of unrestricted submarine warfare, the abdication of the tsar, the strategic air raid on London of June 1917, the Balfour Declaration, the announcement of the Fourteen Points, and the German Lys offensive in April 1918. As a “cultural turning point,” another essay portrays the first public screening of the British film *The Battle of the Somme*.

Each of the essays is a nicely crafted exploration of the broader context of the episode in question. The essay on the bombing of London thus examines problems of strategic air war; the essay on the tsar’s abdication is set within the wider Russian history of the war; and the piece on the German offensive in 1918 recounts the challenges faced by the German high command throughout the conflict. Personalities, often characterized in gratuitous detail, play prominent roles in these accounts. The figure of Lloyd George, a man of “blue eyes, long hair, almost hypnotic charm and indiscreet conversation,” functions as the key to British industry’s mobilization for war (76). Mark Sykes, who is featured in the essay on Zionism that revolves around the Balfour Declaration, was an “ebullient figure with a creative mind” and “a gifted mimic and cartoonist” (187).

Emphasizing the role of personalities in this way may well promote the accessibility of the essays for the general reader, but it also underlines their limitations. The essays are largely self-contained, so questions of transnational comparison remain unexplored. Also unexplored is the issue of what constitutes a “turning point,” despite a gesture in this direction in a brief conclusion. In his own defense, the author professes his distaste for counterfactual history, but there is no way around hypothetical alternatives in a book like this. In what sense did things “turn”? The proposition that flooding the Yser was a turning point implies that
the German offensive in Flanders would otherwise have succeeded. The death of the Austrian emperor in 1916 could only have been a turning point on the (dubious) supposition that, as Beckett writes, Francis Joseph “may have succeeded in forging peace with Russia” (119). To be fair, Beckett’s approach raises a host of interesting historical questions, and, for this reason, the book will likely provoke the debate that is its goal.

Georgetown University (Emeritus)

Roger Chickering


The apparent eccentricity of Isaac Newton’s nonscientific interests never seems to lose its fascination for the modern observer. And yet Newton’s posthumously published Chronology of Ancient Kingdoms Amended [1728] was taken very seriously by eighteenth-century scholars, not least because he shortened the establishment of Greek and Egyptian civilization by more than five hundred years. Newton and the Origin of Civilization tells the story of Newton’s extensive research into ancient chronology and its controversial reception. Comparing his unpublished manuscripts from over half a century of chronological travail to the works of his contemporaries, Jed Z. Buchwald and Mordechai Feingold argue that Newton’s system “differed programmatically from [that of] his predecessors” both in the priority given to astronomy and its use of “the same evidentiary and argumentative structure deployed in his science” (11).

The authors first establish Newton’s unique scientific method. Newton’s contemporaries, such as Hooke and Huygens, were also concerned with the errors involved in experiment. They, however, took the single best measurement from a given set, seeking the most precise and skillful observation, which therefore came closest to the true value. In contrast, Newton, aware of the limits inherent in measurement, took the mean, or average, of multiple discrepant values. Additionally, in certain experimental conditions, he manipulated data to fit a working hypothesis, which itself could be further calibrated by experiment and observation. The authors label this practice “the Newtonian style,” drawing on earlier work by I. Bernard Cohen and George Smith, although their description may have benefited from more detailed and accessible examples of how Newton used working hypotheses in his experimental program (105).

Nonetheless, Buchwald and Feingold provide ample evidence for Newton’s similar reworking of ancient history. In his growing skepticism towards verbal
testimony, he employed an elaborate scheme to extract numerical data from unreliable ancient texts, which could then be averaged for greater accuracy and manipulated to fit his working hypothesis of contracted history. Newton determined that rates of population growth could not allow the expansion into vast empires described by Egyptian and Greek historians within the amount of time proscribed by a literal reading of the genealogies of Genesis. Hence, given his assumption that scripture remained reliable, the ancient records must have been corrupted and smaller kingdoms only amalgamated into empires—the origin of civilization—late in history, around the time of Solomon. To prove this, Newton turned to ancient astronomical observations. He attempted to identify which section of a given constellation corresponded to a textual description and, using the known rate of the equinoctial precession, calculated backwards to obtain the exact date of the observation. In the process, Newton maintained his working hypothesis by selecting specific stars, which yielded later dates through an intuitive manipulation of ancient texts, contemporary star charts, and astronomical records. This scientific approach to history created no small amount of controversy, both in England and the continent, to which the authors devote the entire final third of the book.

The authors present a well-crafted argument in an accessible yet scholarly style, adding proof, in an often-neglected area of Newtonian studies, to the claim that Newton’s “eccentric” interests were connected to his scientific pursuits. This book will add value to any informed discussion of the contextual nature of the history of science.

*Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science and Technology, University of Toronto*


*Six Months in 1945* is the final book in Michael Dobbs’s “Cold War Trilogy.” The previous two installments, *One Minute to Midnight* and *Down with Big Brother*, dealt with the Cuban Missile Crisis and the collapse of the Soviet Union. Dobbs concludes his trilogy with the book under review, which is concerned with the origins of the Cold War during the final days of World War Two. The “six months” in question consist of the period beginning with the Yalta Conference in February 1945 and concluding with the Soviet entry into the war against Japan.
during the following August. The resulting narrative is a fine example of popular history.

Part 1 of the book, “The Best I Could Do,” is concerned with the Yalta Conference during the second month of 1945. Dobbs opens with an account of President Franklin Roosevelt’s long journey to the Crimea, where he met his Soviet and British counterparts, Joseph Stalin and Winston Churchill. Dobbs emphasizes the fact that the American president was very ill, even before his long journey, and as a result, Roosevelt was not at the top of his game when dealing with the Soviet dictator, and Churchill’s penchant for long-winded speeches did not help matters. In the end, however, the president’s willingness to compromise with Stalin was the product of two important factors. First, Roosevelt recognized that the Soviets had conquered Eastern Europe and, as a result, could do what they wanted there. Second, FDR wanted to get the Soviets into the war with Japan and thereby save thousands of American lives. These two circumstances weakened Roosevelt’s hand, making him more willing to compromise on issues such as postwar Poland and the territorial settlement following the defeat of Japan.

Part 2 of the book, “An Iron Curtain is Drawn Down,” deals with Soviet policies in Eastern Europe during the final months of the war. Dobbs points out that the Soviets had legitimate grievances against the Polish Home Army, which continued to harass the Red Army after it had conquered Poland. On the other hand, Soviet policies in Warsaw were often inexcusable, increasing the tensions between the Russians and their Western allies. Dobbs’s section on Romania under the Soviet occupation—a topic often overlooked in accounts of the origins of the Cold War—is especially interesting.

The final section of the book, “A Peace that is No Peace,” concentrates upon the Potsdam Conference and the decision to use nuclear weapons against Japan. Dobbs makes it clear that, in effect, the Cold War was already underway by this point, and the only thing that prevented a more openly hostile atmosphere among the three allies was wishful thinking on the part of their leaders. By the summer of 1945, the interests of the Western allies and the often-legitimate concerns of the Soviet Union were in conflict, and even the founding of the United Nations could not stop the onset of a cold war in Europe.

Nothing that Dobbs has to say will surprise scholarly readers. Indeed, all of Dobbs’s interpretations are very much in keeping with the standard postrevisionist historiography concerning the origins of the Cold War. Further, his total reliance upon published sources available in English assures that Dobbs’s narrative contributes no novel factual information. Six Months in
1945, however, is not written for experts. The popular audience for whom the book is written will undoubtedly find it a fascinating, well-written account of the origins of the defining political event of the second half of the twentieth century.

*Jacksonville State University*  
Rusell Lemmons


This study is a history of human use and occupation of seacoasts with special emphasis on Europe and the Northeast United States. Written by an acclaimed historian, this book traces *Homo sapiens* from Eden to high-rise condominiums built at the water’s edge. As a coastal scientist who specializes in beach research, this reviewer learned quite a bit from reading this book and recommends it to anyone who is interested in coastal areas and the evolution of our relationship with seacoasts.

*The Human Shore* consists of six chapters and concluding comments about how to live with coasts. This reviewer found the early chapters more difficult to navigate with the latter chapters easier to read and more suited to his interest. John Gillis makes the point that the sea has long been considered an alien and dangerous environment in Western culture, with Noah’s flood being a prime example.

Gillis does an excellent job of portraying the people’s evolving relationship with the shore and their eventual love affair with beaches, which was the last part of the shore to be settled. Although his history is sound, the coastal science is not exact. For instance, he cites on page 173 the damming of rivers for beach erosion, which is a problem along the California coast, but rarely a factor along the US East and Gulf barrier island coasts. Here the sediments are naturally deposited and trapped in bays and estuaries so that sand and other coarse-grained material never reach the outer coast.

Gillis also states that it is well known that “restored beaches are twice as likely to erode as those that are left alone.” Therefore, it follows that nourishing beaches are doomed. Actually, the sand obtained from offshore is usually coarser than the native sand and hence less erodible. The real question involving beach nourishment is the issue of who profits and who pays because the lion’s share of the cost of restoring beaches is borne by the American taxpayers as a whole, most of whom will never visit those beaches.
The concluding chapter in *The Human Shore* presents an overview of the beach development, but does not provide scientific clarity as all beaches are not alike. Superstorm Sandy graphically illustrated that wooden houses built at ground level can be easily swept away by the large waves riding on a ten- to thirteen-foot storm surge. If Sandy had made landfall in south Florida, it would have largely been a nonevent because most beachfront houses are well fortified against hurricane-force winds and are elevated above the surge level. In addition, the storm surge would have been much lower because the shoreline is straight in contrast to the juncture of the New York and New Jersey seacoasts, which form a funnel so that water is bunched up and rises higher, just like the normal tide entering the Bay of Fundy in Canada increases several fold as it travels upstream.

*Florida International University*  
Stephen P. Leatherman

*Brothers Born of One Mother: British-Native American Relations in the Colonial Southeast.* By Michelle LeMaster. (Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press, 2013. Pp. x, 292. $39.50.)

Covering the era from the Yamasee War to c. 1770, the author of this study illustrates the centrality of perceived notions of masculinity and femininity in negotiations of Indians and British leaders (and civilians). In separate chapters, Michelle LeMaster addresses gendered approaches in maintaining and establishing peace, conducting war and trade, and managing interracial relations. General commonalities among expectations of manliness and gendered metaphors used by British and native negotiators facilitated communication. What complicated matters, she emphasizes, were the important differences and distinctions missed or misunderstood by both parties. The “father” and “brother” fictive kinship ties, for example, elicited slightly different expectations; the British assumed Cherokees (or Creeks) accepting the label of “brother” to the British indicated submission to the king, their now-shared fictive father. For natives, older brothers/fathers had obligations to provide for younger siblings/sons, and although sons showed loyalty to fathers, they did not necessarily obey them. Both would be disappointed at times, LeMaster demonstrates, and the miscommunication in what *seemed* to be the same language of metaphors aggravated tensions and stymied negotiations.

LeMaster also analyzes the gendered rhetoric regarding interracial unions and the gendered performances in trade, but, as those topics are less original, the strongest chapters are those on warfare and diplomacy. Words exchanged before
and during warfare not surprisingly came through gendered rhetoric from both warrior societies. Yet, as LeMaster aptly argues, even here there was little agreement on what constituted proper martial behavior. For the British, the Indian mode of warfare relying on surprise and small-scale tactics was not valiant, manly, or civilized, and the same was true of attacking civilians or having women participate in the ritual torturing of POWs. Conversely, the British awarding class-based commissions and their failure properly to endure Indian torture rituals reduced them to the level of “old women” (64). As the author reveals, both praise and condemnation of one’s manliness was a “regular part of . . . diplomacy” on both sides (77).

A central component of British-Indian diplomacy, LeMaster convincingly argues, was the manipulation of familial obligations, namely that warriors/men were expected to protect women and children. The French and Indian War, she argues, marks a turning point in British rhetoric in this regard: First, the midcentury British remarks on European casualties sustained in Indian attacks began to emphasize the helplessness of the female and juvenile victims (whereas early reports contained only numbers) and, second, the emergence of British paternalism reflected in their rhetoric of Indians’ failure properly to protect families. That perceived failure compelled the British to insert themselves as “defender[s] of Indian women and children” as the king (as the “father”) would for all dependents (111).

LeMaster tackles a complex project, and she generally does it justice. However, one weakness at times is the greater depth of analysis on Indians in a study that addresses the gendered rhetoric of both societies (e.g., during her discussion of British women during diplomatic meetings). Her analysis of southeastern Indian cultures and societies is astute, but when it comes to acculturation she occasionally marginalizes their agency, which she implicitly tries to assert; acculturation was not always forced on Indian peoples. The only other criticism is the relegation of the highly useful maps to the appendix. Regardless, LeMaster offers an intriguing analysis that historians and students will find approachable and useful.

Randolph-Macon College

Mathias D. Bergmann


This book offers a concise cultural history of neon that emphasizes its “force as a metaphor” in the story of modernity (20). Because neon can be interpreted in
different ways and has figured in both “fantasies and nightmares,” the book could have been titled “Ambiguous Light” to capture its theme (19). The original title in German was Flackernde Moderne: Die Geschichte des Neonlichts. According to some cultural critics, “[i]n the era of artificial lighting and illuminated signs the city was becoming more and more superficial and theatrical, clamouring for more and more effects” (8). But another point of view maintains that “the history of neon stands out against the overly pessimistic story of the ongoing dematerialization of our cities and the virtualization of our everyday life” (10). From this perspective, neon becomes “an emblem of the true city, of craft and of visible and tangible materiality” (132).

That neon can be perceived in contradictory ways is illustrated by the story of Georges Claude, “the father . . . of the neon light” (40). William Ramsay discovered neon, but it was Claude who realized its potential for advertising and made it commercially feasible. The firm of Claude Neon sought to monopolize the industry by selling its patented electrode to franchises worldwide. Claude Neon also produced a magazine, Claude Neon News, that enabled the “French Edison” to construct “his own quasi-religious company mythology” (39, 41). Claude’s biography supports theorists who correlate the success of neon with global capitalism or the “society of the spectacle” (8). But Christoph Ribbat reminds readers that neon was also a boon to small businesses, added color to small towns, and developed into a craft. Although neon symbolized democracy for many people during the 1930s, it was also widely used in fascist Italy and Germany. Indeed Georges Claude became a right-wing politician and collaborated with the Nazis.

By the late 1940s, neon had lost its glamour and became “a metaphor for the rusting, declining city” (68). Only the “neon oasis” of Las Vegas contradicted this trend (11). What no longer worked for advertising continued to work for art. Novelists, poets, artists, film directors, and song writers found neon inspiring or meaningful. Ribbat discusses many of them. There are omissions, as he would be the first to admit.

Ribbat has not always been well served by his editors. Neon was not “introduced to literature in 1947 by the novelist Nelson Algren in The Neon Wilderness” (15). The context of this misstatement suggests that the author intended to say that Algren introduced neon to the title of literature. The publisher’s publicity release for this book states: “Without neon, Las Vegas might still be a sleepy desert town in Nevada and Times Square merely another busy intersection in New York City.” Ribbat knows that incandescence, not neon, transformed Times Square into a place famous for its lights.
This book will appeal to anyone with a flicker of interest in neon. “‘Unsuccessful neon’ . . . shines out over this study,” the author writes, quoting from a poem about childhood memories of a liquor store (21). Ribbat might not realize that the poet was probably alluding to Muriel Rukeyser’s line: “The arrow’s electric red always reaches its mark,/successful neon!” Granting the author his metaphor, his book usually reaches its mark.

Central Michigan University

William Brevda