Agency has long been a central concern of historians of Africa. Past studies of agricultural innovations, labor unrest, and “informal” trade have allowed us to see African peoples not as passive economic actors but as empowered producers who pursued their own aims amid the imposition of exploitative colonial economies. Few studies, however, have examined African consumerism or the ways in which the creation of African consumer cultures was more than a byproduct of colonial or global capitalism. In *Market Encounters: Consumer Cultures in Twentieth-Century Ghana*, Bianca Murillo offers a stimulating corrective to this imbalance. Presented as an “attempt to explore the multitude of relationships that shaped Ghana’s economic reality and structured capitalist exchange” in the British colony of the Gold Coast turned independent nation of Ghana (1957), her book deploys archival and oral sources to explore “the complex social terrains that made the buying and selling of goods in modern Ghana possible” (6). Proposing an African-centered rethinking of consumption studies—a field focused predominantly on consumer choice, demand, and desire—Murillo argues that Ghana’s consumer culture was driven not by things, but by social relationships and everyday contests over access to goods, distribution channels, and commercial spaces. The result is a rich foray into how social interactions, local beliefs, and public sentiment influenced twentieth-century Ghanaians’ experiences with the global market.

Comprised of five crisply-written chapters that progress chronologically but focus on individual case studies, as well as a brief afterword, *Market Encounters* is noteworthy for being one of the first book-length histories of African consumer culture. But the book warrants wide attention for other reasons. One is Murillo’s use of consumer politics as an analytical tool for “peel[ing] back complex layers of meaning” behind wider historical events (163). The fruits of her approach are obvious in her discussions of the creation of the colonial economy (chapters 1–2) and the shifting (and oftentimes disastrous) economic ideologies that followed independence (chapters 3–5), which she recasts not as mere top-down initiatives, but as processes influenced by ordinary Ghanaian men and women. But her analytical tack proves equally insightful about political matters, unveiling how public concerns about economic injustice and the ethics of accumulation were formative to the 1948 Accra Riots and the 1966 military coup that overthrew Kwame Nkrumah. Attending to consumer politics, she reveals, can do much to enrich
our general understanding of modern Africa. Another of Murillo’s innovative methods is her work in corporate archives: repositories that she insists have “untapped” potential for social and cultural history (22). Showing that corporate records can be used to interrogate on-the-ground power struggles as well as racial and gendered tensions, she provides historians with a new means of uncovering colonial and post-colonial histories, particularly for time periods and places for which few official archival records currently exist.

All told, Market Encounters is a highly informative and thought-provoking book that admirably probes the intersections of social worlds and economic processes. It deserves careful attention from students and scholars alike.

Wake Forest University

Nate Plageman


The siege of Acre was the most significant military engagement of the Third Crusade (1189–1192). Hailed by a contemporary as the equal of the famous siege of Troy, it drew warriors from across Europe and the Muslim world. Following its capture by Saladin in the wake of his victory at Hattin in July 1187, Acre was besieged by the combined forces of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem and crusaders from Europe for almost two years, while the besiegers themselves were besieged by the forces of Saladin.

Many contemporaries of the siege of Acre and of the Third Crusade, both Christian and Muslim, wrote at length about these events. Yet none of these writers were eyewitnesses of the whole crusade and all of them wrote with their own axe to grind, each promoting the interests of one of the many military leaders and explaining his failures by blaming other persons or factors. John D. Hosler has successfully combined the myriad conflicting accounts to create a clear narrative of the siege.

Starting from Saladin’s capture of Acre in July 1187, Hosler explains the course of events, analyses the strategies of Saladin and of the crusade leaders, and offers coherent accounts of the battles and other military engagements that took place during the siege. He also sets out a balanced account of events after Acre’s surrender in July 1191 and King Richard of England’s execution of the city’s Muslim military garrison, arguing that both Saladin and Richard violated the terms of the surrender treaty. He considers the contribution of the various
military leaders to the siege and concludes that Saladin’s failure “was mostly of his own making” (164), King Richard played an important role but the additional troops he brought to the siege were more crucial (168), and King Philip of France’s contribution was greater than contemporaries and most modern scholars have admitted (170).

This is an accessible, balanced, and clearly written account of one of the most famous sieges of western history. Non-specialists might have appreciated an additional plan of the city of Acre with its port to show the position of the crusaders’ and Saladin’s army, and some diagrams of the siege engines and equipment: For example, not all readers will know what a “Welsh cat” looks like. Nevertheless, this an excellent starting point for anyone interested in the Crusades, as well as providing a valuable overview for those already familiar with the Third Crusade. Future historians of the Third Crusade will be indebted to John Hosler for making these events so clear.

Cardiff University
Helen J. Nicholson


The false and hostile understandings of European scholars on Islam began to change by the mid-seventeenth century, thanks to the constant efforts of philologists, linguists, theologians, bibliophiles, and others who emphasized the importance of studying the religion in order to understand Christianity better. In the well-researched book Arabic Republic of Letters, Alexander Bevilacqua argues that the European scholars of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries took massive efforts to portray Islam more accurately and without bias. Through their extensive efforts to form oriental libraries by collecting manuscripts from Istanbul and other parts of the Ottoman Empire for royal and private collections, and to study and translate the texts through their erudite knowledge of Arabic, Persian, and/or Turkish, they gradually changed the ways in which Islam was perceived and analyzed in Europe. They constituted the republic of Arabic letters, “a working community of scholars of different languages, political affiliations, and traditions of belief” with shared interests in Arabic and Islam (3).

This Republic constantly utilized analogical and humanistic interpretative mechanisms to normalize Islam as a religion that needs to be studied with fair-mindedness. Their discourses influenced each other, across confessional lines of
Protestants and Catholics, even though heated debates and disagreements ruled the
everyday writings. In the period of Enlightenment, the differences, rather than anal-
ogies, mattered the most in the course of analyses of such towering figurers as Vol-
taire and Gibbon, but they exclusively depended on the previous generations of
scholars who had built the foundational structure for a philosophical enquiry.

This book is a great piece of work as each chapter displays the erudition and
depth of the author’s knowledge in several languages and deep familiarity with
diverse primary sources. His extensive archival research in many different coun-
tries for several rare or unpublished materials equates him to some of the figures
in his own study, who also had to navigate through manuscripts that were written
in as many as languages and kept all over Europe and beyond.

However, the book has three major de
cicits. First, it does not pay suf
cient attention to the colonial background of the knowledge accumulation and dissemination
that was already under way in the early seventeenth century, if not earlier, which
facilitated the Islam-related discourses in Europe. Second, the work is largely
focused on the Middle East alone (or more precisely on the Ottoman Empire and
its connectedness with the European republic of Arabic letters), despite the facts
that (a) many of his subjects such as Reland and d’Hoberlot were pioneers in
exploring Islam and its faiths and practices beyond central Islamic lands, and
(b) Arabic was an important language for Muslim intellectual engagements not only
in the Middle East but also in Africa and South and Southeast Asia. Thirdly, the
book strips off recurrent anti-Islamic, if not Islamophobic, sentiments expressed by
the authors under discussion in order to justify their arguments in normalizing
Islam. Many of them believed in the ideality of historical Muslim figures despite
their Muslim identity, as they generally thought that Muslims would not be able to
become ideal figures because of their affiliation with the ‘false religion’ (for a quick
example, consider Renaudot’s treatment of Saladin, 148–9). The author’s frequent
attempt to underestimate their anti-Islamic expressions, which do not differ much
from the generalist statements in the previous centuries, stands as an apologia for
the good intentions embedded in bad expressions. Even more problematic is the
book’s epilogue, in which the author presents a stereotypical argument of ‘decline’
in the late-eighteenth century, while forgetting the fact that the latter part of the
century witnessed the most candid episodes of European intellectual and juridical
encounters with Islam and Muslims.

Notwithstanding these issues, the book is an impressive opus that presents the
European intellectual history of the seventeenth and eighteenth century very
comprehensively and coherently. It will be a valuable read for anyone interested
in the disciplinary histories of Islamic Studies, Arabic Studies, and Middle Eastern Studies as well as in early modern European history in general.

Leiden University, The Netherlands

Mahmood Kooria

The Americas


This powerful, eminently readable work provides a long-needed Indigenous view of one of the most significant wars in American history. Brooks focuses on two Native leaders who are usually given light treatment: Weetamoo, the Pocasset saunkskwa whose territory lay between Plymouth and Rhode Island; and Wawaus, the Nipmuc Christian who gained the name James Printer with his Harvard education and work printing Bibles and other works at the college. The author begins by tracing the social, economic, cultural, and political worlds that the two faced in the decades after the English colonists had become powerful presences in the region. She explores their critical kinship networks, gender roles, and the physical environments that shaped and connected the coastal Pocasset and inland Nipmuc communities, and the way in which these individuals and their relations sought to maintain or improve their positions against the intrusive colonials.

Brooks then explores how Plymouth’s aggression drove the war, breaking new ground by highlighting Benjamin Church’s role and noting that the colony may have staged the crime that triggered the war; how Weetamoo and James Printer were caught up in the storm; and how English fears and misdeeds caused the conflict to expand into the Connecticut River Valley and Wabenaki territory (Maine). She depicts the overarching Native goal in the war as restoring the balance of power and establishing clear boundaries with the newcomers, rather than driving the colonists out altogether. Her sections on the war make effective use of innovative techniques such as italicized segments to imagine details of experiences not revealed by the records, following John Demos in The Unredeemed Captive (1994); using Indigenous names for important geographic features; and calling Native men “protectors” instead of “warriors” to subvert stereotypes and emphasize colonial aggression.

Brooks’ intimate knowledge of kinship and geography provides the most complete and persuasive account of the evolving connections between the southern and northern conflicts. Her book also offers new evidence that Nipmuc and Narragansett sachems may have been negotiating with Massachusetts for a peaceful settlement just as Connecticut forces conducted viciously effective attacks on
Indigenous communities. It also enlarges aspects of what has become the standard narrative of the conflict: how Massachusetts abused and imprisoned Christian Indians on Deer Island; how the victors broke their pledges and sold surrendering Natives into slavery or executed them; and how, even after the death of Metacom and Weetamoo, the Wabanakis continued their war in the North.

This book was clearly not meant to be a complete or “balanced” history but rather an Indigenous view of the causes and course of the war, centered on the experiences of Weetamoo and Printer and their kinship networks. That avoids the English-centered narrative created by the documents, but also results in little discussion of the colonial experience and merely a few brief descriptions of the Native raids on colonial towns in the winter of 1676. For that reason, those wishing a full picture of the conflict should also read a book with a broader view.

Daniel R. Mandell
Truman State University


The eighteenth-century British Empire was vast and powerful, but often disorderly and unmanageable. Try as imperial administrators and metropolitan investors might to impose order on their empire, colonial outposts were ultimately spaces over which they exercised little control, where cultures clashed, languages mixed, and people were made anew. In the space of these imperial encounters, those who participated in them confronted people very different from themselves and developed multifarious identities as they seized new social opportunities.

Such was the case for Peter Williamson, the subject of Timothy Shannon’s new biography. Born in rural Scotland in 1730 to a family of modest means, Williamson spent almost two decades traveling the British Empire in the middle eighteenth century as a servant, soldier, and captive. Once back in Aberdeen in the late 1750s, Williamson parlayed his experience of empire into a successful career. He published a popular memoir of his experiences in America, opened a successful coffeehouse, delivered performances draped in Native American garb, and cultivated a national celebrity among the Scottish public. Spinning tales of great adventure and tribulation, Williamson captured the imaginations of “plebian Britons” while also challenging the social and racial castes of Scottish hierarchy (7).

How many of Williamson’s tales were actually true is another matter entirely. Shannon is particularly interested in teasing out the veracity of Williamson’s story. Relying on archival evidence from both sides of the Atlantic and a mastery of the
secondary literature, Shannon argues that while not all of Williamson’s claims were true, the essence of his story and of his unlikely success demonstrate how an “ordinary” person like Williamson, “whose migration, labor, and military service made the empire possible,” could exploit the opportunities and ambiguities of empire to “elevate his social status” (6). While he notes that non-elite people are often depicted as victims of empire, Shannon argues that some of those on the margins found ways to manipulate identities in liminal colonial spaces and import them back to the metropole.

At its best, Shannon’s book is a masterwork of historical sleuthing. In the many cases where archival evidence is sparse and all he has to go on is Williamson’s word, Shannon turns to the broader context and probes whether the stories are plausible. For instance, when Williamson claims that he was taken captive among some unnamed Native American war party in the Ohio Country in 1754, Shannon argues that the account is implausible for a variety of reasons. For one, the date Williamson gives for his captivity is a year too early for a soldier to have been captured in fighting. Furthermore, while Williamson claims he was marched eastward toward the Lehigh Valley, Indian war parties in the region almost exclusively marched their captives westward. And finally, Williamson mentions meetings with elite figures for which there is no substantiating evidence (62–66).

While incisive, Shannon’s sleuthing can also turn meandering. In some cases, Shannon drifts too far away from his broader arguments, testing some parts of Williamson’s memoirs against the record without explaining why they matter for the larger project. As a result, he misses some opportunities for analysis that Williamson’s life presents. As Williamson crisscrossed the Atlantic, interacting with Native peoples and appropriating their culture for his performances, Williamson transmuted ambivalent racial identities, performing as an Indian captive and later an Indian king. Shannon gestures at “changing ideas about Native Americans” rooted in Williamson’s performance, but he misses an opportunity for a fuller discussion about the racial implications at play (245). Nevertheless, Shannon’s work is an important contribution to studying imperial history at the margins.

*University of Pennsylvania*  
Kyle Repella


As we approach the 250th anniversary of the American Revolution, the key episodes leading to the War of Independence are gaining renewed attention after
a post-Bicentennial lull. George Daughan’s new work is the latest addition to this literature. Aimed at a popular readership, *Lexington and Concord* provides a political and military history of the calculations and miscalculations that brought British Regulars and Massachusetts militiamen into armed conflict on 19 April 1775 in “the battle heard round the world.”

The classic accounts of this turning-point in American history by Allen French, *The Day of Concord and Lexington* (1925), and Arthur Tourtellot, *Lexington and Concord* (1959), focus tightly on the events of a single day. Daughan takes a wider view. He sets the resort to arms on 19 April in the context of the imperial crisis ignited by the Boston Tea Party, which provoked the British resolve to crack down on the insurgent colony of Massachusetts Bay and its radical epicenter in Boston and led inexorably to a war the colonists never wanted and the Crown did not foresee. His tight narrative, comprising thirty-nine chapters, each five to ten pages long, follows the escalating conflict back and forth across the Atlantic and tracks the developing positions of the key actors in London (George III, Lord North, Benjamin Franklin), Boston (Samuel Adams, Joseph Warren, General Thomas Gage), and Philadelphia (the Continental Congress). The expedition to Concord does not launch until chapter 27, nearly two-thirds into the text. The stage is thus set for the fiasco of the expedition dispatched by General Gage. Certain that the “peasants” of Massachusetts would flee in the face of the Redcoats, British officials sent too few troops, with too little experience, into enemy territory to face a host of farmers and craftsmen led by veterans of the French and Indian War and steeled by a determination to defend their liberty and their land. Lord Percy, who rescued the British force from a total rout, saw the provincials with new eyes: “Whoever looks upon them as an irregular mob, will find himself much mistaken” (258). But Crown and Parliament pressed on, overestimating their power to crush the rebellion for six more years.

This re-telling of the Revolution’s start has its roots in the nationalist histories of the nineteenth century and the consensus historiography of the twentieth. Daughan has scant interest in the social tensions, economic pressures, and political divisions within Massachusetts on the eve of war. He is content to celebrate the people of the Bay Colony as literate, religious, liberty-loving souls, enjoying the highest standard of living in the world and with a prospect of someday eclipsing the mother country herself. General readers, with little knowledge of the subject, will be heartened by this
literary counterpart to Daniel Chester French’s statue of the Minuteman at the Old North Bridge. Academic historians will wish for a subtler account.

University of Connecticut

Robert A. Gross


“In establishing American independence,” wrote the South Carolina historian David Ramsay in 1789, “the pen and the press had merit equal to that of the sword.” Robert Parkinson, in his impressive new book, follows a long line of Revolutionary historians in affirming the power of newspapers to focus and fertilize American resistance to British rule. But unlike many of his predecessors, who have seen print as a delivery mechanism for ideas about liberty, self-determination, or republicanism, Parkinson offers a premise of shattering simplicity: Patriots used newspapers to build and promulgate a white nationalism which would propel the thirteen colonies beyond the reach of Britain.

The “common cause” of the American Revolution, in Parkinson’s telling, was underpinned by racial scaremongering and exclusion. Given the deep affinities between Britain and the colonies, “the patriots had to destroy as much of the public’s affection for their ancestors as they could.” The easiest way to ‘other’ the colonial parent was to connect British officials and strategies to a slew of preexisting “stereotypes, prejudices, expectations and fears about violent Indians and Africans.” As people of color were dragooned into the British war effort, they confirmed Britain’s treachery and abdicated “any of the benefits of American independence.” In Parkinson’s telling, race-making wasn’t simply coincident with state-making: The two processes were mutually constitutive.

The book pursues this thesis through an enormously detailed study of the Patriot press and an ingenious examination of the circuits of information created by American newspapers. The meticulousness of Parkinson’s research is always material to his arguments. After an initial survey of the dynamics of early U.S. newspaper circulation and borrowing, the chapters offer a painstaking chronology of the Revolutionary war in which racial anxieties or bromides play a percussive role. The concluding chapter, which tracks the story of the ‘common cause’ through the post-Revolutionary decades, insists that the intensification of black slavery and Native dispossession after 1815 cannot be viewed as a declension narrative from the hopes of the Revolutionary era. If Parkinson has it right, racial exclusion had always been the price of American nationhood.
This bleak claim seems well fitted to our own historical moment. Historians of the early United States may struggle, though, to square their understanding of antislavery or Indian ‘civilizing’ efforts with the scorched landscape traversed by Parkinson. At heart this is a study of war, and of the forms of affinity and exclusion which structured a long and often brutal armed conflict. The book has less to say about peace, and specifically about the efforts of whites, blacks, and Indians to imagine futures in which race could be disentangled from national belonging. Historians of Revolutionary causation may complain that, in foregrounding race (and largely avoiding the longer history of American separatism), The Common Cause is narrower than its dimensions would suggest. But at heart this is a polemic, in spite of its intricate research and its huge size. As such it should provoke lively debate and argument for years to come.

Nicholas Guyatt
University of Cambridge

Sentiments of a British-American Woman: Esther DeBerdt Reed and the American Revolution.

In this new biography, Ireland explores eighteenth-century transatlantic relationships, companionate marriage, and more through his examination of one fascinating woman. Best known as the author of the broadside “The Sentiments of an American Woman,” which launched the 1780 fundraising campaign by the women of Philadelphia for the Continental Army, Esther DeBerdt Reed earned a position as “one of America’s most sophisticated, poised, confident, admired, and efficacious public ‘female politicians’” (3). Readers learn about Esther’s life as a British-born, reluctant transplant to Philadelphia, and Ireland closely analyzes her affectionate relationship with her husband, Joseph Reed. As Ireland tells us in his introduction, this biography is worth our attention because it allows readers to consider the American Revolutionary era from the perspective of a politically active, but now largely forgotten, woman.

Each chapter of this carefully researched study focuses on the written material, especially the letters, which Esther left behind. Esther’s father was a merchant and had an extensive business correspondence with her eventual husband, Joseph. However, Ireland makes it clear early on that he chose not to focus on this business correspondence, instead he places it “largely beyond our view because it was largely beyond the view of Esther, our principal historical source” (58). As a result, the biography closely examines Esther and her perspective on
the events happening to and around her. Ireland tells us how Esther grappled with the difficulties of maintaining a five-year transatlantic courtship with a man of whom her family initially disapproved, after a family crisis required Joseph’s sudden return to America from London. Although Esther at first resisted the idea of making her home with Joseph in America, circumstances forced her to accept a move to Philadelphia after she and Joseph were finally married. While she was happy to be married, she was not happy in her new home and looked upon her provincial neighbors with disgust. “In her own mind,” Ireland claims, “she did not become an American” (99). The most illuminating section of this study comes when Ireland analyzes Esther’s gradual shift in pronouns when describing growing American discontent. As she began to identify herself with the Americans, she was eventually able to support the American cause, as well.

Esther’s most notable contribution to the era, it seems, was her call in her broadside for women to play their part in the fight for liberty. Ireland explains that Ladies’ Associations, like the one that organized the Philadelphia campaign, provided an important way for American women to heed that call within the boundaries of their expected roles. Ireland presents Esther as someone who successfully pushed the boundaries of female political participation and effectively reminds us of the intertwined and transatlantic nature of many Americans in the Revolutionary era. While many of the themes Ireland explores here have been explored elsewhere, Esther’s fascinating life convinces the reader that they are worth revisiting. Ireland’s fluid and engaging prose makes this fascinating perspective on the Revolutionary era accessible to a wide audience.

University of Minnesota

Hannah Smith


Distinguished popular historian and novelist Thomas Fleming, who passed away at the age of ninety in July 2017, produced a treasure chest full of well-researched, beautifully crafted books during his distinguished writing career. His favorite subject was the American Revolution, writing about virtually everything from the outbreak of the rebellion (1776: Year of Illusions, 1975), to the turbulent months at war’s end (The Perils of Peace, 2008), and the divisive politics of the 1790s (The Great Divide: The Conflict between Washington and Jefferson, 2015), among many other noteworthy volumes. Fleming always guaranteed his readers a well-told story line captured in vibrant prose with added splashes of interpretive insight along the way.
These same worthy qualities characterize Fleming’s last published foray into Revolutionary era history. Titled *The Strategy of Victory*, this volume sweeps through the War for Independence from the battles of Lexington and Concord to “Mad” Anthony Wayne’s defeat of Ohio Indians at the Battle of Fallen Timbers in 1794. Actually, much of the text has little to do with Washington or his strategic thinking. For instance, the bloody fighting in the South from 1778 to 1782 receives extended attention (163–228); however, the emphasis is not on Washington but on Daniel Morgan and his brilliant tactical victory at the Cowpens (17 January 1781) and on Nathanael Greene and his “rise and fight again” operational strategy during the southern campaigning.

Overall, this book pays little attention to Washington’s varying strategic approaches to winning the war. Passing allusions to Fabian thinking (48–50, for instance), referring to Roman general Quintus Fabius Maximus (280–203 BC), “the Delayer” who tried to exhaust rather than fight the forces of Hannibal during the Second Punic War, imply that Washington held to the same strategic persuasion in ultimately defeating the martial forces of Great Britain.

A much more dynamic analysis of the shifts in Washington’s strategic thinking may be found in Dave R. Palmer’s *George Washington’s Military Genius* (2012). The title problem seems to be that the publisher, no doubt trying to enhance initial sales, mislabeled what Thomas Fleming actually focused on in this volume. A more accurate title would have emphasized something like key battles and military leaders who won the American Revolution—and perhaps also their legacy. In the book’s “Afterword,” Fleming stated (276): “As I end our journey, my mind is rich with images of memorable soldiers, starting, of course, with George Washington and Nathanael Greene.” These were his thoughts as he was completing his own life’s journey. Overall, Fleming succeeded admirably in producing a rousing history of the war and the military leaders who made a republic possible in America. Misleading title aside, Fleming’s final book deserves a high recommendation as a most worthy addition to military histories about the era of the American Revolution.

*University of Houston*  
James Kirby Martin, Emeritus


Kate Elizabeth Brown has thrust Alexander Hamilton to center stage as “the [not ‘a’] central figure in the development of American law during the early republic.” “Hamiltonian constitutionalism,” articulated primarily in Numbers 32 and 82 of
The Federalist, “proved to be enduring and authoritative,” she writes; “the US Supreme Court upheld and cited Hamiltonian legal arguments well into the nineteenth century, and occasionally in the twentieth” (6). Few historians would dispute the impact of Hamilton’s indispensable management of the new nation’s finances that provided the foundation for an effective and energetic federal government, but Brown’s claims for Hamilton prompt serious questions about how much “American legal development” owes primarily to Hamilton. Historians have long questioned, for example, the influence of the polemics in The Federalist: Number 32, which Brown relies on most heavily, was cited only six times by the Supreme Court before 1850, and in five of those cases it was raised in a dissent.

Brown’s portrait of Hamilton prompts two fundamental questions: what she means by “American Law,” and how much of that we can attribute to Hamilton. The answer to the first defines it as a jurisprudence of commerce. The new nation, he believed, would be led by a skilled business elite whose political leadership and financial resources, protected by law, would assure the survival of the republic. Unfortunately, Brown ignores some problematic implications of that policy, such as Hamilton’s role in the sweetheart deal that created the public-private Society for Useful Manufactures, as well as his shady undersecretary of the treasury, William Duer, who exploited Hamiltonian legal instruments to advance and then ruin the Society, whose collapse endangered his “ambitious republican statecraft goals” (17).

The second question leads us to recognize how much of Hamilton’s version of “American law” was actually only one component of the array of solutions deployed to solve the vexing constitutional problem of reconciling state with federal authority. To establish the originality of “Hamiltonian constitutionalism” Brown rebrands it as “functional concurrence,” which differs from what Hamilton meant when he wrote of “concurrent jurisdiction” in Number 82 of The Federalist. Rather, Brown applies it to the ways in which “executive and judicial functions were often mixed and unified, with executive officers properly exercising judge-like discretion and judges acting as administrators themselves” (10). To give weight to the concept, she introduces another term, “what I refer to as the federal magistracy—that was concurrent in practice.” It is not clear, however, how this distinction differs from Madison’s well known discussion in Number 39 of The Federalist, or from what historians and legal scholars have identified as a necessary accommodation of local political pressures and a pragmatic policy that separated some government functions and combined others and, additionally, enlisted merchants into the process. Instead, we find a contingent and
multicausal process driven by independent actors replaced by the purposeful planning and execution of a Great Man, and the creation of a “magisterial constitutionalism” that persists in support of today’s controversial unitary executive.

Washington University in St. Louis

David Thomas Konig


Together James Madison and Alexander Hamilton authored the bulk of what would become The Federalist Papers. Initially aligned philosophically about the wisdom of the proposed Constitution, their subsequent politics after ratification differed dramatically enough to consider them not only philosophical but political rivals, as well. What is most interesting about these deep seated differences during the 1790s—over issues like tariffs, public improvements, and a national bank—is that after the War of 1812, James Madison and the Republican Party effectively adopted the very policies that they had fought so hard to undo. Jay Cost’s new volume, The Price of Greatness: Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, and the Creation of American Oligarchy, attempts to account for Hamilton’s and Madison’s disagreements in what he argues are the competing philosophical values inherent in the constitutional order itself.

Cost begins his volume by arguing that the American constitutional order itself contains three related, but ultimately tension filled principles: Lockean liberalism and its concern with the protection of inalienable rights; a republicanism that advocated for a state constructed to facilitate self-government; and a more “practical than moral” (10) nationalism that sought to bring the principles of liberalism and republicanism into practice in the form of a nascent union. After ratification, though, the three principles that cemented Hamilton and Madison’s shared commitment to the Constitution immediately precipitated their political feud as the philosophical commitments of ratification turned to actual policy outputs. The central chapters of the volume highlight these emerging and, as Cost argues, perennial differences. Contentious debates over the constitutionality of the first Bank of the United States, the fairness of protective tariffs and bounties, the financing of the national debt and assumption of state debt, and internal improvements are best understood as competing visions of how to implement these principles in a world where agrarian and emerging commercial interests were constantly in tension. To take the Bank as an example, Cost argues that
Hamilton believed that moneyed interests in the early republic would be incentivized to support the national government if they were investors and stockholders in the Bank. Committed to a different understanding of Republicanism, however, Madison saw in this vision a clear line to the dissolution of republican principles of balance and fairness.

Ultimately Madison would come to adopt many of the policies that Hamilton advocated in the 1790s. In the last chapters of the volume, Cost argues that both men were right: Madison misunderstood Hamilton’s motives in the 1790s as sympathy for monarchism, and Madison, in finally supporting Hamiltonian policies after the War of 1812, underestimated the possibility of tendency toward corruption in public-private endeavors. Competing understandings of liberalism, republicanism, and nationalism, Cost ultimately argues, continue to animate American politics.

Cost’s volume will interest lay and scholarly students of early American political thought and history, especially those interested in the political philosophy of Hamilton and Madison in the early republic.

Justin J. Wert


This is a handsome and engaging book. Containing twelve color plates and two dozen figures, it is biography and expedition chronicle. As her title suggests, the author is at home with the history of science, particularly botany. Lewis collected the Bitterroot in 1805 but died before he could describe it. The long-held view of Lewis’s death—by suicide—leaves a bitter taste for Stroud and is the root of this book. Bitterroot’s Latin name, _Lewisia rediviva_, translates to Lewis revived. Accordingly, Stroud aims to resuscitate Lewis’s reputation.

Stroud employs traditional sources relevant to Lewis and the expedition. The book follows a familiar pattern divided into thirds: biography to 1804, expedition narrative, then political struggles until death in 1809. She argues, originally and forcefully, that there is no evidence of Lewis’s “pathologically depressive, alcoholic, or suicidal behavior” levied by centuries of “denigrating historiography” that has “tarnished his name” (7, 2, 6). Stroud implies Stephen Ambrose, Gary Moulton, Ken Burns, and Thomas Jefferson are his character assassins. Lewis was “a fighter, not a quitter,” filled with “fortitude”
and “a buoyant, positive attitude” (6, 72). “[C]onsidering what Lewis accomplished as the expedition’s leader,” a diagnosis of “manic-depressive psychosis” is “far-fetched,” Stroud asserts (225). Besides, as Lewis descendent Jane Anderson wrote in 1902, “M. L. was too full of his business plans [in 1809] to have had any grand passion” (228). According to “a professional psychoanalyst” Stroud had “spoken with,” charges that Lewis’s preoccupation with courtship failures reveal a “sexual imbalance” are “wide of the mark” (133).

What about the evidence for suicide? Fearful Mrs. Grinder, who found Lewis dead, lied. If Lewis drank, why didn’t his political enemy, Richard Bates, use that as ammunition? Clark’s letter acknowledging Lewis’s melancholy was probably faked. Jefferson’s observation of “sensible depressions of the mind” when in the President’s House was likely a lie to cover support for General Wilkinson. What caused Lewis’s death? Stroud “cannot rule out a conspiracy to assassinate him” (293). Who did it? Perhaps “Indians, or others hired as killers, or ruthless thieves” (294). Stroud produces no evidence to substantiate these theories or to discredit suicide theories. Stroud was right in that “there will be no final answer to the subject of murder,” but the preponderance of evidence still points to suicide from depression and substance abuse, despite her attempts to poke holes in this conclusion (6).

If it was suicide, does the manner of Lewis’s death “defame” him (267–85)? No. Tarnish his accomplishments? No. Necessitate character resuscitation? No. Depression and substance abuse are not moral failings. They are not character flaws. They prevent neither accomplishments nor future planning. They are diseases. People do not “commit” suicide. His traveling companion during that fateful trip, James Neelly, said it best in 1809: Lewis “died … I am sorry to say by Suicide” (275). The author might consult the “professional psychoanalyst” about these issues.

University of Pittsburgh at Johnstown

Paul Douglas Newman


This book began when its author found herself befuddled by a persistent American question after 9–11: “Why do they hate us?” American Niceness seeks to trace the development of “niceness,” a characteristic which nineteenth-century Americans believed they embodied. It serves as a crucial, half-forgotten

1. Bramen finds this type of bewilderment unique to the U.S.—as she notes in an aside, the British never asked during the Troubles, “Why do they Irish hate us?”: 298, footnote 18.
element of American self-perception that she suggests has guided behavior both at home and abroad.

Before our nation came to be comprised of “Ugly Americans,” an earlier stereotype was “Brother Jonathan,” who was amiable, non-aggressive, and unpretentious—in a word, “nice.” Nineteenth-century Americans defined themselves primarily in contrast to Europe’s elites—they were less snobbish, more democratic, and less militarily aggressive. Bramen’s main argument is that this ideal of American niceness functioned as a form of American exceptionalism: “It represents a paradoxical form of democratic arrogance, where Americans are not just friendly, but superior in their friendliness” (16).

Bramen’s book focuses primarily on the nineteenth century, and contains six chapters, investigating Anglo-Indian relations, slavery, contemporary understandings of Jesus, gender relations, and foreign affairs. Bramen’s sources are mainly secondary, and primarily literary, but still impressive in their breadth, including plays, old psychology textbooks, government reports, and modern theorists.

Bramen examines the word’s etymology. Over its long history, “nice” meant “precise,” then became “pleasing,” but also incorporating everything from “foolish, silly,” to “wanton, dissolute, lascivious,” to “skillful in manipulation.”

Nineteenth-century niceness included positive and negative aspects. Gender was important, too. For some women, niceness was a restraint, a “corset.” For other female reformers, the concept gave them power to persuade and influence. Eugene Debs, W. E. B. Du Bois, and Ida B. Wells all found radical potential in demanding niceness from the dominant society. However, it had manipulative and hegemonic tendencies as well, in a society where “Protestant civility became synonymous with good manners” (193).

The author is comfortable analyzing the nineteenth century; she is less so when discussing an earlier era. The Indian chapter appears to be her weakest, with a black-and-white depiction of inoffensive Indians betrayed by Anglo greed that takes little account of Indian agency. Bramen is at her best explaining how concepts of niceness helped blind Americans to abuses. The “myth of Southern niceness” excused American slavery as a kinder version of that institution. “Southern niceness depends not only on the kind master, but also on the happy slave, whose smile confirms the benign nature of slavery” (127).

Abroad, niceness also had a “shadow side” in “its capacity to blind white Americans to the consequences of their own actions through an abiding faith in their

magnanimity and optimism” (144). During the late nineteenth century, Americans continued to compare themselves favorably with the more “naturally imperialist” European nations, envisioning the Spanish-American War as a “a nicer and gentler form of imperialism, one based on democratic principles and the pedagogical mission of tutelage” (252–53). This “violent innocence” (257) in Americans’ self-perception persisted through the twentieth century, up through the current “War on Terror.” It blinded Americans to their own aggressive actions, leaving foreigners’ hostility and retaliation to seem incomprehensible and irrational.

Texas State University

Shannon E. Duffy


Scholars of southern courts have long emphasized their regulation of black lives and curtailment of rights, yet, as Kimberly M. Welch argues, these narratives obscure recognition of blacks as active litigators. Welch contends that blacks, even before formal Emancipation, recognizing the importance of legal protection of property for white southerners, leveraged this concern by publicly asserting their claims as property-holders and “envisioned themselves as full members of their communities” (11). Building upon the scholarship on property claims developed by Laura Edwards and Dylan Penningroth, this work identifies property litigation as a source of power and civic inclusion for blacks.

To support this argument, Welch deconstructs the language and meaning of property appropriated by black litigants in more than a thousand suits in both common and civil law courts in the Natchez District of Louisiana and Mississippi between 1800 and 1860, identifying common approaches despite differing local legal traditions. Welch argues that blacks observed courtroom proceedings and merged local discourses of reputation, reliability, and gender with their experiences as both chattel and property-holders to develop a variety of strategies that proved successful. She then explores how litigants deployed these tactics in chapters focused on debt, property, divorce, and freedom suits. Welch believes that these pre-Emancipation courtroom experiences “provided future generations of African Americans with a model—with language, knowledge, skills, strategies, networks, and theories” for the longer struggle for civil rights and racial justice (192), and she justifies this through a case study of the mixed-race Belly family who transformed a multi-generational history of property litigation into the first U.S. Supreme Court case that affirmed compensation for racial discrimination on public transportation (Hall v. Decuir).
Welch introduces blacks not only as litigious property-holders, but also as money-lenders and legal agents for black and white community members. Yet she also raises important questions about who had access to legal protection and the ways in which blacks leveraged southern courts for their own benefit. Though Welch states this work is not a quantitative analysis of legal activity, the question of the representativeness of these particular litigants and courts remains largely unaddressed. Were they one-time litigants or did they repeatedly call upon the courts for redress? Did black wealth, like white wealth, affect the ability of litigants to make successful claims? Was the Natchez District distinct for its demographics or opportunities for property acquisition? Understandably the limitations of source materials for persons who so often appear at the margins of record-keeping hinders definitive quantitative analysis, yet the question of class and relative power might further enrich studies of black advocacy and accessibility in antebellum Southern courts.

This excellent scholarship tantalizingly adds to the spectrum of agency, resistance, and subordination by addressing black advocacy. Whether indicative of the broader South or not, Welch shows that these black litigants could appropriate the language of property, gender, and community values and create precedents for property claims-making in a culture designed to deny them those rights, thus making this work a valuable addition to studies of law, race, and society.

George Mason University
Sheri Ann Huerta


Specialists know the author of this book for his brilliant work on antebellum Southern politics and the life and times of Jefferson Davis. Now he has turned his attention northward, offering a perceptive biography of a uniquely inspiring and exasperating New Engander: the well-read and widely traveled sixth president, John Quincy Adams. By carefully situating Adams in a rapidly evolving historical context, William J. Cooper provides a thorough introduction to his life and career. Cooper’s engaging account of Adams’s confrontations with bigotry, anti-intellectualism, and virulent partisanship will provide modern readers with plenty of food for thought.

Drawing from Adams’s correspondence, public papers, and treasured diary, Cooper stresses the uniqueness of his subject’s background and education. Unlike such leading contemporaries as Andrew Jackson or John C. Calhoun, Adams was a son of the Enlightenment (and of a prominent founding family) whose tastes and intellect were molded by long stints in Europe, voracious reading in
classical and modern languages, rigid self-discipline, and a deeply ingrained abhorrence of those who followed the main chance. Raised among the Founding Fathers, Adams imbibed their rationalism and idealism and was ill prepared for the rough-hewn partisans who reshaped American politics during and after the 1820s. Particularly noxious to the sixth president were the acolytes of Andrew Jackson, whose shocking election in 1828 denied Adams a second term and inaugurated an era of public retrenchment, expansion of slavery, and Southern domination of federal power. Adams never embraced active campaigning but was elected to Congress nine times after his discouraging presidency; in the House of Representatives, he finally found his voice as a champion of civil liberties against efforts to suppress discussion of slavery. Fittingly, Adams died in the Capitol in 1848, as the fires of sectionalism burned ever hotter.

Adams’s efforts to adjust to new political realities, while steadfastly resisting their worst features, form the central theme of this well-crafted book. Adams, argues Cooper, “embraced and resisted the transitions swirling about him.” He was the “last of the Founders both in his sense of politics and his valuing the Union above all,” but was also “the first of those who rejected the Union with slavery” (xiv). Cooper handles his subject’s often maddening contradictions with a light but skillful touch. Adams craved political advancement but refused to demean himself on the campaign trail, even after Jackson’s election shook his faith that the republic would reward talent and virtue over humbuggery and prejudice. He nurtured a compelling vision for the nation’s future, but struggled to motivate others to follow his lead. Some specialists might wish for more frequent commentary from Cooper, whose analysis is insightful but somewhat reserved. But this approach empowers readers, whether experts or novices, to render their own judgments. In Cooper’s evenhanded presentation, John Quincy Adams emerges as an honorable idealist plagued by an aggravating aversion to advancing his worthy aims by playing by the new political rules. Perhaps too late, Adams learned that principles are ineffective without power, and that self-righteousness is not a viable political strategy.

*Marshall University*  
Michael E. Woods


Jason Opal positions his book as “revisionist,” critiquing Andrew Jackson’s “place in American democratic tradition” (1). His book’s strength is its analysis of Jackson’s treatment of Native Americans and the commercial pressures that
governed much of his personal life. In both instances, Jackson clearly valued the law of nations. On commercial interests, the author provides a much-needed, readable update to the work of Charles Sellers. In the case of Native Americans, Jackson was certainly “a larger-than-life ‘avenger,’” although Opal’s analysis in this case complements, rather than supplants, work done by a number of scholars, including Dawn Peterson and Christina Snyder (2).

The initial chapters are strong on providing context for Jackson’s world but much less persuasive when it comes to explaining parts of his life. Readers come away with a good sense of Jackson’s South Carolina roots and the violent, chaotic setting into which he was born, but Opal sometimes fails to make a convincing case for understanding Jackson’s motivations and actions. For example, he argues that “obscure strongman” Griffith Rutherford “not only shaped the young Jackson’s world but also anticipated the core tensions of Jackson’s life,” a point that he fails to prove (26). He also couches a number of claims about Jackson in speculative terms, saying that he “surely” or “may have” done something for which the evidence is lacking (95, 100).

Though Opal argues that his book “tries to avoid the strong pull of his [i.e., Jackson’s] personal legend and the historical narratives that bear his name,” he is not wholly successful in this regard (1). He describes Jackson as having “fought in the Revolution,” but modern Jackson biographers agree that he did not participate in any meaningful military service (191). Opal also recounts Jackson driving his uncle’s slaves to market in 1784 (47). This story, cited in Hendrik Booraem’s Young Hickory (262, n. 20), comes from an 1874 document relating third-hand information. Opal also notes that “one account names him [i.e., Jackson] as the man who brought news of the Constitution’s ratification to Nashville” (74). The account referenced is Dale Van Every’s Ark of Empire: The American Frontier, 1784–1803 [1963], which does not cite its source for this story; no scholarly biographer gives Jackson credit for informing Nashvillians of the Constitution. On two occasions, Opal also cites Jennifer Hunsicker’s Young Andrew Jackson in the Carolinas: A Revolutionary Boy [2014], a children’s book, to support his argument about Jackson’s legal training (72, 83–84).

In short, Opal does an excellent job of presenting Jackson as someone who used the law to seek justice for his view of American identity. He is less successful in extrapolating this argument to the totality of Jackson’s life and in separating the mythical Jackson from the real Jackson. As the controversies over the $20 bill and Donald Trump’s election as US president have shown, Jackson is not receding into the background. Works such as Opal’s are important to continue
to probe who Andrew Jackson was and what he meant, and means, to the American people.

*Cumberland University*  
Mark R. Cheatham


The life of Thomas H. Gallaudet, who lived from 1787–1851, is detailed in this publication along with significant and less important events from that period. The author shows the impact of historical watershed moments on his life. The history of Gallaudet’s life and the history of Deaf culture in the United States are interwoven. Both are treated with care and attention. Using an expansive lens, Edna Sayers provides the reader with a view of the country as it struggled during the early stages of the new democracy. She documents the evolution of Gallaudet from his days as a student, to his short banking career, to his pioneering the establishment of the American School for the Deaf in Hartford. The fresh information highlights the struggle of the school as it faced completion and attempts to sabotage its beginning. It also looks more deeply at the roles of Gallaudet and Laurent Clerc.

Most historians have adopted and continue to promote the historical narrative that has a hearing male educator as the builder of the Deaf community. Laurent Clerc is seen as important, but not essential, in the same sense as the major player in the establishment of Deaf education. Sayers argues that the actions and efforts of Gallaudet were actually not the driving force behind the formation of the American Deaf community. It was the Deaf educator Clerc who made possible the language that formed community for Deaf persons. Gathering in New Haven from around the country, students learned the sign language that Clerc taught them and combined it with signs they had made. The combination of the French and American signs merged and American Sign Language was born. The students adopted it and with a common language bonds of friendship were quickly formed. The cementing of those bonds became the foundation of the American Deaf Community. Sayers provides an in-depth look at Gallaudet’s religious training and rebellion, his slow evolution to abolition, and his relationship to his father. The author has used the archives, letters, and personal papers of his subject to provide readers with a more complete portrait of T. H. Gallaudet.

Readers get to see a full picture of Gallaudet as Sayers describes his early education at Andover, his successful attempts at writing children’s readers, his
lackluster poetry, and his involvement in and support of the American Colonization Society. Sayers’s well-researched publication uses the backdrop of watershed moments, historical movements, war, and political maneuvering to tell the story of Thomas Hopkins Gallaudet. She provides details of a life that was a force in establishing the American School for the Deaf. Sayers, more importantly, challenges and disrupts the hearing male narrative by deftly showing that Gallaudet was not the singular force. This publication allows for a more expansive view of how the space for the Deaf community was constructed. Additionally, it provides important details of Gallaudet’s life that give readers a more balanced picture of the man and his contribution to Deaf education.

University of District of Columbia Community College Sandra Jowers-Barber


Hostilities between the United States and Mexico began in April 1846, when Mexican troops ambushed a squadron of the 1st Dragoons under Captain Seth Thornton at Rancho de Carricitos, Texas, in the Disputed Territory between the Rio Grande and the Nueces River. President James K. Polk used the incident to request from Congress a declaration of war, which it duly delivered. Expecting a short conflict, Polk launched an invasion of northern Mexico with the Army of Occupation under the command of Brigadier General Zachary Taylor. Much to Polk’s chagrin, the Mexican Army fought hard, and continued to fight hard against Taylor at Monterrey and Buena Vista (Angostura).

When the United States’ main effort shifted southward to the Gulf Coast and an invasion of Veracruz, Mexicans again fought hard, this time against Major General Winfield Scott and the invading army. Nonetheless, American skill vanquished Mexican ineptitude on the field of battle. By 1848, Nicholas Trist, the US envoy who had accompanied the army, had negotiated the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, in which Mexico ceded upwards of half of its territory to the United States. Traditionally, the American triumph of arms was a victory of unity and nationalism over Mexican division and a lack of patriotism. In truth, the tale was much more complex.

Peter Guardino’s The Dead March is the story of war between two unstable republics engaged in the process of nation building, albeit according to different dictates, each guided by differing histories, political traditions, cultures,
Guardino examines the war through cultural and social historical lenses. In telling the story, the author considers the imperatives for war, how each country waged war, their internal political cultures and tensions, their economies, and the impact of the natural environment. The result is a nuanced, critical, and even sensitive portrayal of the actors. The end result is a narrative not of inevitability, but of chance and contingency, in which the American economic might translated into military might against a weaker, but no less skilled enemy.

_The Dead March_ is a most welcome addition to the historiography of this much-understudied and much-misunderstood war. Guardino’s research is a testament to the historian’s craft. He has delved into Mexican archival sources, a rare accomplishment in most histories of the war. Indeed, readers will appreciate the depth and breadth of Guardino’s research. This book sets the standard by which future histories of the Mexican War should, for some time, be judged.

The war’s end proved a mixed blessing and curse. Mexico ceded much of its patrimony, while the United States expanded across the continent to the Pacific Ocean. Mexico suffered civil war and foreign invasion. The _Porfiriato_ (1876–1910) quashed democratic tendencies but created a safe haven for foreign capital. The United States underwent its own civil war, due in large degree to the Mexican War. Each country emerged a different one in the decades that followed. Although the war ended in 1848, its aftermath continues to resonate in Mexican and American political and cultural realms.

_Ricardo A. Herrera_

_School of Advanced Military Studies_

The Valley of the Shadow digital history of the Civil War in the Great Valley of Virginia and Pennsylvania continues to bear fruit. Edward Ayers, co-director of the project from its inception in 1991, has converted mountains of data from two counties—Augusta (county seat at Staunton) in Virginia and Franklin (county seat at Chambersburg) in Pennsylvania—into numerous articles and books, including the Bancroft Prize-winning _In the Presence of Mine Enemies: The Civil War in the Heart of America, 1859—1863_. With the latest addition, _The Thin Light of Freedom: The Civil War and Emancipation in the Heart of_
America, Ayers completes his narrative of war, emancipation, and Reconstruction in the counties of the Valley of the Shadow project.

Ayers deftly mixes primary source analysis from the Valley archive with the latest scholarship on the Civil War, emancipation, and Reconstruction. Underpinning the Valley of the Shadow project and In the Presence of Mine Enemies was an assessment of the role that slavery played in driving these otherwise similar communities in opposite directions. This new study, by beginning in 1863 with the Gettysburg campaign, carries that narrative forward, but without the original animating question. Rather, the destructive war itself; slavery’s ultimate collapse; and the emergence of race, freedom, and black suffrage as guiding questions of Reconstruction fills the current volume.

The book is divided chronologically into two parts. The first takes readers through the Gettysburg campaign to the great Valley campaigns of the fall of 1864. Ayers lets civilians and soldiers from Chambersburg and Staunton interpret the swirling of events around them through newspapers, diaries, and public declarations. To carry the narrative forward, Ayers occasionally interrupts the localized mosaic with a more authoritative historian’s voice presented in italics to guide the reader. This motif works well because, to put it simply, Ayers is a talented writer whose beautiful prose keeps the reader engaged through both narrative formats. Particularly moving here are the sections on the 1864 Confederate raid on Chambersburg and the subsequent destruction of Confederate forces and civilian barns and farms in Virginia.

The second part, titled the “Harvest of War,” captures the perilous process of Reconstruction in the Shenandoah Valley. Here the work of freed slaves comes to the fore, as they agitated for voting rights and fair labor contracts with their former masters. As a majority-white county with a sizable black population, Augusta figured heavily in the conservative movement resisting the tide of Radical Republicanism in Virginia. Ayers is careful here to highlight the shifting attitudes of Pennsylvanians too, as local moderate Republican politician Alexander McClure preserves a bare Republican majority in Franklin County and advocates for thoroughgoing Reconstruction in the face of President Andrew Johnson’s intransigence. The last chapter of the book takes in the question of contested memory, both of the war itself and of Reconstruction.

The Thin Light of Freedom is best read while consulting the Valley of the Shadow digital archive at http://valley.lib.virginia.edu/ so the reader can become familiar with the topography, local personalities, and the typical flow of private and public communication. In all, Ayers has produced a splendid, textured, and
highly readable account of ordinary Civil War and postwar life in which both
generalists and specialists will find much to enjoy.

Maryville College  Aaron Astor

*A Changing Wind: Commerce and Conflict in Civil War Atlanta.* By Wendy Hamand Venet.
(Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 2014. Pp. 304. $27.95.)

The great transportation and business center of Atlanta began in 1845 as one of
a new generation of railroad cities that would eventually include Birmingham,
Dallas, and Omaha. It gained universal fame from Margaret Mitchell’s great
Civil War epic novel *Gone With the Wind* and the resulting 1939 movie. Wendy
Hamand Venet, however, found Mitchell’s fiction lacking as history, for “in
Mitchell’s fictional city, there are no Unionists, no slaves who run away from
bondage, no destitute women who cannot support their children on government
wages, and no children who work in factories to keep their families afloat” (3).
The author describes *A Changing Wind* as an “attempt to find the stories behind
the graves of [Atlanta’s Civil War era] Oakland Cemetery and the reality behind
the fictional story told by Margaret Mitchell” (3–4).

Venet does not write an economic history in *A Changing Wind: Commerce
and Conflict in Civil War Atlanta*, contrary to the title. Business does have a
place in this paper tour of a lost city, as it would in any history of this railroad
city. Venet explains the economic argument that some Southern leaders made for
secession before they called for political disunion with the United States, and
Atlanta’s direct [foreign] trade movement. The author has a chapter on how indi-
vidual Atlanta businesses recovered (or did not) after the war. Atlanta’s location
made the Civil War only a passing event in the city’s spectacular growth. Politics
takes up far more space in this book than does economics. Someone someday
should pick up where economic scholar David F. Weiman left off and write a
financial history of antebellum and Civil War Atlanta. Nevertheless, the author
does introduce such figures as politician Lucius Jeremiah Gartrell and slave
author Harrison Berry, who were noted in their time but are forgotten now.

Venet gives the reader a tour of the lost Civil War city that highlights the
irony and symbolism of its buildings. That proves a formidable task, as the
author writes, “Historians estimate that 40 percent of Atlanta burned in the Civil
War, with most of the rest of its mid-nineteenth-century buildings destroyed in
the next hundred years, razed or paved over to build newer structures in the
name of ‘progress’” (1).
This book educates and entertains in a fast lively narrative. It does have omissions that must seem curious to the Gate City’s Civil War aficionados and scholars, such as the circumstances of Atlanta’s founding or that the photographs of the abandoned Atlanta slave market and of the ruins of the Atlanta Rolling Mill have become two of the most published and symbolic photographs of the Civil War. Overall, it holds more value to someone new to the subject than as revelations to an Atlanta scholar. A bibliography would have enhanced this work for scholars.

Wallace State Community College

Robert S. Davis


Focusing on Montgomery County, Virginia, Facing Freedom enriches the grassroots understanding of the Long Reconstruction era. Thorp contends that African Americans “laid the foundations of a new African American community in Montgomery County that survived the horrors and humiliation of Jim Crow, and their descendants have remained in the county to this day” (8). While not a major slaveholding area, Lee’s surrender brought a slow start to the Long Reconstruction in this place.

Thorp’s chapters on family formation, labor, education, and religion are among the strongest. Deftly employing census records, Thorp reveals African Americans establishing “successful autonomous families” despite the many challenges to curb black freedom (44). These families primarily reflected Victorian gender norms, but separation, widowhood, and transient work patterns added to the household diversity. These households proved essential in sustaining viable communities. Thorp then explores labor changes that allowed African Americans and their families to achieve “modest material success” (72). Beneficial partnerships mattered. Charles Schaeffer, the Freedmen’s Bureau agent, advocated for African Americans in disputes, provided more structure to labor relations, and eliminated the “elements … of slavery” still present (77). While modest economic change initially occurred, Thorp highlights the accelerated the growth of an African American middle class and property-owning class over a thirty-year period.

By considering the Long Reconstruction chronology, Thorp persuasively demonstrates how African American education became a fixture in Montgomery County. It is unclear whether black efforts predated the first Freedmen’s School opening in 1867. African American enthusiasm, however, prompted the
construction of a larger school and expansion throughout the county. Chafing at Schaeffer’s insistence on white teachers, black residents turned to the AME Church for education in Blacksburg and Wake Forest. With the creation of public schools, educational access increased. Schaeffer remained an advocate by facilitating the creation of a normal school and securing additional funding. This collaborative effort embedded the African American schoolhouse into the postwar landscape. Thorp then explores how African Americans “reoriented their spiritual lives” (162). Rejecting their subordination, African Americans established independent black churches when fiscally feasible. Though secular institutions emerged, these black churches remained the “most visible element [of] contribution to African Americans’ sense of identity and purpose as a distinct community in postwar Montgomery County” (182).

In the last major chapter, Thorp briefly delves into African American participation in electoral politics and the judiciary. Following the Reconstruction Acts of 1867, African Americans developed a complex political ethos. Although never securing political office, black men exercised their franchise. African American men and women also employed the courts to advance their rights and secure justice. Though not as rich as the previous discussions, Thorp demonstrates that limited success never deterred those who remained in the county. Rather, they “prepared for the day when those opportunities would return” (223).

By 1909, success had stalled, and some advances had been reversed. Thorp convincingly shows the reasons for significant outmigration but is less attentive to the reasons for African Americans to remain in Montgomery County. Notwithstanding, Thorp persuasively reveals how African Americans laid the foundation necessary for their survival into the twenty-first century.

*University of Alabama*  
Hilary Green


Today the word “populist” has acquired the negative connotations of tribal nationalism, racism, sexism, and antipathy to all elites. Perhaps in response to this, historians have renewed their efforts to clarify who the late nineteenth-century “Populists” really were and how their ideas affected twentieth-century American politics. The author impressively maneuvers
between the various designations of populists over time—from radical reformers and idealists to parochial, backward, anti-anti-modern isolationists, with touches of sexism, racism, and anti-Semitism—to explore more “precisely” the complexity of Populist thought and their relation to imperialism and foreign policy in the 1890s. Though some will wonder if one can achieve precision in understanding an assemblage of western reformers and democrats who had diverse ideas, the author provides a convincing account of their changing fortunes. Grounded in the Jeffersonian tradition of republicanism and liberalism that was never reconciled with the impact of American capitalism, populists viewed the “money power” of corporate monopoly, railroads, and an international cabal of foreign capitalists as a threat to freedom and equality in America.

That worldview initially led to the formation of the Populist Party and the rise of William Jennings Bryan. The author traces how, in the face of America’s embrace of imperialism in the later 1890s—particularly in the annexation of Hawaii, the Spanish-American War, and the occupation of and war in the Philippines—that unity became harder to maintain. Through several well-researched and detailed and nuanced local and regional stories, readers can follow how western populists rose and fell politically throughout the 1890s. Through it all, the western populists became increasingly “unclear,” “confused,” and “messy” and, in regards to Bryan in 1899, “complicated.” The author suggests, however, that instead of disappearing before the rising tide of Republican power and current events, western populists “manifested” themselves in the debates and continued to contest imperialist policy and carried that opposition on into the failed election of 1900. Initially, western populists, in deference to political and patriotic considerations, supported the Cuban war, but only as a war of liberation. That only allowed Republicans to wave the “bloody flag” again and question their patriotism, resulting in defeat in 1898. When war in the Philippines reunited them in opposition, however, their opposition to empire was based less on the usual economic or political concerns, than on racial concerns—harkening back to opponents of the War with Mexico in the 1840s. In the face of wartime patriotism and a renewed economy, they waffled and stumbled into defeat in 1900. Even so, the author tries to hold his line of argument that the Populists remained vigorous by tepidly suggesting that they reflected “America’s own contradictory tradition” exemplified by both Lincoln and Jefferson. More compellingly, he argues that, rather than disappearing, populist opposition remained a vital force into the 20th century and helped the Democratic Party adjust to the modern world. This study will help us further rethink the evasive
Populists and how they responded to modern life and contributed to American politics.

University of Nebraska, Lincoln


The portrayal of women as bad drivers has a well-established presence in American popular culture. Katherine Parkin shows that this is not a new trend and convincingly argues “the public response to women behind the wheel has always been skepticism” (103). She sets out to show how women’s experiences with cars and the automobile industry differed from those of men in ways that expose larger assumptions about gender and gender roles. Parkin effectively demonstrates how “taking a gendered lens to cars” reveals “the long-standing power of patriarchy” to shape women’s experiences with automobiles (180). To Parkin, the key insights are in the “significant continuity of cultural and behavioral impulses regarding American women’s experience with cars” (xx). In American culture in the twenty-first century, as in the twentieth century, “men claimed control of automobiles” while “women and cars persisted in being a secondary relationship” (180, 179).

Parkin organizes the book around key themes, including drivers’ education and drivers’ licensing, the automotive industry, and consumption of cars and car services, including maintenance and repair services, and the tendency to assign cars a female gender role and identity. The book’s organization is especially effective in highlighting the persistence of gendered ideas of access to individuality, freedom, and empowerment through cars and automobile culture. Though driving and car ownership held the potential for women’s freedom, cars instead became a site of gendered experiences and expectations. Drivers’ education programs and licensing requirements centered around “the expectation that male drivers came in with authority” and “women did not know how to drive” (9, 26). Skepticism of women as drivers also shaped how they were viewed as consumers; the automotive industry’s position “was to largely ignore women as consumers” (30). The stereotype of women as bad drivers remained remarkably consistent over the course of the twentieth century, shaping everything from automobile ads to film screens, despite “decades of study that demonstrated otherwise” (71). Although some women defied expectations and worked in the car care industry, “car care retained its male identity” even while American culture has “anthropomorphized cars” as female (144, 146).
The book is fun to read and exhaustively researched, with abundant humorous material analyzed, such as advertisements and prescriptive literature as well as a wide range of illuminating archival sources. Parkin convincingly shows how automobiles have been thought about and talked about as reserved for men. She provides compelling evidence of the ways that gender continues to shape seemingly ordinary everyday experiences in ways that reassert patriarchal power relations and inequities. As Parkin concludes, “The broader American society and its car culture in particular persisted in being patriarchal into the twenty-first century” (180). Overall the book offers important lessons in the power of gendered expectations and images to exclude women from equal opportunities.

Independent Scholar  
Polly Reed Myers


American social historian Jacqueline Jones makes the argument that anarchist-communist Lucy Parsons’ long career in the 19th-20th centuries as an activist, writer, mother, and widowed wife was full of contradictions. These contradictions were birthed from Parsons’ desire to maintain a persona as “champion of the laboring classes” (xiii) while strategically hiding aspects of her own background that would be displeasing—if not downright damning—to the largely white, immigrant masses on whose behalf she advocated. Lacking an autobiographical narrative from Parsons, Jones employs archival materials to prove that Parsons was a formerly enslaved mixed-race black woman from Virginia, rather than (as Parsons herself claimed) the product of Indian and Spanish parentage in Texas. Jones explores what might have led Parsons to create an alternative origin story, and she engages with her willful ignorance about black organizing efforts that stemmed from this choice.

Jones unpacks the inconsistencies within Parsons’ family life, including her troubled relationship with her children as well as her having multiple lovers after the martyrdom of her husband and fellow organizer, Albert Parsons. Despite her public call for traditional sexual mores and nuclear family values, Parsons eschewed the Victorian respectability politics of her age. With these additions, Jones’ work sets itself apart from Carolyn Ashbaugh’s 1976 biography, which before Goddess of Anarchy was the only biography dedicated to Parsons.
While Jones is a professor of history, academics and public audiences will find her work both accessible and rigorously sourced. The work is sectioned into four chronological parts: part one tracks Lucy and Albert Parsons’ childhoods, courtship, and radicalization in Waco, Texas; part two details Albert and Lucy’s arrival on the Chicago labor organizing scene as political orators and alternative media producers. This section contains some of the strongest narrative writing in the book as Jones uses the industrial environment of Gilded Age Chicago as a thread that links the divided (though economically intertwined) worlds of the white immigrant “urban proletariat” (56), the worse-off African-American transplant workers, the drama-hungry journalists, and the anti-anarchist police forces. Chapters seven through nine immerse the reader in the tragedy of Albert’s trial and execution for the Haymarket bombing, as well as Lucy’s efforts to galvanize political and monetary support for her own career as an anarchist.

Section three follows Lucy Parsons’ struggle in her later years to find an organizing community that shared her unwavering values on labor and free speech, particularly as Chicago’s anarchist landscape evolved. While Parsons maintained her earlier calls for tactical dynamite strikes, anarchism had grown to include the embrace of sexual taboo and bohemian artistic expression. Section four explores the latter years of Parsons’ life, including how her organizing efforts shifted to compensate for the widely held wartime view that workers’ organizations, anarchists, and communists were “inherently criminal enterprises” (318).

That it might have gone further in its theoretical analysis of Parsons’ gendered and racial personal blind spots will disappoint some. However, Jones’ work sets a strong foundation for future researchers to interrogate Parsons’ legacy as a woman of color activist in American history. While the narration of copious primary sources remains Jones’ chief contribution to Parsons’ legacy, Goddess of Anarchy may also serve as “a cautionary tale” to organizers today about “the challenges of promoting a radical message” (xii) that is discriminatory in whom it serves and uplifts.

University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

Michelle May-Curry


This book addresses Minnesota’s history of sterilization through the lens of public welfare. Key issues are the place of sterilization in the child welfare system,
the role of institutions in the process of securing sterilizations, and the construction of the concept of the “feeble-minded.” Ladd-Taylor argues that fears of racial purity were secondary to fiscal concerns and the state’s administrative structure: “When eugenic sterilization is examined from a social welfare perspective, it appears less like a deliberate plan for genetic improvement than a mundane and all-too-modern tale of fiscal politics, troubled families, and deeply felt cultural attitudes about disability, welfare dependency, sexuality, and gender” (2). The book traces two conceptions of children: the deserving poor innocent child who merited state protection, and the “opposing image of the wicked or ‘defective’ child” (25).

Minnesota’s Children’s Bureau, via county welfare boards, administered the sterilization program. The result was significant variation in the criteria employed to decide sterilization cases. Minnesota’s sterilization law, passed in 1925, was more limited than those of many states, targeting specifically “feeble-minded and insane persons” who had been placed in state guardianship. The law also required the written consent of either the individual’s spouse or nearest relative. Ladd-Taylor analyzes the limitations of the concept of “voluntary consent,” but she argues that it did offer families a means to prevent some sterilization.

Ladd-Taylor mines an impressive array of state and local records, including the papers of key officials, the Department of Public Welfare, and state institutions. Drawing on case records, she details the issues shaping decisions regarding sterilizations. The text balances the views of policy makers and elites with the experiences of those directly harmed by the state’s sterilization policies, illustrating the degree of administrative variation across the state. Class was a key factor, but race, particularly for Native Americans, was also significant.

The book’s organization is chronological; early chapters focus on institutionalization, the development of the state’s sterilization law, and the definition and construction of “feeble-minded” persons. Both men and women deemed to be “defective” usually engaged in perceived sexual transgressions, but men were more likely to participate in illegal behavior. Chapter 4 analyzes the process of cases of sterilization; for many, surgery was the only escape from an institution. Chapter 5 analyzes the Depression and World War II years. Critiques of institutional care increased after the war, culminating in the deinstitutionalization movement of the 1970s, the focus of chapter 6. The idea of the “feeble-minded” individual gave way to the innocent “mentally retarded” child. The text’s conclusion analyzes how eugenics and sterilization persist despite new protections in the 1975 Mental Retardation Protection Act.
A short review cannot do justice to this carefully researched and well-written study. It will appeal to historians of eugenics as well as social policy, child welfare, and the disabled. Ladd-Taylor complicates the history of sterilization and child welfare policies, clearly demonstrating that “there is no single sterilization story in the United States” (128).

*Michigan State University*  
Susan Stein-Roggenbuck

(Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2017. Pp. 294. $34.95.)

In July 1914, American correspondents gathered in Paris to cover the trial of Henriette Caillaux. The French beauty had murdered a newspaper editor who was running damning stories of her famous and controversial husband—the finance minister Joseph Caillaux. Reporters jostled for seats with Parisian celebrities, who treated the event like opening night at the opera. The courtroom scene so dominated the news that virtually no attention was paid to another murder, the assassination of the Archduke Franz Ferdinand by a Serb in Sarajevo.

Nevertheless, the orientation of American news was about to change. The day that Madame Caillaux was nearly unanimously acquitted—the murder was justified as a *crime passionnel*—Austria-Hungary declared war on Serbia. Reporters streamed to Europe. Over the next four years, Americans were riveted to news about the bloodiest war in world history up to that point.

Historians generally give World War I rather the same level of attention journalists gave the assassination of Franz Ferdinand in 1914. Whereas World War II looms large, the Great War, whose resolution may have helped cause it, is almost an afterthought. The absence of historical attention is especially glaring with regard to press coverage.

Thus a new volume by military historian Chris Dubbs is most welcome. *American Journalists in the Great War* traces the evolution of war correspondence from the early days of war, when journalists were barred from the front lines but were free to set out on their own adventures in search of news, to a new era of guided official tours of battle zones and embedded journalists. Dubbs argues—although he does not attempt to make detailed comparisons—that American journalists helped to shape this “complete evolutionary cycle of reporting” more than any other group of reporters (2).

Dubbs presents a vibrant group of correspondents, including Richard Dunn, Irvin Cobb, Richard Harding Davis, Will Irwin, Frederick Palmer, and William
Wythe, and then highlights their dangerous attempts to sneak to the front lines, as well as their frustrations in dealing with constant and strict censorship. In the early months of war, for example, a group of American reporters arrived in the Belgian city of Louvain. When the German military invaded the city shortly afterward, the reporters feared arrest or execution, but were instead greeted with amusement when they explained to a German officer they had arrived at the sensitive location by taxicab. These “freelance excursions” would soon end, however, as the Allies and Central powers recognized the importance not only of censoring negative press, but also of encouraging positive coverage (108).

Using the correspondents’ published accounts, Dubbs focuses on American journalists’ successes getting war news to American readers. Their persistence coupled with the U.S.'s neutral status in the conflict until 1917 meant American readers were better informed than the publics of the belligerent nations. Dubbs acknowledges the reporters also learned to “steer coverage around forbidden topics” to get material passed by censors, although he could have made more of this (107). After the United States entered the war, correspondents were constantly frustrated by American press handlers. (Does that ever work?)

Dubbs’ descriptive account contributes an important and needed synthesis of American correspondents’ experiences during the war. Although he did not make use of archival collections, he usefully let correspondents “tell their own stories.”

*Louisiana State University* John Maxwell Hamilton and Meghan Menard McCune


The author of this concise book ambitiously describes his study as constituting the “first extended account” of how the early black history movement, trailblazed by Carter G. Woodson, “reflected, refracted, and sometimes even shaped broader trends in African American thought and culture” (1–2).

For Snyder, it is important to understand how Woodson and his Association for the Study of Negro Life and History (ASNLH) coworkers—in various public spaces and with many different approaches—propagated, construed, discussed, performed, and memorialized black history. In his estimation, during the era of Jim Crow segregation, the association was a largely apolitical, integrationist-minded, and racial uplift organization that espoused a pragmatic and vindicationist brand of black history. For him, it was ultimately guided by a trilogy of preoccupations: the color line, culture, and race. These issues, he notes, were “nearly always implicated in the association’s work” (12).
The author subdivides Woodson’s, the association’s, and a group of black scholars’ work into three major periods: 1915–1926, 1922–1941, and 1942–1956. In addition to an introduction as well as a brief epilogue, Making Black History is subdivided into three distinct parts with two interconnected chapters per section.

In the opening chapter, the author overviews Woodson’s early scholarly life and work as well as the formative years of the ASNLH. The most original argument here is that Woodson’s presence at the Lincoln Jubilee in Chicago in 1915 “was one of the first efforts to promote black history to a wider audience” (33). In chapter two, he describes the association as being an advocate of social history and underscores the importance of Woodson’s The Negro in Our History (1922). In part two, Snyder maintains that black history was a vital component of the New Negro renaissance and pinpoints the significance of black history pageants to Negro History Week celebrations and black history consciousness building. In part three, the author unpacks the association’s discourse surrounding race while also delving into how Woodson viewed World War II and how the association responded to the monumental Brown decision in 1954.

The author’s most significant contributions include his discussions of Woodson’s attendance at the Lincoln Jubilee, the association’s influence on the New Negro movement, and black history pageants. He also draws from a host of revealing primary sources. I, for instance, did not know that Woodson called historically-conscious African Americans “wide-awake Negroes” (104).

Several points that he raises do deserve further elaboration and theorization. Scholarship by Woodson scholars challenges his belief that “the cause of the proletariat was effectively absent from the association’s purview” (8) and that the organization was apolitical. Throughout the book, Snyder also refers to “the association” as if the organization was a monolithic group and that most of the association members whom he profiles in depth were published scholars.

Nonetheless, this readable book can serve as a thought-provoking take on the early black history movement for those without expertise in the subject.

Pero Gaglo Dagbovie

Michigan State University


In the wake of slavery another labor tragedy emerged in the American South. Firmly entrenched by the early twentieth century, the exploitive and racist system
of sharecropping seemingly defied humane alternatives. Robert Hunt Ferguson explores a determined challenge to sharecropping in the history of two cooperative farms in Mississippi, the Delta Farm (1936–1942) and its successor, the Providence Farm (1938–1956). Ferguson nicely unravels the strands of radical ideology that motivated the cooperatives and then documents their implementation and evolution in the Mississippi Delta region.

The New Deal programs to confront the agricultural catastrophe of the Great Depression either aided the landowners or, in the case of the Resettlement Administration, did not go far enough. Indirectly, however, they encouraged experimentation. Socialists from afar and in the South, along with the Southern Tenant Farmers’ Union, were willing to promote a new economic model. Christian Socialists sought the implementation of a just racial system. Ferguson shows how the personalities and the commitments of the founders of the Farms put their ideologies to the test. Noble and naïve, they saw the potential of a shift in “race relations generated by pragmatism and desperation” (45). That desperation inhibited economic progress at the Delta Farm; indifferent land and poor yields did not help. The gradual relocation to the Providence Farm offered a more diversified economic base, but eventually a less diverse racial composition. As whites left the Farm for war industries, the remaining “Providence residents turned to black self-help initiatives to redress their own poverty” (109). A cooperative store, credit union, education, and health care formed the core of activities for the residents of the Farm and many African Americans in Holmes County.

The two cooperatives were products of their times. The planning was done by whites, who also supervised farm activities. The African American farmers were not seen as “ready” to lead or to take ownership of the land. Ultimately the “experiment in cooperative communalism” (141) slowly deteriorated after WWII. Following the Brown decision (1954) and the Emmett Till murder (1955), mounting white hostility forced the closing of the Providence Farm.

Ferguson’s sensitivity to the complexity of this radical experiment is commendable. How the Farms fit into the fabric of Southern life from the 1930s to the mid-1950s is adeptly done. Some discussion of the Resettlement Administration, however, would have augmented the context. More difficult to grasp are the feelings of the African-American residents of the Delta and Providence Farms. Their voices come through inconsistently, probably due to a lack of surviving evidence.

Ferguson is careful not to overstate the impact of either the Delta or Providence Farms. His study is fascinating in showing the possibilities and the currents that ran counter to the oppressive social and economic regime in the early
twentieth-century South. If cooperative communalism was ultimately not the solution, it formed part of the continuum of resistance. Ferguson’s fine analysis honors the whites and African Americans who glimpsed a better future.

Cornell College

M. Philip Lucas


Several years ago, Karen Cox and Sarah Gardner organized a panel on the South during the 1930s at a Southern Historical Association conference. Surprised by the enthusiastic reception their panel received, they decided to turn it into a larger book project. Reassessing the 1930s South is the result.

More specifically, Cox and Gardner have assembled thirteen essays and organized them in five groups: “Literary Alternatives,” “Art and Theater,” “Tourism and Modernization,” “Rural Representations and Realities,” and “Race and Interracialism.” As those subheadings suggest, the bulk of the essays focus on Southern history through what we might call a cultural lens—Cox is the author of a book about the South in American popular culture. None of the essays engages with, for example, Southern politics, economics, or demography in a direct way.

The volume usefully reminds us just how central the South was—literally and imaginatively—to the New Deal’s responses to the Great Depression. In 1933 Franklin Roosevelt thought Southern poverty was the single biggest challenge he faced as he moved into the White House, and a 1938 report commissioned by his administration identified the South as “the Nation’s no. 1 economic problem—the Nation’s not merely the South’s” (128). As a consequence, the South came under national scrutiny to an extent it had not since the end of Reconstruction and often in ways that made Southerners resentful and defensive.

Edited collections are notoriously difficult to review. The essays here range widely across subjects and geography—from Bryan Giemza’s tightly focused micro-biography of the novelist E. P. O’Donnell to Nicholas Roland’s discussion of the Hall of Negro Life at the Texas Centennial Exposition of 1936 and much else in between. Some subjects will be familiar to most readers, like the Highlander Folk School, and others may not be, like the sociological work of Ruth Allen and Margaret Jarman. That’s surely one strength of this volume, though it is also the case that there is some repetition that might have been edited out. Two essays deal with Tennessee Williams and two with the Tennessee Valley Authority. Perhaps my
major frustration with *Reassessing the South* is that too many of these essays feel too brief. I found myself wanting authors to develop ideas and lines of inquiry more fully. In the end, the collection might have been even more satisfying had there been somewhat fewer contributions that ran deeper.

In their introduction to the collection, the editors write that they want to present a South during the Depression decade that is more complicated than “the binary of a benighted versus romanticized region” (4). In fact, that description doesn’t do full justice to this collection. Taken together, these essays give us a composite portrait of the South on the cusp. No one in the 1930s could know about the dramatic transformation about to change the South, but these essays reveal a South poised between the past—and many furiously trying to cling to it—and imagining a future that might be different.

*Steven Conn*

*Miami University of Ohio*

---


In *Revolutionaries for the Right*, Kyle Burke provides an invaluable examination of the global organizations and private support backed by a handful of US conservatives during the Cold War. In speaking to foreign policy studies, Burke’s work marvelously complements those examinations highlighting long-overlooked US networks and funding of conservatism, notably Godfrey Hodgson’s *The World Turned Right Side Up* and Kim Phillips-Fein’s *Invisible Hands*. Though hitting upon larger connections and episodes with appearances by Eastern European, Southeast Asian, African, and Latin American anticommunists, the book primarily traces a select group of influential conservative internationalists thanks to Marvin Liebman’s memoirs and papers, Clarence Manion’s radio broadcasts and correspondence, and John Singlaub’s files.

The surprisingly brief first chapter introduces the reader to Liebman and the early efforts of the Asian Peoples’ Anti-Communist League, the Committee of One Million, the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations, and Mexican Jorge Prieto Laurens to build world-spanning anticommunist networks in the 1940s and 1950s. The constant fragmentation surrounding these first attempts would have been the perfect opportunity for Burke to dig deeper into these counterrevolutionaries’ vision, for their understanding of the role of the ‘state,’ racial and gender hierarchies, and antisemitism creep up throughout the book. Likewise, the book in
many sections reveals how non-US anticommunists tried to latch onto or utilize US domestic issues, oftentimes white backlash to civil rights, to their own advantage. On one hand, such perspectives and right-wing strategies would merit their own sustained analysis. On the other hand, Burke’s focus is not on these larger worldviews but on the emerging networks themselves, which is why his research really flourishes from the second chapter onward and makes his book a blueprint for future investigations of international anticommunism.

The Cuban Revolution, the Vietnam War’s escalation, and Congolese decolonization sparked Manion and Liebman, joined by William Buckley, Max Yergan, and Miami-based Cuban exiles, to work through the Young Americans for Freedom, the Freedom Studies Center, the American Committee for Aid to Katanga Freedom Fighters, and the Friends of Rhodesian Independence. Dovetailing with local fears of civil rights movements as communist machinations, these elite US conservatives lobbied Congress and grassroots organizations to stand against supposedly Soviet-driven efforts throughout the world. Into the 1970s, the same frustrations and disagreements kept plaguing the World Anti-Communist League, the American Council for World Freedom, and the American-Chilean Council.

Singlaub and fellow intelligence/military veterans then take center stage, seeing the Church Committee, withdrawal from Vietnam, and Jimmy Carter’s election as the latest betrayals of US international might. From shaping think tanks to commemorating their efforts in *Soldier of Fortune* to supporting right-wing groups in Central America, Afghanistan, and Southeast Asia, such sources of private support soon found public legitimacy and support in Ronald Reagan’s White House, leaving a legacy found today in conservative policy organizations and private military firms.

*Stephen F. Austin State University*

Aaron Coy Moulton


Gary Dorrien’s profound book offers a new perspective in civil rights history by tracing the development of the black social gospel leading up to the emergence of Martin Luther King Jr. and the effects it had in the aftermath of his assassination. This book is the sequel to *The New Abolition: W.E.B. Dubois and the Black Social Gospel.* Dorrien’s argument rests on key people such as Mordecai Johnson, Benjamin Mays, Howard Thurman, Adam Clayton Powell Jr., Martin Luther King Jr., and Pauli Murray. He argues that the black social gospel, rooted in Walter Rauschenbusch’s philosophy, drove the works of Johnson, Mays, and Thurman. They influenced
King, who in turn used that philosophy in his own activism, inspiring countless others in the wake of his death. He writes that the black social gospel laid the foundation of the “theology of social justice that the civil rights movement espoused” (4).

Dorrien spends time in chapters two and three on Johnson, Mays, and Thurman, laying the foundation for his argument. The history of Howard University and the role it played in shaping the movement is a fascinating highlight from this part. He moves on to Powell in chapter four and then focuses on King in chapters five and six. Chapter seven examines how this philosophy continued after King’s murder through J. Deotis Roberts, James Cone, C.T. Vivian, and Murray. His treatment of Murray is intriguing, offering a narrative that argues both King’s and the black social gospel’s relevance through the pioneering works of this trailblazer.

The book sets King as a bridge of the movement, inspiring the generation that followed while taking strength and guidance from those who came before. Dorrien weaves an engaging, thought-provoking narrative, highlighting various perspectives of similar events that fostered the leadership of the movement. One example of this style is an examination of the role that some of these leaders had in the Prayer Pilgrimage for Freedom in 1957. Johnson, Powell, and King all spoke at this event in front of the Lincoln Memorial with future SCLC staffer Andrew Young cheering in the crowd. Dorrien writes about Johnson’s celebration of the Brown decision and Powell’s discontent with the administration in chapter four (220). In the following chapter he focuses on King’s “Give us the Ballot” speech at the same event (305). This type of analysis shapes the tone of the book by demonstrating how the philosophies and lives of these civil rights pioneers were entwined.

Dorrien’s analysis illuminates the role that the black social gospel played in the civil rights movement, delving into the nature of that philosophy and how it was a pervasive element in the tactics of these individuals, serving as an anchor that held together their approaches to confronting racism. The book’s eloquence lies in its ability to show how important these relationships and ideas were to fulfill the goals of the movement. It is an exemplary addition to the field and should be read by anyone studying this vital moment in United States history.

Quinnipiac University/University of Connecticut

Philip A. Goduti Jr


An unabashed believer in economic liberalism, C. Don Johnson warns us of the dangers of Donald Trump’s protectionist policies. By exploring the history of
protectionism since the nation’s founding, the rise of the modern-day liberal order, and its potential demise under Trump, this former congressman, trade negotiator, and lawyer lays out a story designed to reach a wide audience. Granted, this book is not cutting edge research; he consulted few archives and mainly drew on the work of others (he has a fine bibliography) or government publications, supplemented by periodicals. Sprinkled in are anecdotes drawing on his long experience, since the 1970s, with policymakers. His task, however, is not to engage trade experts but to issue a red alert that the multilateral trade system of the past seventy years is under threat from Trump’s protectionism. This danger risks undermining the economic health—or perhaps even the survival of business and labor interests—of the United States. Johnson is all about tearing down walls that, if maintained, eventually weaken nations at home and make them vulnerable to predators abroad.

Johnson makes his case that freetrade benefits workers, as well as businesses, although in the last few decades the government could have been more responsive to labor’s (as well as the environmental movement’s) protests over market forces. Claiming that trade affects politics, not just economics, the author traces the history behind the “visible hands” of people and agencies who made policy. He zeroes in on the interests behind policy and whether their own self-interest, the public good, or political payoffs drove their decisions. The politics of protectionism oftentimes undermined the working class by denying labor the right to a fair wage. The key is that there has always been conflict over trade, but it was political and not economic in nature.

An introduction to Adam Smith in an age of mercantilism and British free trade policies of the nineteenth century precedes Johnson’s entry into American trade history. Roughly a third of the book brings the story from the nation’s founding to the Great Depression. In this standard history of political fighting over the tariff, Johnson notes that protectionism, fed by Hamiltonian industrial policy and emerging nationalism of the antebellum period, was more the rule than low tariffs. Reform ebbed and flowed after the Civil War. In the Progressive Era, Republicans divided to give Democrats a foothold to lower duties (and supplant the lost revenue with a national income tax) but business protectionists dominated in the 1920s, and the GOP’s 1930 Smoot-Hawley Tariff, designed partly to protect labor, worsened the Depression. Johnson notes the legacy of Smoot-Hawley stretched through his lawyer days in the mid-1970s, and does so today.

The second part of the book is remarkable for both its length (about a third of the book) and for targeting just 15 years of history, around World War II. This is Johnson’s anchor, so one wonders why he felt the need to detail the prior history. Under Cordell Hull, the trade liberalization and expansion guru, U.S. policy embedded protectionism in an overarching liberal economic order that shaped post-World War II
history. We know the story well but this section is superb at capturing trade politics, including propaganda on both sides of the debate. Sheer American power prevailed as well. Indeed, Anglo-American negotiators created a multilateral regime based on careful reciprocal tariff reductions, but Hull’s market-oriented vision won out over the socialist protectionism of John Maynard Keynes, including the dashing of a world trade organization meant to promote full employment and corral big business. Still, GATT and the Marshall Plan built a postwar liberal order as much as military and monetary cooperation.

Part three finishes off this last bit of history and rushes through the next thirty years, a curious approach because Johnson earned his chops during the legislative process of the Trade Reform Act of 1974. Regardless, he spends sufficient time on the mid-twentieth century to make a case for NAFTA and the WTO as institutions that finally gave labor more rights and leverage, even if labor organizations did not see things that way. This last section covers the drama of textile negotiations, NAFTA, and especially the Seattle protests of 1999. It also addresses the partisan battles over free trade agreements, including the ill-fated Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) that labor denounced even if it backed Barack Obama in general. Donald Trump and his brain, Steve Bannon, engineered their America First doctrine by focusing on protectionism and withdrawal from multilateralism. Johnson reminds us that the liberal economic order is an unappreciated tool of American prosperity, leadership, and sound politics, a thought oft-heard today.

University of Colorado Boulder

Thomas W. Zeiler


The American Revolution created not one nation, but two. By drawing an international border at the war’s end through Britain’s North American empire, Congress and George III laid the groundwork for the modern United States and Canada. The early history of that border is the subject of Lawrence Hatter’s valuable new book.

During its first thirty or so years, the U.S.-Canadian boundary was a border in name only. Under the preliminary articles of peace, which the emissaries of Britain and the United States signed in November 1782, the government of Lord Shelburne promised a commercial treaty that would allow the newly independent states to trade with Britain’s remaining empire on the same terms as they had
before the revolution. Those plans came to nothing. Having swallowed the bitter pill of independence, Parliament refused to enact the necessary legislation, and the Board of Trade closed the Caribbean to American ships and goods. In Canada, however, British officials proceeded to create a local free trade zone by retaining seven forts in what was now U.S. territory. Two, Detroit and Michilimackinac on Mackinac Island between Michigan’s lower and upper peninsulas, became sites of a flourishing Indian trade in animal furs that stretched deep into the trans-Appalachian west and, eventually, the lands and waters of the Louisiana Purchase. In the Jay Treaty of 1794, Britain agreed to hand Detroit and Michilimackinac over to the Americans but secured concessions that allowed its merchants to continue plying their trade.

In relating this history, Hatter focuses on two groups. The first consists of the Indians and the British and French merchants—the “citizens of convenience” of the book’s title—who traded with them. Under the Jay Treaty, British and U.S. nationals were permitted to cross the border at will, live on either side of it, and decide whether to be American citizens or British subjects. In the now-American town of Detroit, fully a third of the male settler population chose to remain British (82). In the second group are the agents of the burgeoning American state: soldiers, customs officers, and governors, for whom the trade between Canada and the Indians of the Northwest Territory represented a potentially lethal threat to the republic’s territorial ambitions. As long as pro-British Federalists held the levers of power, fur traders retained the advantage. Following Jefferson’s election, the balance tilted the other way. During the embargos of 1807–1811, merchants on both sides of the border suffered heavy losses, and the War of 1812 shut down the trade altogether. After 1815, the Madison and Monroe administrations refused to let the Canadians return. The United States’ dominion over the Indian territory of the West was complete.

Hatter tells this story with considerable skill. The book is well-researched, drawing on published as well as archival sources. For anyone interested in how the British Empire became the United States and Canada, Citizens of Convenience should be required reading.

University of New Hampshire

Eliga Gould


The author of this study has combed through the archives to bring to light the intricate connections between artists, the Mexican State, and their respective
ideologies, which were not always mutually supportive. Stephanie Smith traces the tumultuous relationships between the artists who underscored their commitment to the ideological left, which at times was the primary focus, and those for whom the artwork was more important. Indeed, David Alfaro Siqueiros and Diego Rivera were at odds with each other and with the PCM, the Mexican Communist Party, for much of their lives. The challenge of working during the postrevolutionary era (1920–1970s) complicated life for Mexican artists, as they were to represent the nation and educate the populace. However, many also chose to radicalize the people ideologically, which may have resulted in negative or positive repercussions from the State. Smith succeeds in detailing how faithful the artists were to the Communist Party, to their art, and to the nation.

Beyond Rivera and Siqueiros, Smith includes two chapters of the five dedicated to women artists during the Cultural Revolution (1919–1954) and to their role in creating the postrevolutionary society (1930–54). The author emphasizes Frida Kahlo and her part (along with Rivera) in bringing Leon Trotsky to Mexico as a political exile. Kahlo’s and Rivera’s support for the Russian is discussed in depth, as well as his impact on the State, other artists, and the Communist Party. This sole individual caused immense disruption to normal day-to-day life in Mexico, and while Trotsky did survive one assassination attempt, he did not escape the second.

Many female artists, such as Tina Modotti and Aurora Reyes, are presented here. Additionally, LEAR (League of Revolutionary Writers and Artists) and the Taller de Gráfica Popular (TGP) including Celia Calderón, Andrea Gómez, Elena Huerta, Sarah Jiménez, María Luisa Martín, and Fanny Rabel are mentioned. Moreover, the struggle between politics and art through the lens of gender becomes a focal point that comes to a head when Tina Modotti is arrested and exiled. Many of the artists, of all genders, continue to represent the people in their work and not bow to outside forces. Specifically, the TGP stated: We believe “that, in order to serve the people, art must reflect the social reality of the times and have unity of content and form” (165).

This work will serve scholars and graduate students studying the postrevolutionary era. The specificity of detail cannot be matched and permits a greater understanding of the complexity of this period in Mexico’s history. Stylistically, the text is accessible with each chapter presenting another angle; it is as if each chapter adds another layer of depth to the mural that Smith masterfully paints. In summary, Smith analyzes the ideological lives of the
artists while shedding light on the interconnectedness of the Mexican State, political ideology, and art.

Georgian Court University Kathryn Quinn-Sánchez, Ph.D., and Jaime A. Rivera Flores, Ph.D.

ASIA AND THE PACIFIC


This book is a welcome contribution to contemporary literature on Nur Jahan. The text is beautifully written, and Lal’s narrative is a powerful rendering of the complexities of Nur Jahan’s family life and of her many accomplishments. Throughout the book, it is clear that the author has a deep familiarity with the dynamics of place and with the Persian sources. This makes for an impressive study, seamlessly weaving rich and evocative details from her resources into a clear and engaging portrait of one of India’s most powerful women and one of the jewels of the Mughal period.

The author uses a breadth of sources, especially and importantly, Persian sources. Because the Persian materials are not all contemporary to Nur Jahan’s life, they can fill out the gaps in the original story creating a fulsome depiction of the empress’s life. It would be helpful, however, if the author had made clear the evolution of the renderings of Nur Jahan’s life, so as to highlight the development of interpretations over time.

One of the important sources for the Nur Jahan story is the information, contemporary to her life with Jahangir, that comes from miniature painting. Three such paintings are of note here in seeing the context of the lives of women at the court. The first is an image of Jahangir investing a courtier with a robe, ca. 1616, now in the British Museum, London. In the group of onlookers is a figure who has been identified as Sir Thomas Roe, and whose embassy to India occurred in the period 1615–1618. Roe was present at the court hoping to obtain protection on behalf of the East India Company’s operation in Surat. The book’s discussion is substantial, and is important to the issue of Mughal women and international trade. When the author notes of Roe and Jahangir, however, that “there’s no evidence in the Mughal court records that they ever met” (p. 139), an exploration of the nature and place of the British Museum image would be helpful.

The second painting is “Jahangir and Prince Khurram Entertained by Nur Jahan,” now in the Freer Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C. This image depicts
a celebration of the military successes of Khurram/Shah Jahan in the Deccan. The author discusses this painting at length, but does not mention the images depicted in the gallery on the wall above Jahangir’s head and below the red canopy. A close look reveals the presence of the Madonna image (see M.C. Beach, *The Imperial Image*, 33, 205–206), an image that appears in other paintings, e.g. “Darbar of Jahangir” ca. 1620 from a *Jahangir-nama* manuscript (M.C. Beach, *The Grand Mogul*). Such paintings suggest that the presence of European influence at court may be an important corrective to the Nur Jahan story, and raise questions about the prominence of the Madonna in Mughal court galleries.

The third painting is “Jahangir Playing Holi,” a folio from *The Minto Album*, a collection begun under Jahangir and continued under Shah Jahan. The collection is now divided with some folios, as this one, housed in the Chester Beatty Library in Dublin (see A. Okada, *Indian Miniatures of the Mughal Court*, 191–195). This painting, ascribed to Govardhan and dated ca. 1615–1625, is important for the book’s discussion of life in the woman’s apartments. It shows women in Jahangir’s court celebrating Holi, the Hindu festival of spring, in which women sprinkle each other with colored powder and enjoy food and drink, to the accompaniment of musicians. This painting would be a useful addition to the book’s discussion of the presence of Hindu practice among women at court. With this painting, as with the previous one, several issues deserve to be explored: a comparison of the visual treatment of women in Akbari and Jahangiri painting, and the growth of portraiture in the painting of these two periods.

In all, Lal has given us a very useful book and a commendable addition to Mughal and Women’s Studies.

_Trinity College_  
Ellison Findly  
Scott M. Johnson ’97 Distinguished Professor  
of Religious Studies, Emerita


This book is a comprehensive and erudite study of the discourses surrounding the crowd (qunzhong), or mass politics, during China’s transformation from a dynastic empire to a nation-state in the first half of the twentieth century. As a new form of aggregating people, the crowd is a central concept in Chinese intellectuals’
imagination and representation of the society and the political life of the new nation-state. With five main chapters, Xiao skillfully analyzes a wide variety of writings by philosophers, psychologists, and writers to investigate the circulation of the discourses of “crowd” across different disciplines and their interaction with the tumultuous political life of the time. The narrative follows an approximate chronology of the unfolding of political history, from the May Fourth Movement in 1919 to the escalation of the Communist Revolution in the 1940s. Yet the majority of the analysis centers upon the 1930s. The book is an important addition to the body of literature that studies political history through the approach of new cultural history.

The first two chapters examine two opposing discourses about the crowd by social psychologists and philosophers, respectively. The Chinese social psychologists, represented by Gao Juefu and Zhang Jiuru, embraced Le Bon’s crowd theory and characterized the crowd as irrational and easily manipulated (chapter 1). Such elite, statist views of crowd were in line with those of elite intellectuals and politicians in the early twentieth century. By contrast, philosopher Zhu Qianzhi rejected Le Bon’s theory of crowd manipulation and celebrated the “spontaneous feelings” of the masses (Chapter 2, 78 and 86). Zhu’s thought both originated in the Confucian teaching of the School of the Heart and resonated with the contemporary trend of the rise of public passion, a sign of modernity.

Chapters 3 to 5 investigate the works by writers who actively wrote about mass politics to show how the above issues surrounding the crowd—the question of subjectivity, spontaneous feelings, and the lack of rationality—played out in their writings. While embracing mass politics as a way of realizing individual wills, many writers feared the dissolving boundary between individual and the collective and sensed the danger of losing subjectivity (chapter 3). Therefore, many literary depictions of mass movement highlighted the tension between self-realization and self-disavowal. Yet, unlike those writers who were cautious about losing subjectivity, communist writer Hu Yepin imagined the collective formation as a transformative experience of enjoyment (chapter 4). This is because Hu had a persistent “longing for intimacy and self-fulfillment” (148), which was shown in his early works. Xiao suggests that this view was also shared by many other intellectuals and became the typical understanding of mass politics under the Communist regime.

Chapter 5 then follows the leftist writers Ai Qing and Ding Ling into the communist revolutionary bases to interrogate the role of voice as a powerful tool in mobilizing the masses and generating class subjectivity. The spontaneous feelings generated by the voice of the masses helped individuals transcend the boundary between self and the collective, and thus enabled individuals to gain class subjectivity. However, by claiming access to the voice, a political organization such as
the Communist Party could also manipulate the class subjectivity. In the epilogue, Xiao shows that, after 1949, the communist discourse of mass politics became the dominant view.

University of Iowa

Shuang Chen


With the general public and policy-makers as its intended audience, this collection of essays addresses almost all the key issues in Chinese politics, economy, environment, society, culture, and foreign relations. All of its authors are faculty members or affiliates of the Fairbank Center for Chinese Studies at Harvard University, and this volume serves to showcase their work as the Center celebrates its 60th anniversary.

Despite the brevity of the 36 pieces, each ranging from seven to eight pages, insights abound throughout the volume. Elizabeth Perry’s discussion of the CCP’s “right to rule”, for instance, questions the Party’s appeal to the idea of a “historical legitimacy” that bases its authority on the achievement of the Communist Revolution in restoring China’s territorial integrity and sovereignty. Instead it calls for serious efforts to promote social justice and welfare that are central to the Party’s original ideals and inherent in the ancient Chinese concept of Mandate of Heaven (16–17). Likewise, Joseph Fewsmith observes the inadequacy of the anti-corruption campaigns under Xi Jinping to rebuild the CCP’s legitimacy and underscores the necessity of fundamental structural changes that go beyond the enhancement of the Party’s Discipline Inspection Commissions (24). Mark Elliot’s review of the issue of ethnic tension in contemporary China ends with a suggestion of “sufficient political, cultural, and economic space” for non-Han peoples “to have the freedom to be simultaneously full-fledged citizens of China and ethnic Tibetans, Uyghurs, or Mongols” (41–21). In his discussion of the seven factors that have driven China’s economic growth in the past few decades, Richard Cooper finds that six of them, except for education, will disappear or no longer work as effectively as before, but he suggests that “slower growth by itself will not signify failure” (120). Robert Ross’s examination of US-China relations calls for a “policy of restraint” that allows for negotiations and compromises instead of a confrontational strategy driven by nationalist impulses (86).
The challenge for any researchers, inside or outside China, is to think “out of the box”, that is, to free themselves of the constraints imposed by the paradigms and methodologies of their respective fields and instead understand China on its own terms. The post-1949 Chinese state does appear to be problematic when measured by Max Weber’s criterion of “rational-legal” legitimacy. To make sense of the stark “anomalies” of the contemporary Chinese state, which is unusually big in size and highly authoritarian in structure, however, we need to look back at a historical course, centuries longer than the Communist revolution, in which those who dominated China transformed their state in their own ways, an experience far more complex than the “empire to nation-state” pattern found in other parts of the world. Likewise, to appreciate China’s potential for future economic growth, we should not limit our attention to the obvious factors that economists have usually stressed. Instead we should take into account a larger picture in which a set of factors embedded in Chinese cultural and historical heritages work together to sustain, directly or indirectly, China’s economic expansion. The questions about China, and answers to some of the questions raised in this book, could be different when it is viewed from different perspectives.

*The University of Texas at Austin*

Huaiyin Li


No event occurring during the Vietnam War has received more analysis, more attention, or more criticism than the Tet Offensive. Books such as Bill Allison’s *The Tet Offensive: A Brief History with Documents* (Routledge, 2008) and James Willbanks’ *The Tet Offensive: A Concise History* (Columbia University Press, 2008) have relied on primary sources to explain the myriad causes, mistakes, and miscalculations made by the American military and political leaders. Vietnam War scholar Edwin Moise has taken the research on Tet a step further by examining both American and Vietnamese sources to conclude that much of what we know about Tet is simply myth that is not supported by evidence.

When an author decides to attack conventional wisdom that has existed for fifty years, the burden is profound, particularly when analyzing an event that has become accepted scholarship. Moise establishes the conventional wisdom right up front by listing the eight most commonly held beliefs about Tet, including that the attacks were well coordinated by Communist forces, that the event was brief, that the offensive crippled the enemy critically, and that the American media
“failed to notice an American military victory but portrayed it as its opposite—an American military defeat” (2). It is the last myth that is most important because if one assumes that the media portrayed the takeover of the American Embassy in Saigon and the three-week battle in Hué as military successes, but without examining the results in the rest of the country, such depictions may have resulted in a perception by the American people of a military defeat. Moise argues that conventional wisdom does not take into account the actual words of correspondents such as Walter Cronkite. “First and simplest, the Vietcong suffered a military defeat” (179).

The other myth that Moise tackles extensively is the extent to which the enemy’s strength was crippled by America’s response. By use of Order of Battle Summaries gleaned from obscure Military Assistance Command, Vietnam (MACV) sources, Moise identifies enemy strength numbers that indicate substantial increases rather than decreases after Tet. And enemy contacts also did not diminish after Tet, thus negating the theory of a decimated Communist military force. And considering that the war would continue for another five years with minimal diminution of casualties of both American, South Vietnamese, and Communist forces, one can conclude that the enemy was not “crippled” militarily.

As commemorative anniversaries occur for the next seven years, Vietnam War scholarship will move beyond the orthodox and revisionist “camps” into post-revisionist inquiries which will reveal new profundity beyond that of previous scholars. Ed Moise has established himself as one of those researchers who will dig deeper and search for new avenues of scholarship to aid the next generations in understanding what happened in Vietnam. The Myths of Tet provides a fresh look at the most important event of America’s most controversial war.

Texas Tech University

Ron Milam


Senior New Zealand historian Michael Belgrave has put his many years of researching with the Waitangi Tribunal to good use by writing a big book on the fascinating story of the creation and gradual demise of the King Country. This richly detailed and eloquently written study is a useful complement to Vincent
O’Malley’s even larger book on the Waikato War and its long lasting impact on the Tainui iwi (tribe) and the Kingitanga (King Movement). Belgrave doesn’t spell out this complementarity but his industrious research reveals much about the Ngāti Maniapoto experience of colonial wars, land confiscation, and the on-going disruption caused by British Imperial expansion. For overseas readers, Ngāti Maniapoto made up the other major tribe within the Kingitanga, and its territory lies to the west of Tainui lands where the Māori King Tāwhiao took refuge in this virtually independent state within a state from 1864 to the 1880s. Finally, in 1885, with the sale of land to the colonial Government to make possible completion of the main trunk railway line from Wellington to Auckland, the autonomous King Country was broken up and Tāwhiao moved the Kingitanga back to his ancestral home at Ngāruawāhia, north of modern day Hamilton. Thereafter, white settler farmers would slowly open the so-called “King Country”.

Surprisingly, this story has not been examined in much detail previously and Belgrave’s book is, therefore, a worthy addition to New Zealand historiography. It also highlights the urgent need for new biographies of the key Ngāti Maniapoto negotiator—the warrior chief and New Zealand Wars’ hero Rewi Maniapoto, as well as the remarkable, but sometimes mercurial, Tāwhiao. Several other important Ngāti Maniapoto Rangatira (Chiefs) also make long overdue and welcome appearances in New Zealand historical writing.

Nevertheless, the book seems to lack the tribal experience as caught in Māori language sources that have become much more readily available in recent years, especially via Māori language newspapers now online, and growing tribal archives. The author focuses rather heavily on official government sources in the form of a Royal Commission and accounts as supplied in English language newspapers controlled by settler journalists and editors, some of whom had vested interests in the opening up of the King Country. Belgrave could also have made a greater effort to follow the example of other leading scholars of Māori history such as Judith Binney by interviewing descendants of the negotiators as well as contemporary Ngāti Maniapoto commentators on the longer range impact of the developments and land sales he describes in such careful detail. After all, O’Malley managed this effectively in his study of the long-range impact on Tainui. Given that the King Country story reveals much about the consequences of European imperial expansion for indigenous people, wider comparisons with the rest of the British World or the North American Plains Wars are strangely absent.
So although Belgrave’s well written and carefully researched new book enriches New Zealand historiography it could have added even more if he had utilised a broader range of sources to underpin his study and attempted transnational comparisons.

University of Otago, New Zealand

Tom Brooking

EUROPE

The Etruscans (Lost Civilizations). By Lucy Shipley. (London: Reaktion Books Ltd [distributed in the USA by the University of Chicago Press], 2017, Pp. 213. $25.00.)

One of several small volumes in the new and growing Lost Civilizations series, which includes Egypt, The Greeks, The Persians, The Indus, and The Goths, Lucy Shipley’s The Etruscans is a thoroughly up-to-date account of what we know today about the most important pre-Roman civilization of ancient Italy. Intended for a general audience and written by a recent University of Southampton Ph.D. whom Redaktion Books describes as “a writer and blogger,” this well-illustrated book (with a very welcome selection of objects not usually reproduced and discussed) nonetheless includes extensive footnotes (183–204) for further scholarly inquiry. Shipley addresses the reader in an engaging conversational prose style, which is complemented throughout by enticing chapter titles, such as “Ostrich Eggs and Oriental Dreams” (46–60; on the so-called Orientalizing phase of Etruscan art and focused on the Isis Tomb at Vulci), “Sex, Lies and the Etruscans” (123–135; on erotic art and the Greek author Theopompos’s [flawed and biased] account of Etruscan “sexual politics”), and “Listening to Livers” (152–165; on Etruscan religion). For those fascinated by the enduring “mystery of the Etruscans” Shipley has a balanced and fully informed discussion of the ancient and modern theories in her “Where Is Home?” chapter (28–45).

The various theories about Etruscan origins make for interesting debates, but one thing has seemed clear for many years: Whatever the origin of the Etruscan people, the Etruscans of the historical era were a mixture of indigenous and immigrant populations with wide exposure to different artistic cultures. But until their language can be fully deciphered, the epithet “mysterious” is likely to cling to this civilization.

Shipley deserves strong praise for her intimate familiarity with Etruscan archaeological sites and museums housing Etruscan objects, and tourists and museum-goers will appreciate the tidbits of advice scattered through the text, for example, “If you are looking for a spot of peace and quiet among the hubbub of
a visit [to the British Museum], the Etruscan gallery is a good bet” (47). Indeed, this book is such a “good read” that it tends to conceal the writer’s deep erudition not only about the Etruscans but about the history of Etruscology.

Readers seeking to learn more about the most famous works of Etruscan art and architecture will be disappointed, however. In 180 pages of text, there is passing reference at best to the grandiose tumuli of Cerveteri with their rock-cut interiors mimicking the appearance of Etruscan houses; the magnificent frescoes of the Archaic and Classical subterranean tomb chambers of Tarquinia; and the Apollo of Veii and the painted terracotta statues of that site’s Portonaccio Temple. This is truly a book—albeit an excellent one—about the Etruscan people and Etruscan civilization, not Etruscan art.

Fred S. Kleiner

Northern Italy in the Roman World: From the Bronze Age to Late Antiquity. By Carolynn E. Roncaglia. (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2018. Pp. xxi, 232. $44.95.)

Most would agree, these days, with the statement that nations are invented. They are not naturally birthed into the world, a primordial spirit carried by pure-blooded races which waits only to be reawakened and reinvigorated by ideologues, intellectuals, and politicians at the right moment. Instead, Eric Hobsbawm and Benedict Anderson and many others have taught us that nations are built upon invented traditions, carefully curated memories, and scientific racism. Still, most would also agree that within nations there are regional identities. If we can agree nations are inventions that subsume a host of regional identities, are these regional identities somehow more natural and real than the nations to which they belong?

This book addresses this question with respect to “northern Italy” in the Roman period, from Roman colonization in the third century BCE to the troubles of the third century CE, with probes into the longer history of this region in the Bronze Age and the Early Middle Ages. The author traces how the modern administrative regions of the Valle d’Aosta, Piemonte, Liguria, Emilia-Romagna, Veneto, Trentino-Alto Adige, Friuli-Venezia Giulia, as well as parts of Slovenia and Croatia, became, by stages, absorbed into the Roman state, and how the inhabitants of these regions began talking of themselves as Romans—never “northern Italians.” She is quick to emphasize that the process of making these diverse regions, ecologies, and cityscapes into a Roman political, economic, and cultural entity resulted in an “artificial creation.”
The author proceeds, sensibly, with a mixture of large-scale surveys of the peoples, places, and events that characterized “northern Italy” from pre-Roman to post-Roman times, with more detailed case studies of some of the most important, and best attested, sites. Thus after four chapters that survey how the non-Roman regions on either side of the Po River became Roman, we are treated to portraits of individual locations: Como, the Tanaro Valley, Aquileia, and Milan. The author shows particular care in the use of inscriptions. Through inscriptions we are introduced also to the names and ambitions of soldiers, wool merchants, city councillors, and government administrators. What emerges will be familiar to those working on other regions of the empire: Rome ruled with a light touch. Largely tax-exempt and accepting of Roman rule, those settling in Roman northern Italy used Roman culture, including language and architectural forms, to full advantage, profiling themselves, when possible, as elite members of their societies, and profiling their cities in a constant jostle for pre-eminence in locally understood hierarchies of place.

The author’s command of the materials is enviable—the notes are a goldmine of scholarship and data. The occasional misprints do not take away from the argument and the otherwise high quality of production. However, one significant distraction should be pointed out: Figures 4 and 5 are referenced incorrectly on pages 41 and 46, and the figures themselves should be transposed to better illustrate their usage in the text. Even though the author does not engage with related scholarship on state formation and infrastructural power, this study will be of interest not just to Romanists, but also to those interested in how empires create consensus from a mishmash of regional particularities.

University of Massachusetts Amherst

Jason Moralee


The volume under review could probably have been three, or even four, books. In brief, the author seeks to argue the case that those who would hold that the United States of America was founded with values that could be called Judeo-Christian are mistaken, and that the values in question are really imperial and Roman, in particular Augustan. Stated more crudely, Augustus was the Roman imperial forerunner of so much that we could label right-wing, misogynistic, backwards, unenlightened, reactionary, conservative, and desperately in need of the refreshing light and wisdom of sober scholarly analysis and debunking. Preferably with frequent citations of Michel Foucault. By the end of the work, what
will not be found is anything approaching a systematic or comprehensive treat-
ment of the subject of its title. But one might well conclude that Rome’s Augustus
was a forerunner of Ronald Wilson Reagan.

To this reviewer’s mind, the book’s ultimate strategy in pursuit of defend-
ing its thesis is to fashion a kaleidoscope of manifold and diverse images that
ultimately cause dizziness. In the first pages—ostensibly devoted to Augustus
and the Roman Empire—we leap from Augustus’s moral legislation to
Horace’s *Epodes* to the imperial physician Galen to the Greek novel *Leucippe
and Clitophon* of Achilles Tatius, again with the requisite amount of Foucault
to season the selective, ahistorical, highly idiosyncratic, undisciplined mish-
mash. Pixies in a mushroom circle might find navigation easier than the slow
and determined reader of this brief volume. How we manage to move from
Ovid to Cassius Dio in the span of one sentence—as if all of these authors
were next door to each other in the same moment of intellectual rapture—
defies comprehension. Sources, in short, are trotted out to serve an agenda.
Throughout, to the degree that you appreciate the difference between maius-
cule “Ideology” and minuscule “ideologies,” you will peruse these pages with
more or less profit.

After the chapter on Roman antiquity, the author moves to sections in
Judaism and the “New Testament.” Here we find a similar methodology, one
that might well be labeled a game of intellectual hopscotch, as we proceed from
the Book of Tobit to the epistles of Paul, again with just the right dash of con-
temporary scholarship to pave the way between the attempted analyses of the
disparate selections of ancient sources. The only unifying point of reference
would seem to be that the given text addresses sex, the role of women in society,
or views on procreation. Gratuitous contemporary references abound as mile
markers on the highway of disorder.

For what is perhaps most stunning about the author’s work is how much is
addressed in comparatively short compass. The main body of the book consti-
tutes 123 pages, in which we move from Rome to Judaism to early Christianity
to the contemporary Catholic Church’s views on homosexuality, as well as the
American political system, the Supreme Court, and Ronald Reagan and his intel-
lectual and ideological epigones. Ronald Reagan is a frequently recurring bogey
of enlightenment. One might have wished for a bit less on Reagan, Obama, and
the ideological travails of late twentieth and early twenty-first century America
and a bit more on, say, Saint Augustine.

On a note concerning writing style, the author’s insistence on employing con-
tractions with extreme frequency is both distracting and infelicitous in a work of
scholarly prose. First-person pronouns abound, and we learn *en passant* that the author looks “rather conservative, dressed in a pair of khakis or grey flannel pants, paired with a repp tie and navy blazer.”

In summary, this is a very self-indulgent work, one that has unquestionably interesting ideas lurking behind now this corner, now that—and with an author who is clearly capable of serious textual analysis and valuable commentary. But indeed, this book could probably have been three or four in total. As it stands, a general readership will find the plethora of scholarly allusions and references to obscure texts less than congenial, while scholarly audiences may wish for a more orderly presentation of material and ideas, as well as a title a bit less misleading. The author has unquestionably important things to say about a very wide range of ancient texts. A more focused arena of play would do greater justice to the manifest talent and skill of the author, and to subjects that are indeed deserving of critical analysis and appraisal.

*Ohio Wesleyan University*  
Lee Fratantuono


Many books aimed at the ‘intelligent general reader’ have been published about illuminated manuscripts—one of the best being by Christopher de Hamel himself (*A History of Illuminated Manuscripts*, Oxford, 1986; 2nd ed. 1994)—but none like the present volume. What distinguishes it sharply from everything else in the field is that it sets out to give the reader the experience of encountering manuscripts for him/herself, sharing the journey (both intellectual and physical) of researching them, and tracking their history from the point of creation to the reading rooms of the institution where they now reside.

Each of the twelve chapters treats a single manuscript, running in chronological order from the sixth-century Gospels of St Augustine to the sixteenth-century Spinola Hours. The volumes have been selected to offer variety not only in terms of date and type of book, but also with regard to subsequent history and current repository. As well as two gospel-books, two books of hours, a bible, and a psalter, there is an Aratea (an account of the constellations), a Beatus (an exposition of Revelation), a patristic commentary (Jerome on Isaiah), *Carmina Burana*, the *Canterbury Tales*, and a treatise on warfare. The institutions range from the Medici Library in Florence to the Getty Center in Los Angeles: Five are in
mainland Europe (Copenhagen, Florence, Leiden, Munich, Paris), three in the
British Isles (Aberystwyth, Cambridge, Oxford), two in the USA (Los Angeles,
New York), plus one each in Eire (Dublin) and Russia (St Petersburg). The
histories of the different books involve many famous figures not only of the Mid-
dle Ages (such as Gregory the Great, Bede, Charlemagne, and St Louis) and
Renaissance (the Medici and Sforza families) but also of more recent centuries
(the Pierpont Morgans, the Rothschilds, Adolf Hitler, Pablo Picasso); many living
individuals, from the current archbishop of Canterbury and his predecessor to
the curators of collections, also feature.

The basic point here is that, while few today actually get to touch medieval
manuscripts—“it is easier to meet the Pope or the President of the United States
than it is to touch the Très Riches Heures” (2)—such books have touched the
lives of countless people across the centuries. “The idea of this book, then, is to
invite the reader to accompany the author on a private journey to see, handle
and interview some of the finest illuminated manuscripts of the Middle Ages”
(2). Accordingly, each chapter highlights key points of interest in the chosen
manuscript (the presence of a signed portrait of the illuminator, for instance, or
the possibility that the book was written by Chaucer’s personal scribe), and then
takes the reader on the intellectual and physical voyage of discovering them. First
and foremost this means visiting the libraries where the relevant manuscripts are
kept—experiences that embrace the setting and architecture of the buildings,
their bureaucracy, interactions with curators, and the ambience of the reading
rooms, as well as the nature of the manuscripts themselves. All this is described
with wit and charm: “It was raining heavily on my visit [to Leiden] and I was
very wet by the time I arrived. … I finally stood dripping water at the red and
white inquiry desk thrusting my wet woolly hat into my coat pocket and attempt-
ing to look like the kind of person who might be allowed to see the most valu-
able book in the country” (145–6). One relevant and colourful detail that is
overlooked (presumably because de Hamel had acquired his reader’s ticket long
before he was working on this book) is that to gain entrance to the Bodleian
Library, in addition to furnishing references and identity documents, one is
required to swear an oath. Specialist readers will all know libraries whose idio-
syncrasies are equal to those in de Hamel’s roster; however, the one really glaring
omission—for which one would readily have sacrificed Leiden—is the Biblioteca
Apostolica Vaticana, where (having negotiated Swiss Guards, grand courtyards,
narrow archways through which zoom cars, and various keys) one reads price-
less manuscripts in an austere barrel-vaulted chamber presided over by a grand
crucifix.
It is difficult to imagine any reader, general or specialist, who would not be engaged by de Hamel’s accounts of these manuscripts, in which the scholarship that has unravelled their secrets is set out with the pacing of a detective story, alongside the sagas of how they have ended up in their current homes, and the exalted (and notorious) company that they have kept along the way, not to mention the hoops through which the modern researcher must jump in order to see them. Full acknowledgement is made of the scholars upon whose work the author draws both in lengthy bibliographies at the end of the book—theymselves replete with interesting asides: “I am unable to resist reporting that I used most of my advance from Allen Lane for writing this book to buy a fragment of a Dante manuscript also given in 1438 to Filippo Maria Visconti and similarly looted from Pavia during the French occupation” (604)—and in the narrative of individual chapters: “An unexpected benefit of [the new] single open reading room, rather than the hidden crannies of Elizabethan alcoves, is that one can see and wave to other readers. I was pleased to espy down the far end [Scholar X] whose article ... is one of my principal sources for [the MS in question]” (242).

New findings by the author himself (such as textual evidence for associating the Gospels of Augustine with the circle of Gregory the Great, details of the relationship between the Aratea in Leiden and that in Boulogne, the recent history of the Hours of Jeanne de Navarre, the possible early common provenance of the Spinola Hours, the Rothschild Prayerbook and the Très riches heures) enrich the narratives; and the collation formulae that he provides for each book will gladden the heart of codicologists. Yet perhaps the single most valuable aspect of this book for future workers will be as a record of the problems and pleasures of an age and type of scholarship that are fast vanishing: as ever more volumes are digitized and research is increasingly accomplished from surrogates, first-hand encounters with truly great medieval books of the sort described here are becoming rarer and rarer even for specialists.

*Durham University*  
Richard Gameson


In this meticulously researched study, Catherine Mooney offers a valuable reappraisal of the famously resilient Clare of Assisi. Deeply familiar with the politics of medieval hagiography, Mooney sifts through the “sources closest to Clare’s
own life” (1), disentangling these fragments from medieval hagiography and later historical “Clares” to present what she modestly terms a “bare-bones profile” (8). Throughout the book’s nine chapters, Mooney seeks to get as close as possible to the “real Clare,” resisting the temptation to flesh out her subject with stories—however charming—that appeared in texts composed many years after Clare’s death (specifically, texts written to advance Clare’s canonization). Nevertheless, Mooney does not seek to peel away the layers of legend in order to leave the reader empty-handed. Indeed, Mooney’s portrait of Clare succeeds in offering a richer, more nuanced narrative of the “religious movements” of the thirteenth century.

Dominated by Francis of Assisi, Dominic de Guzman, and Pope Innocent III, this narrative tends to emphasize the difficulties women had finding their place in a movement with few acceptable female roles. Thus, in this traditional narrative, Clare features as a defiant “Great Woman” courageously resistant to papal attempts to impose enclosure and material possessions. While certainly resilient, Mooney’s Clare did not stand alone. Rather than marvel at Clare’s “exceptionality,” then, Mooney invites the reader to better understand the circumstances, ideals, and personalities that supported, advanced, or limited her efforts on behalf of herself and her sisters at San Damiano (later known as the Poor Clares). Surrounded by similarly resilient women and men, Clare doggedly defended two central objectives for herself and her community: to maintain ties with Francis and his companions and to live lives of radical poverty. Yet Clare and her sisters also knew how to play the “long game” (220), negotiating and compromising with church authorities at pivotal moments in the community’s history.

This is clearly, then, not a book “just” about Clare. Mooney provides a valuable case study that helps shed light on the maneuverings of countless medieval women—mostly nameless—who sought to live lives inspired by Jesus and his apostles. Mooney’s study thus adds to a growing body of scholarship on women’s religious communities focused on how women created their own religious spaces. Mooney’s careful analysis charts how Clare’s community slowly coalesced over time into a community of like-minded penitent women and how the community shrewdly contended with papal efforts to impose regulation and unity. Clare persistently defended her vision of the *vita apostolica*, advocated for her community, and supported other, similarly inspired women, all while compromising where and when necessary. In these efforts, significantly, she found a number of male supporters.
Mooney’s book is not only an admirable example of historical scholarship, it has the added merit of providing a helpful, highly readable introduction for the Anglophone reader to a wealth of Italian scholarship on Clare and San Damiano. It is essential reading for historians interested not only in women’s religious communities, but in the medieval church more broadly.

Tanya Stabler Miller
Loyola University Chicago

Peter Hart’s *The Last Battle* gives voice to the soldiers who fought in the final battles of World War I: the Fifth Battle of Ypres, the Battles of the Sambre, the Selle, and the Meuse-Argonne. It was during these battles that Allied victory emerged in November 1918, as a result of the “accumulated strength and proven fighting prowess of the Allied armies, their underlying materiel supremacy and the gradual collapse of German discipline in the face of inevitable defeat” (ix). By recounting these battles of the so-called Hundred Days Offensive in the words of the men who fought them, Hart provides the reader with a sense of the enormous effort required and the many risks taken even after the watershed battles of the Second Marne and Amiens.

A very significant portion of the text consists of long quotes from the memoirs, letters, and recorded testimony of a wide variety of mainly Allied and American soldiers and airmen. The author is attentive to the experience of African-Americans in the United States Army, but uses very few German witnesses and almost completely neglects the role of colonial troops in the French and British armies (other than Canadian and Australian). While Foch, Haig, Ludendorff, and other commanders make appearances, the vast majority of Hart’s sources were at the front as lieutenants, captains, majors, and, in a few cases, private soldiers.

The work is very accessible to a general audience, and Hart does an impressive job contextualizing the long blocks of testimony and setting the stage for the individual testimony so that the reader does not lose track of the larger strategic picture. A few dozen well-chosen photographs and portraits depict some of the personalities encountered and the destruction wrought. Though Hart knows his subject well, a scholarly readership may be somewhat disappointed by the narrow source base, which consists of published sources and manuscripts held at the Imperial War Museum, where Hart serves as oral historian. A list of recommended books leads the reader mainly to more memoir literature and largely
neglects the many outstanding recent works on the war as well as some still-relevant classics.

Those are small quibbles that reflect a reader's expectations more than the quality of the work itself. One effect of Hart's use of so much first-hand testimony is that his own fluent prose is complemented by a delightful variety of other voices and styles, making for an engaging reading and learning experience for readers of both greater and lesser expertise.

*Temple University*        


From 2 June 1484, Silesian knight Niclas von Popplau was granted a series of meetings with King Richard III. His notes give a highly particularized account of the character and behavior of Richard and his court, by which we can visualize the exact expressions of Richard as if we were present. Such data allows Chris Skidmore to provide a fascinating narrative of Richard's behavior throughout his career, avoiding both the "black legend" (10) of the Tudor historians and modern vindications, strengthened since the recovery of his body in Leicester. The king's motives emerge so clearly that we understand the sequence of complex political events and why his most provocative actions occurred.

As the Duke of York's youngest son, with the deficient physique seen in his recovered skeleton, Richard was driven to military achievements which earned him the highest status. To secure that he also had to destroy his older brother Clarence, who sought to seize Richard's share of the inheritance of Warwick, the kingmaker, via the dowry of the younger of Warwick's daughters—both married to the Woodville brothers. Skidmore's insight into such situations clarifies startling elements in Shakespeare's play, such as Richard's seduction of Lady Anne after the Yorkist murder of her husband and her father-in-law. Skidmore observes that the widowed Anne "had no one to represent her own interests. Faced with being left in limbo, the only way that she would be able to secure her inheritance was through marriage.... She would need a husband powerful enough to face up to Clarence" (73).

The narrative shows Richard's later career to be governed by the challenge to the Yorkist family generated by King Edward IV's catastrophic marriage to Elizabeth Woodville, for her ambitious family sought hegemony after the premature death of the king. To preserve his own status as protector of the young heir
Edward V, Richard produced brutal initiatives such as the murders of Rivers and Hastings, and possibly engineered the disappearance of Edward V and his brother. Even Richard’s co-conspirator Buckingham fatally turned to the Woodvilles. Though his murder was then politically expedient, whoever was guilty of the princes’ disappearance, its popular attribution to Richard invited the betrayals that lost him the battle of Bosworth Field. Yet Richard’s last desperate charge there against Richmond came within feet of success.

Skidmore details these vicissitudes with a clarity, coherence, and precision, via contemporary factual accounts, which make his narrative as readable as an historical novel. Ironically the “real” Richard who emerges is neither so unrepresentative of his society nor so outrageously seductive as Shakespeare’s Machiavel. He proves a man of his time, capable both of brutalities and gestures of conventional piety, and generosity to women and even foes, though always with an eye to expediency. This is as readable and convincing a history as one could wish.

_Sources_:


As this book’s regular reprints attest, interest in Henry VIII’s sisters has not waned over the decades since the initial publication of _Sisters to the King_. Author Maria Perry’s careers span acting and journalism, including holding the post of Fashion and Beauty Editor of the _Manchester Evening News_. While such a past may seem odd to traditional academics, Sir Geoffrey Elton, who suggested this topic to Perry, and Dr. David Starkey, who guided much of her research, recognized that by combining a close examination of the rich primary sources in the British Library and The National Archives with an eye trained to understand the importance of material culture, Perry was in a unique position to scrutinize the oft-told stories of the Tudors in an innovative way.

Perry charts the lives of Henry’s older sister Margaret, wife of James IV of Scotland and great-grandmother to James VI & I, and his younger sister Mary, wife of Louis XII of France and grandmother to the ill-fated Lady Jane Grey. That both women’s progeny were central to the events of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries is well known. Here, Perry makes a case for their contemporary importance, not only as pawns in the chess game of foreign policy played by early modern European monarchs, but also as women in their own right, who
both notably married for love after becoming dowager Queens. Moreover, she brings the court environments of England, Scotland, and France to life in a novel way, providing rich descriptions of the clothing, tapestries, jewels, table settings, horses, castles, masques, tournaments, and a wide array of kingly gifts that were everywhere in court life, highlighting the deep layers of meaning that were associated with those items, which can be difficult for twenty-first century readers to comprehend.

While the title may seem to suggest that Mary and Margaret are Perry’s central characters, the importance of the preposition “to” becomes apparent from the book’s start, which begins with Henry instead of either sister. Just as much time is spent on Henry’s first two wives as his sisters, and the climax of Perry’s story seems to be Henry’s divorce and first remarriage. Perry’s focus on understudied women is welcome. However, she makes several claims that undercut that contribution, including arguing that James IV’s illegitimate children would be brushed aside today as “a tragic excess of testosterone,” claiming that Margaret’s misfortunes were largely due to “a moment of womanly weakness and romantic folly,” and speculating where and how “smoothly, delicately, luxuriantly [Anne Boleyn] gave in” to Henry (73, 112, 281).

Engaging and easy to read, this book provides a new spin on an old story, and would be particularly well suited for individuals interested in the Tudors in general or those who want to learn more about material culture of 16th-century western European nobility. This text might not be as appropriate for those hoping to see Mary and Margaret in their own light, and not just as windows into Henry’s persona.

Tim Daniels
Ferrum College


John Cooper examines in great detail the political negotiations around the passage of the Liberal welfare reforms between 1906–1913, concentrating on the old-age pension and unemployment and health insurance initiated during that time period. His chief argument is that a new “counter elite” pushed for these reforms, composed of social reform activists, settlement house workers, sociologists, clergymen, sociologists, and Fabians. Interestingly, he points out that some businessmen were acknowledging the need for social reform, and they also sent their sons (and sometimes daughters) to Oxford and Cambridge, where they
were influenced by the new thinking of TH Green and other philosophers. Charles Booth and Seebohm Rowntree came from business families, but they used their scientific acumen to produce sociological studies proving the need for social reform.

Cooper is very good on gender issues, giving welcome credit to the many women involved in sociology, social reform, and lobbying. He asserts, probably justly, that women social reformers were more influential than the suffragettes. Cooper also provides welcome detailed coverage of the issues of insurance for women workers and wives, pointing out that by leaving out wives and failing to provide adequate maternity cover, the new health insurance system remained actuarially unsound.

Cooper attempts to refute the conventional narrative that imperialist social reformers pushed for welfare reforms because they feared the working class children would grow up to become unfit soldiers. The key imperialist social reformers were not involved in lobbying for such measures as school medical inspections, he argues; instead, Labour party activists, philanthropic women, and medical men spearheaded these reforms. He explains away the use of imperialist rhetoric by medical men as a way of manipulating conservative sentiment in supporting such legislation.

The author is also very good on land reform, seen as necessary to undercut the power of the aristocracy, to raise the taxes necessary to pay for the new welfare benefits, and to provide the land needed for more housing. However, it would have been useful to have a longer discussion of the 1906 Workmen’s Compensation Act, which would have allowed Cooper to make a stronger argument for changes in the opinions of businessmen toward more willingness to countenance state intervention.

While historians conventionally identify the welfare measures of this period with Lloyd George, Cooper gives more credit to Herbert Asquith. He also refutes earlier arguments that the Fabians were not that influential on the Liberal welfare measures by demonstrating the influence of the Webbs over Asquith among others. Furthermore, he reveals Churchill’s intense interest in social reform. Cooper also wants to undermine the notion that the power of the Labour party and trade union militancy pushed the Liberal Party into social reforms, but he concedes that the 1912 miners’ strike pushed the Liberal government to espouse more effective welfare legislation.

This book will be very useful for those seeking detailed background on the passage of these important social welfare reforms, but, while it is very dense and
at times sentences could have used some editing for clarity, I did not find any typos. The book is hardbound but disintegrated after one reading.

Anna Clark


Looking back on becoming Prime Minister in May 1940, Churchill reflected that his past life had been but a preparation for the trial he was about to face. _Churchill Warrior_ elaborates upon that remark, arguing that Churchill’s military life was an essential part of that preparation. Indeed, the author makes clear that Churchill came to the position of war leader “with a unique and unrepeatable experience” (423). Brian Lavery traces that experience in great detail, from childhood toy soldiers to the end of the Second World War, investigating “how Churchill gained his unique insight into war strategy and administration, and the impact it had on his thinking and leadership” (x).

The organization of the book serves its purpose well—broken into four main sections, only the last deals with post-1939 events. Though Churchill’s leadership in the Second World War is the crowning moment of the tale, Lavery demonstrates that it was built upon what came earlier and reflected a tremendous range of familiarity with and understanding of military matters. The breadth of Churchill’s experience can be glimpsed in his comments to his old regiment in 1935:

> Whatever be the weapons which are given to the 4<sup>th</sup> Hussars, the regiment will play the same tune on them and will carry the same old traditions, whether it be with the sabre and wheel into line for the charge, whether it [be] as mounted infantry, as rifle-armed cavalry or, as you now are, a mechanized unit. (373-374)

It was with this regiment that he had ridden in the last great cavalry charge conducted by the British Army at the Battle of Omdurman in 1898—a regiment that would trade horses for tanks.

Lavery claims to be filling a gap in Churchill studies, arguing that the most extensive biographies have been written by political historians not stressing the military dimensions, though military histories of the period focus on specific issues, missing the full range of Churchill’s activity and involvement. This is a rather sweeping claim to make considering the vast fields of Churchill scholarship. Certainly it ignores a number of important books, such as Douglas Russell’s
Winston Churchill Soldier (Conway, 2005), Geoffrey Best’s Churchill and War (Bloomsbury, 2006), and Carlo D’Este’s Warlord (Harper Perennial, 2009), to name only a few.

Though it is not unique, Churchill Warrior does have much to offer: short issue-targeted chapters for easy reference, insight into the inner workings of committees and the role of personality at high levels of command, meticulous detail about the capabilities of weapons systems, exploration of the tension between domestic and military concerns, and examination of the development of Churchill’s military thinking among them. One especially valuable contribution is Lavery’s consideration of Churchill’s career as a military historian and journalist, revealing how his commentary on historical and contemporary conflicts shaped his views and strategic choices. Though the book does not offer much in terms of critical comment or evaluation, it is a valuable study and a compelling read.

Cedarville University

Justin D. Lyons


For decades, scholars have endeavored to understand the ways in which French Enlightenment thought translated into actual practice and affected people “on the ground.” A generation of historians starting with Robert Darnton distinguished the so-called High Enlightenment of the elite philosophes from the “underground” literary works that, they contended, exerted a much larger impact on society as a whole. Meanwhile, scholars such as Roger Chartier sought to separate fact from fiction in tracing the relationship between Enlightenment ideas and French revolutionary upheaval.

To date, however, very few historians have weighed these questions from a military vantage point, as Christy Pichichero does in this innovative study. (The only other major work in this vein is Arnaud Guinier’s L’honneur du soldat. Éthique martiale et discipline guerrière dans la France des Lumières, published by Champ Vallon in 2014.) By explaining how Enlightenment thought impacted, and was impacted by, the army, warfare, and martial culture, Pichichero provides novel perspective on both the evolution of Enlightenment thought and the history of the army in eighteenth-century France.

In Pichichero’s telling, the Military Enlightenment began in the late seventeenth century as one dimension of the broader intellectual movement that
scholars recognize as the Enlightenment. The Military Enlightenment reflected an effort by contemporaries to apply “a critical philosophical spirit, or esprit philosophique, to acquire a deep understanding of war and the military” (2).

Significantly, Pichichero argues that the thought associated with the Military Enlightenment was the work not just of military officers and state administrators, but also of literary elites, political theorists, mathematicians, and others who participated in debates and dialogues regarding how warfare and the army might be improved. Common people, too, eagerly followed and in some cases contributed to dialogues related to warfare and military institutions, which played important roles in their everyday lives.

Pichichero’s sources reflect the voices of the former groups—military administrators and literary elites—much more than those of common people. This is unsurprising, of course, given that ordinary French men and women left behind many fewer writings on warfare and the army than did elites. Nonetheless, Pichichero draws on an impressive range of published and (to a somewhat lesser extent) archival primary sources.

Although this book focuses on the Military Enlightenment in France between the time of Louis XIV and the Napoleonic era, Pichichero suggests that similar themes played out in other European states, albeit not necessarily according to the same chronology. In addition, Pichichero extends the geographical scope of the work beyond the French metropole, which is its main focus, to include some consideration of the Military Enlightenment’s impact on French colonies; on this point, however, her chief conclusion is that the Military Enlightenment was of relatively little importance in most colonial settings, Saint-Domingue being the major exception.

Given its scope and theme, this book makes for excellent reading for two groups of historians. First, military historians will benefit from Pichichero’s detailed and original analysis of the development of eighteenth-century military culture. Second, scholars of the Enlightenment will find here vital new perspective on the real-world impact of Enlightenment thought through the medium of the army.

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute

Christopher Tozzi


The best history monographs deliver much more than is expected from their main subject matter. Lucy Pick’s new study is such a book. The opening pages promise a history of royal women in the early medieval Iberian kingdoms of
Asturias and León-Castilla. But it does not take long for the reader to realize that Pick has written one of the best studies of medieval political power to appear in recent years. The key to its success is Pick’s decision to eschew historians’ tendency to divide “power into public (or male) and private (or female) spheres” to explain powerful medieval women (9). The royal women in her study wield public power in many of the same ways that kings do: by distributing or withholding political influence and material benefits, managing patronage networks, and claiming special access to the sacred.

The first chapter contains an excellent evaluation of the continuities and discontinuities between Christian monarchies before and after the Muslim conquest of Spain in 711. Using insights from anthropology, Pick argues that even though the indigenous Northern Iberian tradition of matrilineal succession was eventually abandoned, the Visigothic inheritance laws, which gave daughters and sons the same rights to inherit their parents’ property, influenced the royal women’s position in medieval Spain. Starting in 785, when the widowed queen Adosinda chose to protect her nephew’s (future king Alfonso II’s) rights to the throne by being consecrated to religious life, and until the end of the eleventh century, almost all of the royal daughters of Asturias, León, and León-Castilla would live as women vowed to chastity and serve as “custodians of family memory, imitators of martyrs, givers of gifts, and intermediaries with the divine” (62). They were not, however, nuns or abbesses. As lay dominas (female lords) of numerous monasteries and churches in the infanzgo given to them by their royal parents, women like Elvira Ramírez (daughter of Ramiro I) and Urraca Fernández (daughter of Fernando I) turned the combination of landed wealth and spiritual capital into considerable power.

In Chapter 2, Pick explores the “politics of virginity” underpinning the royal daughters’ special status in León-Castilla. At its center was the cult of Pelayo—a male Christian youth who was martyred for allegedly resisting sexual advances of the Córdoban ruler, Abd al-Rahman III, and who became the model for the royal virgins. In Chapter 3, Pick explains how Urraca Fernández and other women consecrated to virginity created “networks of patronage, piety, and influence,” both “earthly and divine” (107, 122). In the concluding chapter, she discusses the pro anima gifts given by royal women to religious institutions, and their role of preserving the memory of the royal dead by acting as custodians of their remains and praying for their salvation. This erudite and meticulously researched study opens new horizons in scholarship. Pick seeks to modify Teofilo Ruiz’s argument about the lack of sacral kingship in León-Castilla by suggesting that the sacred dimension is found in the pious practices of royal virgins. She also
draws attention to similar traditions of consecrating royal daughters to religious life in the kingdoms north of the Pyrenees, especially in the German Empire, urging scholars to explore this connection further.

Rice University

Maya S. Irish


The life and works of Victor Klemperer will be familiar to most historians of modern Europe. Born in 1881, Klemperer was the son of a rabbi who had converted to Protestantism in 1903. During the First World War he was a volunteer in the Bavarian Army on the western front before—following injury—he was transferred to an administrative role in the German occupation of central-eastern Europe. In 1920 he became full professor of Romance languages at Dresden Technical University, a position he held until his dismissal because of Nazi Germany’s racial laws in 1935. A survivor of Nazism, he is best known for the diaries he kept secretly between 1933 and 1945, which were published in two volumes in the mid-1990s: _I Shall Bear Witness_ and _To the Bitter End._

_Munich 1919_ provides us with yet another example of Klemperer’s brilliance at his un-chosen calling as chronicler of twentieth century extremes. First published in German in 2015, it is not (as its title misleadingly suggests) the publication of Klemperer’s diaries from the same period—a German edition was already published in 2000. Instead, it contains another two sets of text from Klemperer’s archive. The first consists of his journalism. While he stayed in Munich during the winter of 1918–19, Klemperer filed reports for the _Leipziger Neueste Nachrichten._ Many never made it into the newspaper and are published here for the first time. The second consists of Klemperer’s reflections upon the revolution, a text that he wrote in secret during the extreme circumstances he faced in 1942.

_Munich 1919_ thus contains two perspectives upon the German Revolution of 1918–19: those of the journalist paying close attention to events in the streets and meeting houses of the Bavarian capital under Eisner and during the tumultuous days of the Councils’ Republic and its violent suppression; and those of the intellectual looking back and trying to understand the long-term origins of the destruction taking place around him. It is a brilliant book that will be essential reading for all with an interest in twentieth century German history. The contrast between Klemperer’s ‘live’ histories of the revolution and his later recollections will be particularly valuable for anyone teaching a seminar upon historical
methods and source analysis. The only disappointment concerns the presentation of Klemperer’s texts. Without prior knowledge of the history of the revolution of 1918–19 and the reasons for the particularly aggressive course it took in the Bavarian capital, general readers will miss much of the significance of Klemperer’s observations. Sadly, the afterword to Munich 1919, a historical essay by Wolfram Wette, is not up to the task. This is not the fault of its author—a fine historian who has made an important contribution to modern German history—after all, the essay was originally written for the German edition and as such it assumes considerable prior knowledge of events on the reader’s part. This volume would have been better served by a new more comprehensive introduction to the subject for English-language readers.

University College Dublin

Mark Jones


This outstanding book is both unique and somewhat conventional in its treatment of the role of Islam in Nazi Germany’s military and political strategy during World War II. Its uniqueness lies in its primary focus on German efforts with regard to the large Muslim populations of the Soviet Union and the Balkans; essentially, only one chapter is devoted to Islam in the predominantly Arab regions of North Africa and the Middle East. Moreover, its focus on Islam as a world religion, rather than on specific ethnic, cultural, and linguistic groups of Muslims in all of those regions, offers the reader a different perspective on Nazi strategic policy during the war. What is consistent, and therefore not particularly new, is its almost exclusive emphasis on the content and distribution of Nazi propaganda among Muslims, with little reference to or analysis of the actual intent or goals of Nazi geopolitics in those regions.

In North Africa, the Middle East, and South Asia, German propaganda emphasized defined common enemies, shared by Muslims and Germany, namely British and French imperialism. In eastern and southeastern Europe, of course, the principal target was atheistic Bolshevism. These targets were not mutually exclusive; the Germans usually combined them with a third alleged common enemy, namely a world Jewry often depicted as the source of the other two. In any case, the goal was to mobilize Muslims everywhere to rise up against their combined “Jewish and Allied oppressors,” and to recruit young men for special military units in the Wehrmacht and the SS for the military struggle against the
“common enemies” of Germany and Islam. Ultimately, as Motadel concludes, German propaganda “failed to incite significant uprisings behind the front lines” (315). Nor was that propaganda able to compensate for some of the natural Muslim distrust of European Germans.

The author emphasizes that, notwithstanding certain successes in the Nazi propaganda campaign, especially in the USSR and in the Balkans, it failed in the end to produce the desired results. He quite rightly points to the significant political, cultural, religious, and linguistic diversity of the Muslim populations under discussion, a reality that makes any general conclusions about Muslim responses to German efforts problematic in any case. Indeed, he argues, “The question of the wider appeal that this religious policy and propaganda had on Muslims across the world cannot be answered conclusively here, as the reception of German policies by Muslims has not been the focus of this study” (317). With his focus on German policy, and not on Muslim responses, the author does allude to natural contradictions between Germany’s public praise and support for Muslims on the one hand, and Germany’s own ambitions in Eastern Europe, and those of allied or friendly states like Italy and Vichy France in Arab lands in the Middle East and North Africa and Croatia in the Balkans, on the other. Indeed, more clarity on Germany’s actual intent, beyond its propaganda campaigns in those regions, would further improve this otherwise excellent and much needed contribution to the existing literature on this topic.

University of Vermont

Francis R. Nicosia


Among the works marking the centennial of the Russian Revolution in 2017 was this history with a focus on the semi-constitutional Duma period 1905–1914 and “silver age” of Russian culture. Its author is Mikhail Zygar, not a professional historian, but a journalist and widely known personality on Russian independent television—and an entrenched critic of Vladimir Putin. The book cannot be compared with other histories of the period. It is largely the product of Zygar’s own efforts to build an unofficial archive of the Revolution containing memoirs, correspondence, and related materials. He has read widely in the reminiscences of most of the famous figures of the time, but not in other documents or secondary works, which he regards as so much sediment that needs to be cleared away in order to understand the period and the shadow it casts over the present. He tells the story
afresh, in his own way, in a narrative containing new material but also retelling a lot of familiar tales, often without benefit of any interpretive connecting tissue. Zygar says he wants to avoid clouding up the story with anything that will distract attention from the narrative, which he delivers in a breathless present tense.

Complaining about any of the special features of this book would be pointless. Zygar thinks that his narrative speaks for itself. And the way he writes it, it does. The history that he relates is a vehicle for a vast, resourceful, brilliant polemic against the Putin regime. In his telling Putinism is copy of the statist ideology of Nicholas II, that is, another effusion of Russia’s traditional Byzantine Caesaro-Papism (although he does not use this phrase). In both cases the Russian church functions as a department of the state. Democracy is not just presented to the public by a controlled media as being wrong for Russia; it is said to be a myth. Just as there was no Russia without the Tsar, today there is no Russia without Putin. Where segments of the creative intelligentsia yearn for a Russia more culturally recognizable to the west, a clique of reactionaries, crooks, and siloviki (bureaucrats in national security ministries) rally against them behind a stifling religious obscurantism. In Tsarist Russia, the reaction was led by the proto-fascist Black Hundreds and funded by the Okhrana, the Tsarist secret police. The opposition was similar, police trade unions led by priests, many of them agents of the Okhrana. Zygar thinks Putin’s Russia is imitating this model.

Both the Russia of Nicholas II and that of Vladimir Putin are seen as ideocracies, regimes ruled by ideology, their power struggles at bottom spiritual struggles. At stake is a fight for freedom from censorship, autocracy, and national chauvinism. Russia’s collapse in 1917, Zygar thinks, was not inevitable and its struggles today are not historically logical. Nor is history itself. It is “one long blunder” (518). It is “an illness” (519). His Russian readership has only a choice between tyranny and exile.

San Francisco State University

Anthony D’Agostino


Perspective is part of the historian’s craft—an interpretive point-of-view that serves as an organizing lens through which facts and events are given some order and sense. There is no history without selection and the author’s own analysis, his or her own construction of an argument. But among the conventions with which a historical narrative is fashioned, there must be faithfulness to established
facts, care in the discussion of existing historiography, and some restraint in allowing one’s own biases and preferences to influence the story. In his avowed postrevisionist history of the Russian Revolution of 1917, Sean McMeekin thwarts many of these conventions.

McMeekin’s area of expertise has been late Ottoman history with forays into World War I and the Russian role in its origins. In this breezy history he takes on the academic professionals who have written on 1917 with the aim to right the record, which he argues has been distorted by most practitioners, with notable exceptions like Harvard emeritus historian Richard Pipes. Like Pipes, whom he admires and cites hundreds of times, McMeekin sets out to reverse the social historical consensus of a generation of self-styled “revisionists,” who had refocused the history of the Revolution from a tale of demonic conspirators like Vladimir Lenin to a broader panorama of social actors—women, workers, soldiers, and peasants—who through their own activities undermined the moderate Provisional Government, self-selected in February, and opened the way for the Bolshevik seizure of power in October. In his narrative, McMeekin begins with the intriguer Rasputin, who, it turns out, was wise enough to warn the hapless Nicholas II not to enter the Great War, and continues with Mikhail Rodzianko and Alexander Guchkov, who conspired with the military to drive the emperor to abdicate. McMeekin’s point-of-view is legitimist, defending the legally constituted authority against treacherous usurpers from below or outside who undermined the organs of order, most particularly the army. He characterizes the February Revolution as a mutiny since legitimate authority belonged to the tsar, and the people in the streets were notoriously bloody-minded.

Unfortunately, this text is quite unreliable. There are factual errors—the Russian Social Democrats did not split into Bolsheviks and Mensheviks because of Lenin’s anti-Semitism; neither the April Crisis nor the “July Days” were attempts at a Bolshevik putsch (the selection of this redolent word is not accidental)—and unexplained omissions, primarily the whole social landscape in which Bolshevism grew into the most potent political force in Petrograd and other major cities. Like earlier conservative accounts of the Bolshevik victory, McMeekin subscribes to discredited theses that Lenin and his party were not only bought by German gold but were the principal reason (by their effective propagandizing) why workers and soldiers turned into irresponsible, even treasonous, subversives. There is no discussion of the economic collapse of the country, the social polarization of upper and lower classes that led to a protocivil war between the soviets and the government, or the independent aspirations of the lower classes that Lenin and his comrades articulated in their demands for land, peace, and a government of soviets.
McMeekin’s concentration on the military yields interesting insights, because, as Lenin understood, revolution is not an election campaign but a war. The winner is the side that has men with guns at the right place at the right time.

But because the social, economic, and even discursive contexts are left out, in order to explain major turning points, the author repeatedly relies on accidents and coincidences: if only the tsarevitch’s measles had broken out a day earlier, the tsar would not have left Petrograd for the front; what if Lenin had been arrested on the eve of October? He sets up Marxism as a straw man and ends up with bewildering contingencies: “Far from an eschatological ‘class struggle’ borne along inexorably by the Marxist dialectic, the events of 1917 were filled with might-have-beens and missed chances” (345). Ignoring what dozens of historians have contributed to our knowledge of 1917 does not advance understanding of extraordinary events that profoundly shaped the past one hundred years.

University of Michigan

Ronald Grigor Suny

GENERAL, COMPARATIVE, HISTORIOGRAPHICAL


In recent years, historians have turned more intently to studying climate’s influence on early America. But the field has been missing a continental study, surveying the imprint of the environment on Europe’s earliest colonial projects in North America. Sam White’s new book, A Cold Welcome, is, in many ways, the first of its kind.

White explores Europe’s earliest forays into North America—voyages of exploration as well as colonial settlement—in order to understand how they were impacted by the Little Ice Age. (The “Little Ice Age,” he is quick to explain, is best understood not as a single event, but as a complex constellation of forces that led to global cooling and extreme weather between about 1300 and 1850.) White looks most thoroughly at the triad of European settlements launched in 1607 and 1608—Jamestown, Santa Fe, and Québec. At nearly every turn, White shows, these projects were buffeted by climate- or weather-related challenges. The Little Ice Age shaped Europe’s encounter with North America.

It was not simply that climate foiled some European expeditions, White argues. But for “accidents” of climate change, “the whole geography and chronology of colonization would have unfolded differently.” He points out: “It was
only during a window of climate-driven crisis starting in the 1590s that France and England [broke] into Spanish claims in North America” (251).

*A Cold Welcome* draws from both human and natural archives. White’s book is especially strong in its reliance on climatic evidence that has only become available recently: ice core samples, soil deposits, sediments. In White’s narrative, “growth rings in Québec’s pines” often speak as loudly as records of Jacques Cartier’s expeditions (186). White’s reliance on climate data will offer surprises to some readers. Many know that Jamestown’s water supply was foul and salty. But some may not realize that drought lay behind the James River’s brackish waters: The “exceptionally dry summer had so reduced the flow of the James that saltwater encroached from the sea,” White explains. To those familiar with David Stahle’s work on tree rings and drought, or Karen Kupperman’s studies of climate and colonialism, or Peter Mancall’s writing on Henry Hudson and the Arctic cold, among others, some of White’s story will feel familiar. The book’s main contribution lies in bringing the climatic contexts of Spanish, French, and English colonial endeavors into the same frame.

White’s work invites new scholarship. He leaves room, for instance, to chart precontact climate change and its effects on European colonialism. White examines Cahokia’s climate challenges, among other stories. But we could know more about Native experiences with climate as a foundation for analysis. Also lost in the narrative, somewhat, are the intellectual contexts of European colonization.

This book will be a baseline for future studies of North American climate history, in the period of exploration and early settlement. It is an important work. But it also presents a readable narrative, relevant to modern concerns about climate change.

Wellesley College

Katherine Grandjean


Melinda Harm Benson and Robin Kundis Craig suspect that the rhetoric of sustainability has run its course. To explain why, they consider the cultural narratives that structure environmental policy in the United States. Benson and Craig argue that such narratives constitute one of the most important tools for coming to terms with climate change and the Anthropocene, because a reconsideration of basic narratives “can be a very powerful way to change both social phenomena
like law and individual behavior” (9). Stories underlie law and policy, the
authors explain, in ways that set limits as well as inspire action, so that confront-
ing environmental change means, first, confronting environmental storytelling.

Benson and Craig describe three narratives in particular that continue to
shape environmental management. First, the “Manifest Destiny Narrative,” a
story about humans productively dominating a nature made up of material
resources. Second, the “Tragedy Narrative,” a story about growing awareness of
environmental decline in the postwar U.S. and, in response, a top-down regula-
tory regime. Finally, the “Sustainability Narrative,” which emerged in the 1970s
but gained purchase in the 1990s. The Sustainability Narrative is a story about a
search for balance, in which sound policy can produce a stable mix of social
good, economic growth, and environmental protection.

All of these narratives, Benson and Craig note, as well as the policies that they
have shaped, rest on a belief in “stationarity”—the idea that nonhuman nature is
predictable and tends toward equilibrium. The Anthropocene undermines this
belief. The idea of the Anthropocene, Benson and Craig explain, rests on not
only an understanding of human activity as one of the most significant causes of
ecological change, but also the view that people are not separate from the envi-
ronment and are instead part of innumerable social-ecological systems (SESs) that
bind humans and nonhuman nature and render cause and consequence unpre-
dictable and even unknowable.

Given that flux and uncertainty, Benson and Craig offer a new narrative:
“resilience and the trickster,” in which climate change acts as a mythological
trickster, frustrating reliable models and predictable outcomes, and in which pol-
cymakers plan for rather than against change, emphasizing general adaptation
rather than overly specific preservation. By stressing resilience theory, the authors
hope to chart a middle course between the overconfidence of an anthropocentric
worldview and the despair of an apocalyptic one. Resilience, they explain, can
recognize “that humans are not fully in control of natural systems and SESs but
nevertheless still possess significant ability to influence those systems and the
future directions they take” (21).

As Benson and Craig acknowledge, resilience-based policies do not always
sound like bold steps in new directions. The authors’ case studies—on watershed
management in northern New Mexico and on marine fisheries—are innovative
but hardly revolutionary, as are the book’s suggestions for common-sense strate-
gies like more creative technology, less perverse regulatory incentives, and better
long-term planning. But Benson and Craig make clear the radical possibilities of
resilience when they emphasize communitarianism over liberal individualism,
when they criticize anthropocentric policies, and when they advocate “across-the-board implementation of ecosystem-based management based on a strong precautionary principle” (169).

The End of Sustainability is an interdisciplinary work in the best sense, bringing together history, policy, law, and literature in order to interrogate a concept—“sustainability”—that is too often unquestioningly embraced. Benson and Craig provide a rich and provocative discussion of environmental governance and its underlying assumptions. Their ideas deserve a broad hearing among scholars, policymakers, and anyone who wrestles with how government and environment fit uncomfortably together.

Northwestern University

Keith Makoto Woodhouse


Two stories dominate the history of nineteenth-century America—western expansion and emancipation—but rarely are they studied together. In Ikuko Asaka’s provocative, outstanding first book, she argues that not only were both processes closely linked, but that theories about each race’s alleged suitability to specific climates—white people in temperate climates, black people in tropical ones—help explain how many white people were able both to vehemently oppose slavery while simultaneously justifying black people’s exclusion from the expanding frontier. Asaka does not limit her focus to the United States. Transatlantic in orientation, Tropical Freedom follows the idea she calls “black tropicality” (140)—that black people were biologically suited to tropical climates—as it took root in revolutionary America, and through to post-emancipation Jamaica, Trinidad, Canada, Liberia, and the Reconstruction South.

We are used to thinking of biological theories of racial difference as the purview of proslavery ideologues. But Tropical Freedom shows that even slavery’s opponents, at least many white ones, had come to argue that black people were, if not biologically inferior, then at least better suited to climates similar to West Africa’s—and that, conversely, white people were best suited to climates similar to their native Europe. Initially, neither British nor American abolitionists subscribed to this idea. In the 1780s, for instance, British abolitionists showed no geographic preference for where to resettle the roughly 3,000 black Loyalists who won their freedom fighting for the British during the War of
Independence, sending half of them to Nova Scotia. But by the 1830s, it became clear to British officials that the settling of western Canada, and for American officials, the settling of the western frontier, would not be possible if whites had to live side-by-side with free blacks. To make emancipation compatible with western expansion, then, many white supporters of emancipation began to argue that freed blacks would be able to make the most of their freedom if resettled in tropical regions, ones that were, they claimed, biologically suited to their “natural” constitutions.

Freed black people rejected many of the suggested destinations, be it Jamaica, Trinidad, Honduras, or Liberia. Asaka’s study, which gives equal attention to black voices, shows that even when black abolitionists embraced emigration projects to tropical climates, like Haiti or Sierra Leone, they avoided any mention of the climate’s alleged suitability to the black race. Mary Ann Shadd Cary, a free black American who fled to Ontario in 1853, rejected Caribbean and African emigration locations entirely, insisting that Canada was as natural a home for black American refugees as it was for European settlers.

Scholars across multiple subfields—race and empire, nineteenth-century America, black history, the Atlantic World, abolitionism—will find this work immensely rewarding. And no doubt many will have their bones to pick. Some might wonder why there is little engagement with the history of scientific racism, particularly the theory of polygenism and ideas about innate inferiority, which had become a staple of antebellum discourse. Others will wonder what Asaka makes of the argument, increasingly prominent among scholars of abolitionism, that antislavery leaders of all races were in fact the harshest critics of colonial expansion, not its tacit allies, as Asaka implies. Still others might wonder why a study dealing with white settler colonialism seldom discusses Native American removal. But no one will question that Asaka has written a first-rate book, one that demands the widest possible audience.

The Ohio State University

Eric Herschthal, Ph.D.


For many scholars and students of international relations, the first half of the twentieth century is an era in retreat from globalization and filled with conflict. For too many specialists, international cooperation only accelerates with the foundation of major global multilateral institutions after World War II. Daniel
Gorman overturns this image by widening our perspective on international cooperation, encouraging the reader to look beyond international organizations to the contributions of a diverse universe of actors in forging transnational bonds of collaboration. Although he cannot ignore the dominance of affluent, white men in formal intergovernmental cooperation, he emphasizes the contribution of women, labor, colonized populations, and other communities in widening of cross-border connections and activism.

Gorman’s wider vision of international cooperation is embedded in the book’s organization, which does not privilege the League or other formal international organizations. Without neglecting those institutions, he examines ideas of international order, the internationalization of knowledge, international law, transnational humanitarian activism, international social movements, functional and technical cooperation, and private cooperation by organized corporations and technical experts. His coverage is comprehensive, and extensive bibliographic resources are provided for those who wish to research further. Unfortunately, encompassing such a broad range of cooperative activities and agents results in a tendency to list rather than analyze and weakens his overarching narrative, in which international cooperation emerges in response to globalization.

Several intriguing, cross-chapter themes emerge. In contrast to the conventional view of the United States as isolationist and withdrawn from the world during most of this period, he demonstrates the pervasive influence of U.S. actors in the development of international law, in leadership of humanitarian activism, and in private cooperation among corporations. Although he sometimes presents international hierarchy as binary (the West and the rest), Gorman’s account also demonstrates considerable agency and influence on the part of less powerful states, particularly those in Latin America. More attention might have been given to Japan, that non-Western escapee from colonialism and aspiring imperial power. Finally, and paradoxically, World War I created incentives for deeper international cooperation, not only on the part of those who worked energetically (and unsuccessfully) to prevent the return of catastrophic warfare, but also by those who learned from inter-allied and technocratic cooperation during the war (163) as well as humanitarian intervention in the war’s aftermath. Economic cooperation (e.g., the League’s role in economic stabilization and monetary cooperation under an adapted gold standard) is slighted relative to other domains, although Gorman’s treatment of interwar cartels as a form of private cooperation is a useful addition to our understanding of economic governance during this era.
As an antidote to conventional histories of the early 20th century, Daniel Gorman’s book will be invaluable in the classroom and for those working in fields other than international history. For those interested in contemporary global governance, he confirms a distinguished ancestry for “new” forms of governance that include nonstate actors.

American University

Miles Kahler