BOOK REVIEWS


EDITOR

RICHARD SPALL
Ohio Wesleyan University

REGIONAL SUB-EDITORS

Robert Dietle
(Modern Western Europe)
Western Kentucky University

Douglas R. Bisson
(Early Modern Europe)
Belmont University

Helen S. Hundley
(Russia and Eastern Europe)
Wichita State University

Jose C. Moya
(Latin America)
University of California at Los Angeles

Susan Mitchell Sommers
(Britain and the Empire)
Saint Vincent College

Sally Hadden
(United States)
Florida State University

Richard B. Allen
(Africa, Middle East, and South Asia)
Framingham State College

Betty Dessants
(United States Since 1865)
Shippensburg University

Nigel Kennell & Stefanie Kennell
(Ancient World)
Memorial University of Newfoundland

Paulette L. Pepin
(Medieval Europe)
University of New Haven

Richard Spall
(Historiography)
Ohio Wesleyan University

Peter Worthing
(East Asia and the Pacific)
Texas Christian University

STUDENT EDITORIAL ASSISTANTS

SENIOR ASSISTANTS

Jennifer Kirsop
Scarlett Rebman
Kaleigh Felisberto
Ryan Colopy
Janna Dagley
Sean Kennedy
Mark Lovering
Ben Malecki

Colin Magruder
Patrick O’Connor
Alex Branstool
Zak Gomes
Troy Jeffrey

Ryan Jarvis
Kara Reiter
Abraham Gustavson
Jesse Hysell
Lauren McCullough
Greg Stull
Eric Francis
Olivia Talbott

Originally planned as a study of the economic history of Hausaland in northern Nigeria in the nineteenth century, *Telling Stories* became a holistic exploration of the history of Hausa society in the era of the jihad. This was because, as Mary Wren Bivins explains, “The silence of women in colonial archives on both sides of the modern border of Nigeria and Niger pushed my research beyond the confines of written documents” (131–132). Therefore, drawing on a wide variety of published and unpublished sources, which includes oral traditions, folk stories, poetry, and published European travelers’ narratives, embodying women’s voices, the author crafts an absorbing story of the Islamic-induced transformations of Hausa society in this rather slim book.

As the subtitle of the book suggests, the author’s central focus is on Muslim Hausa women, whose voices seemingly remained “obscured by the overwhelming masculine presence in the production and reproduction of the sources” of nineteenth-century Hausa history. But in her gendered historical approach, Bivins demonstrates that women’s voices and contributions to the changing historical landscape in the Sokoto Caliphate were “undeniably present” (130). Consequently, she begins with a close look at the dynamics of change in the rural Hausa villages, where women by and large dominated the day-to-day activities, except “in public prayer.”

Of particular significance are the pivotal roles women played (and still play) in the economy of northern Nigeria, such as in agriculture and food production, in trade, and especially in the textile industry. In Hausaland, only women make cotton thread, and they sell it to the weavers, who produce the cloth. Surely, women “significantly contributed to the economy of textile production in the Sokoto Caliphate” (57). Women, too, are responsible for the dyed cloth for which the trading city of Kano is internationally renowned.

Of interest, also, are the discussions of women’s encounters with Islam and the impact of Islam on women’s education. Muslim women, as the author avers, were active in the production and dissemination of knowledge, exemplified in the literary works of Nana Asma’u, Shehu Usman’s daughter, whose “scholarship played a significant role in the education of scholars” and others in Sokoto and its hinterland (118). Furthermore, Bivins describes fascinating aspects of Hausa social life, such
as marriage and courtship, sexuality, gender, and kinship. As well she provides vignettes of European life, drawn from travelers’ narratives, which mirror the liaisons between male European travelers and Hausa women.

Assuming (perhaps wrongly) that the story of the creation of the Sokoto Caliphate is familiar to readers of this book, the author regrettably failed to provide the necessary background information, which would have otherwise enriched the study. Nevertheless, in *Telling Stories* Bivins makes a significant contribution to Africanist scholarship, as she focuses both on the history of women and the ethnography of Hausa society.

*Kent State University*  
Felix K. Ekechi


This narrative is a personal account of the Iraq War from the perspective of a reserve army officer who served in a Civil Affairs outfit stationed in Mosul. Mosul is a mixed ethnic city in the North that is dear to the Kurdish minority but bitterly contested by the once dominant Sunni minority. The author, Wayne H. Bowen, specifically relates his assignment as a liaison officer to the University of Mosul during his eight-month tour of duty from February to October of 2004. Although this experience carries both the vividness and dangers of a “foxhole account,” it was a rather unusual foxhole. Since the University of Mosul is the second largest university in Iraq, the author (an academic himself) provides a unique perspective of the integration of academic politics into a “national” war of sectarian strife. The time frame covered is also pivotal in that the author gives a view of Mosul under formal American occupation of the Coalition Provisional Authority until June of that year, when it came under interim Iraqi authority in the government of Ayad Allawi.

This exclusive focus is also the central limitation of this work. There is no introduction to the war nor any mention of a possible conclusion. Reading this book is like being dropped into the second act of a three act play, and then being lifted out at the end of this act. But in this second act, in Mosul, the reader is given a truly realistic portrait of the complexities of this struggle. Indeed, in one remarkable paragraph, Bowen tells it all:

In a typical week I meet with radical anti-American students, Anglophile Professors . . ., empire-building deans, corrupt government officials, pro-American Kurds, burned-out hippies working for NGOs, American soldiers
who want to kill all Iraqis, former Iraqi soldiers who want to kill all Americans, State Department officials who can’t stand the Army, Army officers who can’t stand the State Department, translators who speak English better than I do, Iraqi students who want me to give them one of the secret scholarships they know I am hiding, intelligence officers who think all Iraqis are terrorists, Iraqis who think all Americans are intelligence officers, American soldiers who want to move here (at least to Kurdistan), and Iraqis who want to move to the United States. (41)

In these complexities, several insights emerge. For one, personalities do matter. Bowen talks about the deep improvements that came with Herro Kader Mustafa, the head of the CPA for northern Iraq, and the setbacks that came with her successor. In a sense, readers see in this book how a university is in the cockpit for the creation of new political order. It is also a central arena for the dilemmas of creating a new society. Despite the attempt to purge Baathism from Iraqi society, for example, Bowen reveals the many ways this ancien régime persists. From this vantage point, the reader can see the dimensions of the obstacles to this new society, as well as an appreciation for the long path to any desired outcome.

After reading this book, the outcome in Iraq is very much still in doubt. Even if many do not want to, reading *Undoing Saddam* is a good way to find out why.

Saint Louis University

Timothy J. Lomperis


This volume contains three books: a two-hundred page history of women in the Middle East aimed at students, scholars, and the broader public; a collection of the author’s articles on the study of Middle Eastern women (originally published between 1979 and 2001); and autobiographical material from the author. The mixture works on the whole, particularly in an age when the personal history of scholars of the Middle East is being scrutinized as much as their work. In addition to the historical review, however, one selection each, laying out the challenges and achievements of Middle Eastern women’s studies, and a biographical piece would have sufficed.

Nikki R. Keddie’s reading of the history of Middle Eastern women is informed by her important work in Iranian history and her study of the nomadic way of life and its impact on Middle Eastern societies. The main weakness of this history is insufficient recognition of the groundbreaking work on the Ottoman Empire that
has revolutionized our view of premodern Middle Eastern women’s lives. Also, economic activities of women are downplayed despite growing quantitative and qualitative data on women’s property ownership, transactions, and professions. The statement that the Islamic *waqf* endowment was used to avoid granting women their liberal inheritance rights under Islamic law is out of date, disregarding numerous studies and the developing polemic on the gender implications of *waqf* endowments that have been carried out in the last decades (43). Keddie’s sensitivity to women’s empowerment in tribal settings, while not ignoring patriarchal aspects, leads to an extremely valuable thesis on societies with tribal backgrounds, which, as she pointedly states, are not necessarily Islamic (39).

The country by country treatment of the 1914–1945 and post-1945 periods privileges Iran over Turkey, even when it can be demonstrated that events in Tehran were influenced by those in Istanbul and Ankara, or Egypt, whose innovations often influenced the entire Arab world. Admittedly, the quantity of research on women and gender in Iran has mushroomed since the revolution of 1979, and serious studies of other areas are uneven in quantity and quality. It would have been preferable to approach the subject of women and gender in the twentieth-century Middle East by broad themes rather than by countries, which would highlight major trends rather than details that may be superfluous to the general reader and overcome lacunae in research on certain countries. Nevertheless, some of the country chapters would be very useful for teaching purposes because they summarize numerous studies in a manner comprehensible to the general reader and because they reference published research.

Keddie was a pioneer of the renewal of Middle Eastern women’s studies and remains conversant with developments in the field. Her “state of the art” articles reflect these changes, with the superb “Scholarship, Relativism, and Universalism, 2000,” the most comprehensive and analytic of these. The autobiographical material in the book reveals a fascinating life as a Marxist, political activist, and woman. Keddie came to women’s history in the wake of the feminist movement and has contributed to its progress. This volume, however, does not live up to its promise.

*The Hebrew University of Jerusalem*

Ruth Roded


Now sadly a shell of its former self, Jaffa, once a major commercial and cultural center, was the queen city of historic Palestine. This author has produced a
welcome addition to the growing number of studies on Palestinian cities. Both historians and casual readers will find much of interest in Adam LeBron’s work.

Jaffa prospered from the fruits of the surrounding lush orange groves from which the book takes its title. LeBron captures the complex tapestry of life in this Mediterranean port city from the early twentieth century to the present day by intertwining the oral histories of Jewish and Palestinian families. The families include, among others, the Jewish Chelouches originally from North Africa, the Aharoni family from Bulgaria, the Meisler family from Poland, the Palestinian Christian Andraus and Geday families, as well as the Muslim Hammamis, most of whom are now part of the Palestinian diaspora. In the opening chapters, LeBron movingly describes the rich social and economic life created in Jaffa from the intertwining of differing ethnic, socioeconomic, and religious groups.

As the Zionist movement grew in number and power under the British Mandate in the 1920s and 1930s, Jaffa society split into two separate national groups: Jewish and Palestinian. The chaos following the declaration of the United Nations partition plan in 1947, the departure of the British, the 1948 war—understandably known by Palestinians as the Nakba (disaster)—and the war of independence for the Israelis led to the massive exodus of the Palestinians from Jaffa. The departure of the middle class from Jaffa left the remaining Palestinians without an organized leadership with which to negotiate or confront the new Israeli government.

Using extensive oral histories and documentation in printed sources, LeBron details the causes and results of this exodus and the subsequent “ethnic cleansing” of Palestinians from Jaffa and elsewhere in the newly created Israeli state (132, 266). The charismatic Israeli leader and first prime minister, David Ben-Gurion, asserted that Jaffa should become a Jewish city. In fact, so many families like the Aharonis moved into the houses left empty by the Palestinian exodus that Jaffa became known as Sofia by the sea. Sandy Tolan’s The Lemon Tree [2006], set in Jaffa, amplifies City of Oranges with a vivid portrait of a Palestinian Christian family and a Bulgarian Jewish family, both with claims to the same house in Jaffa.

Subsequently, much of old Jaffa, including hundreds of Ottoman buildings, was razed in the name of urban renewal, a process actually begun by the British during the Mandate. In the 1960s, parts of old Jaffa were gentrified with the creation of artists’ quarters. However, as time went by, Israeli, Arab, and Jewish society further separated, and former contact among families almost ceased. The ongoing Aqsa Intifada, begun in 2000, and mounting violence caused by Palestinian attacks against Jewish Israelis and Israeli attacks against Palestinians in the Occupied Territories and Palestinian Arab Israeli citizens, led to further polariza-
tion. In an instance of class interests trumping both ethnic and religious differences, contacts in Jaffa (and elsewhere in Israel) in the present day are limited almost entirely to very wealthy Jews and Palestinians, or among criminal elements within both groups. Thus political events tend to overshadow the oral histories in the last chapters. LeBron is perhaps overly optimistic when he concludes that, in the future, Jaffa should become a “place where Jews, Muslims and Christians can connect, like they used to” (367).

*Eastern Michigan University*

Janice J. Terry


In this book the author provides a wide-ranging analysis of the conditions that led to violence and corruption in Angola from the 1970s to 2004. The book consists of nine chapters. The first two chapters include a brief discussion of Portuguese colonialism in Angola and an overview of the liberation movements, emphasizing particularly the regional and ethnic bases of the movements, their imported ideologies, and the conditions that led to the descent into civil war following the chaotic departure of the Portuguese. Chapters three and four detail the crucial role of non-Angolan actors in the civil war and the crucial role that UNITA’s insurgency played in the violence that characterized Angola during the 1980s. The final chapters highlight how the MPLA used the war as a means of maintaining control of the state and tolerated the culture of corruption that came to characterize the postcolonial Angolan state. These chapters also discuss the important role that ethno-regional politics played in the contest between UNITA and MPLA. The author makes recommendations that he believes would prevent a return to violence and eliminate the conditions that fostered corruption at the highest levels of the postcolonial state.

*Rebels and Robbers* is a timely book that is a good introduction to the study of postcolonial Angola. The author provides a thorough overview of the role that violence, ethnicity, and corruption played in Angola’s political development from the 1970s to 2004. Unlike many of the studies on postcolonial Angola that have condemned UNITA for the violence that Angola experienced or that have emphasized the role of external players in Angola’s postcolonial development, Assis Malaquias’s study is more nuanced. He rightly criticizes the strategies adopted by the leaders of both MPLA and UNITA in their efforts to take and keep control of the postcolonial state. Moreover, he provides a penetrating analysis of why UNITA opted to continue its campaign of violence and how corruption came to
dominate state action in Angola. His detailed analysis of why the various attempts by outside agencies to bring about political reforms in Angola failed, and his recommendations, are a timely reminder of the major problems Angola still faces.

This work is really an analysis of published books, articles, and media accounts of Angola available in English. Of the more than two hundred items that appear in the bibliography, not one is in Portuguese, and there is no reference to the many Portuguese-language newspapers published in Angola or Portugal that closely followed events in Angola from the 1970s. This is unfortunate, for had the author made an effort to consult the many journalistic and media accounts in Portuguese, the book would have presented a more accurate picture of the crucial role that the Catholic Church and other civil organizations played in pushing for the end of violence and political reform. Moreover, at times the book reads more like a detailed outline of policy recommendations for good governance than an analysis informed by a thorough familiarity with the Angolan reality. Despite these shortcomings, Rebels and Robbers is a valuable introduction for readers unfamiliar with developments in contemporary Angola.

Boston University

Linda Heywood


A Pulitzer Prize-winning reporter for the Wall Street Journal, Amy Dockser Marcus argues that the Arab–Israeli conflict actually began in July 1913. Zionist settlement guards charged Palestinian Arabs from a nearby village with stealing grapes. Subsequent brawls led to the death of an Arab peasant and to an apparent retaliatory shooting that killed one of the settlement guards. From this, suggests Marcus, arose an implacable divide where Palestinian Jews and Arabs were forced to choose sides, abandoning any hope of mutual tolerance that had been the norm for most of Ottoman rule. She sees this situation, and the inability of both sides to discuss matters and compromise, as the basis of today’s hostilities.

Marcus develops her story through a focus on personalities: Albert Antebi, a Damascene Jew and Ottoman citizen; Arthur Ruppin, a high-ranking Zionist official responsible for Zionist land purchases; and Ruhi al-Khalidi, a Palestinian notable who served as an elected member of the Ottoman parliament in Istanbul.

The author mourns the disappearance of Ottoman civility epitomized in the personalities of Antebi and al-Khalidi, persons who sought compromise and dialogue. She contrasts them with Ruppin, who strove to establish a Jewish majority in Palestine and to deny Palestinian peasants the right to work land...
purchased by Zionists. Ruppin represented Zionist objectives first outlined by Theodor Herzl, whose own visit to Jerusalem in 1898, for Marcus, was a “turning point” for Jerusalem: “the rise of [Jewish] nationalism was shrinking the shared traditions and communal space that had always been a central part of the fabric of life in the city” (44).

Nonetheless, Marcus essentially sides with Herzl and Ruppin. When discussing the grape-stealing accusations of July 1913, she presents Antebi as bemoaning Zionist behavior and their refusal to try to “get along with their [Arab] neighbors”; it was the guards’ “obstinacy and refusal to take advice from people who knew the Arabs had created the very conditions that gave rise to the current troubles” (108). But she then depicts Antebi as siding with them against the Palestinians, presumably because he was Jewish, and as objecting to apparent Zionist peace efforts “before judicially establishing the aggression of the Muslims against us” (110).

This account appears self-contradictory and conflicted. Antebi, Marcus’s model of an Ottoman Jew, appears more Zionist than the Zionist guards he criticized, whereas, as she notes elsewhere, Arabs were willing to accept Jewish immigration into Palestine so long as they became Ottoman citizens, but they always distinguished that from Jewish demands for a separate political entity. Eager to seek reconciliation and peace today, Marcus mourns the loss of the Ottoman era of communal integration, but as a Zionist she cannot object to the creation of Israel that caused this loss. And Arab opposition to Jewish separatism was expected, as Ruppin acknowledged (192–193).

Marcus prefers another Ruppin comment from 1937, in which he states that Zionists should distinguish between what they might wish for and what, practically speaking, they could have, an idea she suggests should apply to Israeli goals regarding retention of land today. Although admirable, the context of compromise today is not that of 1913, and if Marcus really harks back to that era as the model, there would be no Israel today because Ruppin’s goals would not have been achieved.

However engaging Marcus is in her search for understanding and the wish for shared Palestinian–Jewish narratives, this book amounts more to wishful thinking than historical analysis. Also, Marcus is casual on dates; the British took Jerusalem in December 1917, not “probably in 1918, near the end of the conflict” (158, 204). One should read it in conjunction with another book that approaches the same topic, Shared Histories: A Palestinian–Israeli Dialogue, edited by Paul Scham, Walid Salem, and Benjamin Pogrund [2005]. The book’s contents contradict the title. In that study, Israelis and Palestinians who grappled with issues at several conferences had finally to agree that they had no shared history and that
each should respect the historical narrative of the other. As most agreed, this was more difficult for Palestinians and Israeli Arabs, because Israelis insisted Palestinians accept their historical narrative first before being willing to consider that of the Palestinians. That lack of mutual respect is today’s reality, and it has little to do with the world of Ruhi al-Khalidi and Albert Antebi.

University of Arizona

Charles D. Smith

“NEW VISTAS IN EAST AFRICAN SOCIAL HISTORY”


The two books under review make important contributions to East African social history. The studies focus on regions, one in western Uganda and the other in western Kenya, that suffered a particularly violent colonial conquest as a result of sustained resistance followed by some years of neglect. In both regions, the conquest and the decade that followed it brought large losses in cattle and other livestock. Neither district was part of the political mainstream of the colonies within which they were situated. In addition to these similarities, the authors of both books have taken advantage of rich archival sources and oral interviews in the field to present well-documented historical studies, including good use of statistics taken from colonial records. Moreover, both make effective use of the research of Western anthropologists who worked in the areas after World War II. Both books are grounded in the relevant secondary literature. Both make authoritative contributions with the primary focuses of the books: demographic changes in the Bunyoro kingdom in the first and the “crisis” over marriage in Gusiiland in the second. In particular, the authors realize the importance of colonial economic changes impacting the social history that is the focus of the books.

Yet significant differences also mark the authors’ approaches to social history. Obviously the subjects are different (population and environment as opposed to “girl cases”). Shane Doyle demonstrates that Bunyoro was violently conquered, was deprived of a huge amount of land and livestock, and was neglected, systematically oppressed, and underdeveloped. Brett L. Shadle shows that Gusiiland was at first neglected but suffered no loss of land (some Gusii gained access to additional land under colonial rule), and cattle herds were rebuilt after World War
I. Gusii accommodated themselves to colonial rule, and eventually experienced considerable economic prosperity as a result. (It was the first African area to plant arabica coffee legally in colonial Kenya.) Although the latter economic innovation, together with large increases in the sale of maize and the later introduction of tea and pyrethrum, encouraged and sponsored by the colonial state in Gusii-land, brought substantial increases in wealth to the region, Doyle presents a persuasive case that new crops such as cotton and tobacco, by contrast, brought great poverty to Bunyoro.

There are also significant differences in the ways the books approach their core issues. Although Doyle does not make political history the center of his study, he provides at least two chapters that give the reader an understanding of the main political trends and issues in colonial Bunyoro and, to a lesser extent, in the larger Uganda arena. Shadle leaves colonial politics (Gusii or Kenyan) largely out of his social history. In the treatment of colonial rule and its impact, Doyle presents an extremely negative picture, as colonial officials and European missionaries helped to shape Bunyoro’s disastrous demographic experience through their hostility and neglect. By contrast, Shadle presents the missionaries and colonial rulers in a much more benign light, especially those who served in Gusii-land after the 1930s.

Moreover, the crisis and decline in Bunyoro was far more severe and threatening, as it involved a decline in population with only a modest recovery toward the end of the period covered by the book. In chapters six and nine in particular, Doyle presents a compelling analysis of the demographic disaster. A variety of factors are shown to be responsible: the colonial conquest and colonial policies brought on a series of famines and epidemics and encouraged large-scale migration from Bunyoro. The Nyoro themselves bore considerable responsibility for this situation. Doyle maintains that the Nyoro leadership, particularly after the failure of the Nyangire Rebellion of 1907, was characterized by “conservatism and limited ambition” (96). Gender relations also “lay at the heart of the evolving colonial demographic crisis” (244). All this meant that between 1910 and 1924, Bunyoro’s birthrate was the lowest of any district in Uganda and the mean death rate was higher than average. These factors, together with nutrition, are treated in detail, with the sections on endemic and epidemic diseases (sexually transmitted diseases, sleeping sickness, and malaria) being particularly revealing. The population of Bunyoro thus only began to recover toward what Doyle estimated to be preconquest levels at the end of the colonial period (three decades later than the East African norm). Even late in the colonial period, Bunyoro suffered more from malnutrition than any other people in Uganda.
This—together with an unhealthy environment, the nature of gender relations, and poor health for most of the Nyoro population—explains chronic infertility and high mortality.

In view of the focus of the second book under review, it is of interest to note what Doyle has to say about marriage and gender relations in Bunyoro for roughly the same time period. Just as in Gusiland, the 1930s witnessed bridewealth becoming increasingly inflated; unlike Gusiland, payments of bridewealth became monetized. Important results of this situation were an increase in informal unions and later marriages. Although polygamy remained a desired marital state for men, Doyle argues that such a practice was the preserve of the wealthy. The period also produced a high divorce rate for Bunyoro. Thus marital issues clearly had an impact on Bunyoro’s low fertility.

Doyle’s study makes a significant contribution to understanding health and population issues in one portion of Uganda. Although some might contend that Bunyoro’s experience was atypical for colonial Uganda, it is nevertheless valuable for historians to have access to studies like this as it is important to understand the experience of all regions of colonial East Africa. Among the less-than-completely satisfying aspects of the book, however, are the several references to the Kikuyu of Kenya. These add little to the reader’s understanding, as the two regions had quite different precolonial histories and experiences under colonial rule. Doyle’s treatment of innovation in the colonial economy also leaves something to be desired. It contrasts with that of Shadle, who provides a detailed account, for example, of the introduction of coffee growing that helps the reader to understand the roots of differentiation in Gusiland. Doyle’s treatment emphasizes differences in wealth, but provides little detail as to their origins. A particularly confusing aspect of Doyle’s narrative has to do with his reference to other scholars. He identifies these by their profession (e.g., historian or anthropologist), but for African scholars, their nationality and/or ethnic origin is also indicated. If it is significant that a scholar is Nigerian or Ugandan, then one wonders why Canadians, Americans, Scots, or others are not so identified in the book.

As noted above, “Girl Cases” treats economic innovation more effectively as a prelude to a detailed examination of marriage and associated gender issues in the Gusii highlands over a period stretching roughly from the late 1930s through the 1960s. Here also there was a crisis, although different than that in Bunyoro, of marriage. The background to the colonial economy is preceded by a discussion of the establishment and functioning of colonial rule in Gusiland and a chapter that sets the background for marriage disputes with a brief description of Gusii
marriage practices and the nature of the disputes examined in the book. An interesting and informative part of the discourse is provided by a description of the agitation in Britain over the issue of forced marriages in Kenya and other colonial territories that owed much to the initiative of the Church Missionary Society missionary W. E. Owen. The discussion provides new insights as to the metropolitan conceptions of problems with African marriage in the second half of the 1930s.

Turning back to Gusiiland, the focus on marriage disputes includes forced marriage and runaway wives, elopement, adultery, and abduction. All are well illustrated through examples drawn from cases heard by the Gusii local tribunals set up in 1937. Forced marriage and runaway wives highlighted the issue of female choice in a spouse, which could easily lead to conflict with the woman’s father, as the narrative illustrates. Elopement was primarily the result of a couple’s gamble that they could draw a reluctant father into marriage negotiations. Abduction of a woman to gain a wife involved the use of force and sometimes physical harm, but a common reason for this, the court cases indicate, was a lack of sufficient wealth to afford the escalating bridewealth demanded by Gusii fathers. Behind these “girl cases,” therefore, were the economic realities of Gusiiland from the 1940s to the end of the 1960s. Rising levels of income from the sale of crops and greater numbers of men seeking wage employment (particularly high during World War II) pushed bridewealth ever higher. This had a negative impact on poorer households in particular. Shadle demonstrates, for example, that in the 1940s and 1950s it took up to three or four years, and perhaps longer, for a poor man to earn money to meet the bridewealth demanded at the time.

The result was that what the book terms “disputes over women” or “girl cases” poured into the courts that colonial rule created in Gusiiland (Ritongo Kuja and Ritongo Gesima) (152). Shadle was fortunate to gain access to these court records, and he makes excellent use of them. In his analysis, he maintains that women’s consent and female agency generally lay at the center of the struggle over marriage that the court cases reveal. The analysis of the court cases also demonstrates the difficulty of balancing or reconciling the rights of fathers and daughters and husbands and wives. The result was that court elders “usually favored the rights of senior men over their womenfolk, but did not always dismiss women’s wishes” (177). Compared with this rich data and insightful analysis, what is termed the demise of marriage disputes is relatively briefly treated in chapter seven. Nevertheless, a key point comes through. Just as the “peculiarities of the colonial political economy and legal system help to create the context for
and to shape the crisis in Gusii marriage,” a different political economy and judiciary in independent Kenya changed the nature of marriage disputes, reducing the number and importance of “girl cases” (215).

Although the core of the book represents a most interesting excursion into the social history of marriage and gender relations in East Africa, this study is characterized by far too many problems that weaken its value, particularly for the specialist in Kenyan history. First, there are the factual inaccuracies, which are far too numerous for a book seemingly based on the consultation of a wide range of archival sources. Despite several uses of the term, there was never any entity in colonial Africa known as the East African Protectorate. S. H. Fazan was not provincial commissioner of Nyanza in 1949, nor was H. R. Lambert a postwar champion of resurrecting communal authority (189, 210). There was no South Kavirondo Local Native Council (LNC) in 1933 or after 1948. The author neglects to tell his readers that South Kavirondo had two LNCs between 1925 and 1936. K. L. Hunter did not appoint the first African Assistant Administrative Officers, unless one may construe such a conclusion from the fact that Hunter presided over a panel of Nyanza province district commissioners that made the recommendation for the first six appointments (187). The archival record does not support the claim that “the administration directed” anthropologist Philip Mayer “to study ‘traditional’ cooperative farming techniques” (207). Rather, the record suggests that Mayer sold the idea of using neighborhood work groups (risaga) as the basis of establishing group farms to the colonial administration. Moreover, Shadle’s claim that the esigani (marriage go-between) was a male friend of a bachelor seeking a suitable wife would be disputed by many Gusii (128). To complicate matters further for the reader, the term is spelled differently in the book’s index and in the text.

Second, more than a little confusion stems from the author’s view of, and use of opinions from, the several colonial officials who figure in the narrative. He offers sound advice for the researcher when he observes: “Even with the transfer of knowledge between old hands and new recruits, DCs [District Commissioners] had come and gone in Kisii with marked rapidity; colonial understanding of long-term continuities and changes in Gusii social relations was probably not terribly deep” (51). Yet this cautionary note is not followed by the author himself! He gives pride of place on far too many occasions to the opinions and insights of such administrators. This provides plenty of fuel for confusion and misunderstanding, particularly for the reader who is not well schooled in Kenyan history. This is particularly a problem in chapter six, where the author informs the reader that after World War II a new generation of European administrators
entered Kenya, who thought differently about the future of Africans and of Kenya. This is all quite true, but to assert that, because of this, “the ethos of the interwar years was by 1945 ‘dead and done with,’” is surely misleading (187). K. L. Hunter, an administrator who features prominently in the book, was an example of an individual whose views hardly fit such an interpretation. He was of course not a new administrator, but although he took up new ideas after 1945 (e.g., agrarian reform and state controlled gold mining), he also became an advocate for reviving and utilizing communalism in the postwar world in the shape of the group farms initiative in Gusiiland and the attempt to use the liguru to implement soil conservation in North Nyanza.

Another difficulty for the reader comes from the author’s seeming desire to make use of every bit of interesting information gleaned from his research, packing this into endnotes if not the text. Yet such material, in the form of quotations or otherwise, requires a proper context for these to be meaningful, particularly when they have little to do with “girl cases” in Gusiiland. Thus, although C. E. Buxton’s extramarital affair(s) are titillating, they appear to have nothing to do with the subject of the book (76). Nor is it clear what relevance Buxton’s right-wing political views and affiliations after his retirement in Kenya have for “girl cases” in Gusiiland. If such information is important, then the author has likely erred by not telling readers that Hunter was an enthusiast for the New Kenya Party after his retirement and that S. H. Fazan was an advocate of a majimbo (federal) constitutional future for Kenya following his.

In addition to these points of criticism, it should be noted that there exist conspicuous voids in this social history. The absence of political context has been noted earlier. The state of emergency existing in Kenya from 1952 to early 1960 is little touched on, for example. Nor is there any meaningful discussion of the spread and impact of Western education in Gusiiland. The impact of Western education on the “girl cases” in the courts is largely absent from the narrative as well. So too is the impact of witchcraft. Perhaps the author did not wish to delve into the subject, but it seems difficult not to consider the issue in light of the historic importance of fears of witchcraft and witchcraft accusations in the making and breaking of Gusii marriages.

Although this review provides an extended critique of the second book, this has been deemed important because the majority of the readers of this journal are not specialists in the field. This well-documented book is impressive on many levels, but the criticism noted earlier should be placed in the balance in any overall assessment. Like Crisis & Decline, it provides new detail on previously little-studied subjects; it offers many significant insights; and it opens the way for
further research. Nevertheless, the presence of errors and questionable interpretations presents the reader with potential problems.

West Virginia University

Robert M. Maxon

**THE AMERICAS**


Scholars who are familiar with the literature on Franklin D. Roosevelt and the New Deal will find little that is new or interesting in this book. General readers, however, may find Jonathan Alter’s well-written account a useful introduction to FDR’s early political career and the policies he supported during his first three months in office.

Notwithstanding the title, the author devotes considerably more space to Roosevelt’s career before his inauguration in March 1933 than he does to his policies during the first hundred days of his administration. In Part one, Alter discusses Roosevelt’s life before his election as governor of New York State in 1928; in Part two, he focuses on the 1932 campaign and election; and in Part three, he carries the story from the election to FDR’s inauguration. It is only in Part four that the reader reaches the hundred days. Yet even in the hundred-or-so pages that Alter devotes to that period, he includes chapters on “That Temperament,” for example, or “Surpassing Charm,” or “That Voice” that describe Roosevelt’s general outlook and approach to politics rather than his early efforts to combat the Depression.

Alter offers cursory two-page accounts of the Securities Act, the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and the Tennessee Valley Authority. The Civilian Conservation Corps and the National Recovery Administration each receive only nine pages. The reader comes away with the impression that the hundred days did not matter all that much, an impression strengthened when Alter writes: “Most of the landmark New Deal accomplishments that endure to this day—the Security and Exchange Commission [1934], Social Security [1935], and the pro-union legislation like the Wagner Act [1935] that empowered the government to fight unfair labor practices—date from later in the decade” (274). He adds that if the legislation enacted during the hundred days had succeeded in bringing recovery, “the United States would not now have the wide variety of social advances that it largely takes for granted” (274).
Although Alter’s judgments are usually sensible, he begins his book with a sensationalized claim. He located an unused draft of a radio speech Roosevelt delivered to the convention of the American Legion shortly after his inauguration, a draft proposed by “someone in the small Roosevelt inner circle.” It “contained this eye-popping sentence: ‘As new commander-in-chief under the oath to which you are still bound I reserve to myself the right to command you in any phase of the situation which now confronts us’” (4). Alter writes: “This was dictator talk—an explicit power grab,” and adds that FDR was “contemplating his ‘right’ to command World War I veterans”—“apparently to guard banks, or put down rebellions or do anything else he wished”—even though he had no power over them (5). But then “an astonishing thing happened—or more precisely, did not happen.” The speech was simply relegated to the files “where it lay unexamined for more than seventy years” (7). There is nothing astonishing about any of this, however, since nothing suggests that Roosevelt himself ever contemplated any such action.

Cornell University

Richard Polenberg


New York’s Rudolph Giuliani became “America’s Mayor” on 11 September 2001, when, covered in dust and soot, he calmed and inspired a shattered city and nation. Giuliani’s leadership that day and during those that followed secured him a place in national legend as an American Churchill, indomitable and unafraid in the face of unspeakable horror. But for journalists Wayne Barrett and Dan Collins, Giuliani’s heroism obscures a critical question: Was New York as prepared for the events of 9/11 as it could have been? *Grand Illusion: The Untold Story of Rudy Giuliani and 9/11* offers their answer, a prosecutorial brief against the mayor for what they call “the eight-year history of error and indifference that preceded that moment” (340).

For Barrett and Collins, the terrible “ifs” accumulate. What if the New York City police and fire departments, long-time interagency rivals, had been able to communicate with each other more effectively as the towers burned? What if the command center of Giuliani’s Office of Emergency Management had not been constructed at the mayor’s insistence in the World Trade Center complex itself, rendering it unusable on the fateful day? What if the fire department radios had been operable in a high-rise inferno? What if confused 911 operators had not instructed North Tower occupants to remain in the building in the wake of the attacks?
The authors lay these errors and others at the feet of Giuliani, who, they argue, should have anticipated another attempt to destroy the World Trade Center given the precedent of the 1993 bombing. Even allowing for the truth of their assertions, however, Grand Illusion is good journalism and bad history. Assuming that all would have been well “if only” ignores history’s contingencies, which never move in a straight line. Had Giuliani’s command center been sited in Brooklyn, as Barrett and Collins argue it should have been, would these different circumstances have produced a different set of calamities? Had the 911 operators told those on the towers’ upper floors to leave, would they have rushed into the wrong stairwell and perished? Would they have obeyed the warnings at all? Having observed the failure of the 1993 plot to destroy the World Trade Center, what if the terrorists had chosen to attack the Statue of Liberty instead? Counterfactual history is an interesting parlor game, but it is not the real thing. Had Rudolph Giuliani done everything the authors demanded in Grand Illusion, events on September 11 may still have unfolded as they did, or perhaps even more catastrophically. Asking Giuliani to have foreseen the contingencies of that uniquely tragic day is asking too much. History has judged Franklin Roosevelt less on what he could have done before Pearl Harbor than what he did after it. Once the journalists have their say about “America’s Mayor,” it will again be history’s turn.

Lawrence University

Jerald Podair


In 1867, New York artist J. L. Giles produced an extraordinary engraving. Titled “Reconstruction,” the print depicted the United States as a nation in which racial justice and harmony were more than empty promises, and the old pillars of “Slavery” were replaced by “Justice,” “Liberty,” and “Education.” It was a stirring scene, a hopeful, albeit naïve, vision of what the newly reconstituted nation could achieve in the wake of a bloody Civil War. Alas, it was not to be. As the voluminous literature on Reconstruction has illustrated, guarantees made to people of color in 1865 were abandoned in favor of a brutal system of legal segregation after white southerners “redeemed” state governments during the 1870s.

Much has been written about the historical period that Mark Twain dubbed the Gilded Age, but, according to Edward J. Blum, author of Reforging the White Republic, major studies have ignored the role that religion played in defining the
attitudes of whites living during that time. Blum seeks to rectify this oversight by tracing the evolution of a new white republic as national leaders abandoned the promise of Giles’s vision of Reconstruction and justified their actions based on Protestant Christian values, which supplanted the old North–South/slavery–abolitionist schism of the antebellum era. In his view, the end of the nineteenth century in America “witnessed northern white Protestants thoroughly embracing and propagating an ethnic nationalism that privileged whiteness at the direct expense of the radical civic nationalism of the mid-1860s” (7).

This book represents a bold look at Reconstruction and its aftermath. Blum paints on a broad canvas, introducing numerous characters and episodes ranging from Dwight Lyman Moody and his religious revivals of the 1870s and 1880s, to the Yellow Fever epidemic of 1878, to the reformist efforts of the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union beginning in the 1880s. Each of these examples is designed to show how the antipathy victorious northerners felt toward vanquished southerners in the early Reconstruction period gradually became the antipathy that whites felt for nonwhites.

As with any bold new study written across a sweeping landscape, occasionally nuances are lost or obfuscated. The argument that civic nationalism gave way to ethnic nationalism is not altogether convincing, nor is it axiomatic that the former necessarily preceded the latter so much as the two coexisted in varying degrees over time. Moreover, the author does not fully consider the array of historical, political, legal, economic, and social forces that influenced and, in turn, were influenced by the development of American racism apart from postbellum Protestantism.

Despite these criticisms, Reforging the White Republic is an important work that adds to the literature on race relations during the three decades after the end of the Civil War. By emphasizing the importance of religion in the conflation of whiteness and nationalism, Blum illuminates a heretofore neglected part of the historical record. Students of nineteenth-century American history will find the book well worth their time and attention.

Kennesaw State University

J. Michael Martinez


With the publication of the author’s previous book on the pictorial histories of ancient central Mexico, Stories in Red and Black, students of Mesoamerican civilization have anticipated a similarly synthetic, yet ethnographically rich,
account of the other major genre from this tradition. These are the divinatory
almanacs, sometimes combined with protocols for ritual or cosmogonies that
soothsayers used to maintain the vital links between men and the gods. Cycles of
Time fulfils this promise, providing a guide to the twelve surviving manuscripts
in this tradition. Whereas previous scholars—particularly Eduard Seler and Karl
Anton Nowotny—offered detailed iconographic and structural analyses of indi-
vidual manuscripts, the author explores the fundamental organizational and
interpretive structures that determine how the almanacs were used.

Adapting the highly effective outline of her previous study, the author organizes
this book much like a grammar, interpreting the manuscripts through a series of
increasing levels of complexity. She begins at the most fundamental level, with an
explanation of the nature and sociological significance of the calendrical systems
used in the manuscripts (chapter two). This is followed by a detailed explanation
of the graphic elements of which the almanacs are composed (chapter three). Not
only are these images designed to communicate concrete meaning, but also to
explore esoteric associations based on a system of metaphoric and metonymic
correspondences. The following chapter (four) explains the presentational format
by which these elements are organized, either as lists, tables, or diagrams.

Chapter five constitutes the core of the study, which explains at length the
functions of the almanacs, categorizing them as multipurpose, directional (focus-
ing on the prophetic qualities of the directions), or topical (relating to a single
domain, such as childbirth or Venus). In accordance with recent scholarship,
Elizabeth Hill Boone utilizes both iconographic and structural analysis as well as
interpretations derived from early chronicles. Chapter six describes the ritual
protocols contained in several manuscripts, while chapter seven explores the
unusual narrative segment of the Codex Borgia, previously interpreted as either an
explication of the movement of Venus or as a series of separate rituals. Departing
from these views, Boone sees this section as a cosmogony, beginning with a sort
of “big bang” and ending with the kindling of primordial fires in association with
calendrical rites. Chapter eight discusses the provenience of the manuscripts, while
the final chapter (nine) summarizes the manuscripts as an expression of a widely
shared religious and divinatory system.

Boone offers many new interpretations of interest to the specialist. However,
the book will be most appreciated for the way in which it makes a complex artistic
and intellectual system intelligible to the nonspecialist. This is accomplished partly
through its methodical, precisely focused discussion of the components and struc-
ture of the almanacs and also through its multipage layouts of the manuscripts
and reading-order diagrams, which help the reader understand the almanac
structures. A useful appendix also summarizes the content of the almanacs of each manuscript included in the study.

California State University, Chico

Matthew G. Looper


Plutarco Elías Calles is remembered in Mexico as one of the Revolution’s “winners,” those opportunistic survivors who mouthed the pieties of social justice while establishing an oligarchy more brutal and corrupt than the one they had just overthrown. Their venality is the theme of short stories by Mariano Azuela and Martín Luis Guzmán and the novels of Carlos Fuentes. Jürgen Buchenau might have been forgiven had he merely added corroborative detail to this familiar narrative. Although he does that, Buchenau also offers a complex and nuanced portrait of a man who dominated Mexico’s political life for more than a decade and who launched a “perfect dictatorship” that lasted until the final decade of the twentieth century.

Buchenau characterizes Calles as an “authoritarian populist.” His political ideals—rationalist, materialist, antidemocratic, anticlerical—derived, ironically, from the positivist education he received during the Porfirio Díaz era. Hence, although his rhetoric could be radical, over time his actions looked increasingly like the “order and progress” of the old regime. As governor of Sonora during the Revolution and later as President of Mexico, Calles called for agrarian reform. But he showed more interest in promoting commercial farms than restoring land to peasants who had been robbed of it prior to the Revolution, and most of the land he distributed came from political opponents and Yaqui Indians. A former businessman, Calles expressed support for workers’ rights and economic nationalism, but in practice he suppressed strikes, consigned workers to an official union controlled by the corrupt Luis Morones, and was careful not to impose too heavily on foreign investors lest they take their money elsewhere. Calles was a strong proponent of public education, but even that had an authoritarian purpose: indigenous students were compelled to learn Spanish in hopes of turning them into “Mexicans.” Although the point is not made explicitly, Buchenau’s account demonstrates that there were numerous continuities between the Díaz regime and the post-Revolutionary state.

Calles is best known for his hostility toward the Catholic Church. He expelled all priests from Sonora while he was governor. Later, as president, he provoked the Cristero Rebellion by his intemperate attacks on the Catholic clergy. The church—
state conflict dragged on for three years, resulting in tens of thousands of deaths and bringing a halt to the economic recovery, which Calles’s probusiness policies had stimulated. Buchenau acknowledges that the anti-Catholic crusade was part of a larger pattern of Liberal–Conservative battles going back to the middle of the nineteenth century, but he argues that Calles’s idiosyncratic, even “irrational” hostility toward the clergy raised the conflict to a new level of violence.

Calles’s finest hour came when the popular revolutionary leader Álvaro Obregón was assassinated just before he was to succeed Calles as president. Suspicion immediately fell on Calles. To defuse the crisis, he announced that he would give up the presidency after his term ended and leave the selection of his successor to Congress. He then created a political party that embraced all of the major revolutionary leaders and their factions, thus putting an end to the cycle of revolts that had roiled Mexican politics ever since the collapse of the Díaz regime.

During the three brief presidencies which followed his own, the so-called “Maximato,” Calles meddled in the affairs of government to forestall any actions that he considered too radical. Buchenau argues that during this time Calles was less powerful than many historians have supposed, only truly dominating the administration of the hapless Ortiz Rubio. The death of Calles’s second wife and his own declining health led him to spend most of his time outside of Mexico City and reduced his influence over people and events. He was finally and irrevocably detached from power by Lázaro Cárdenas, who outflanked his political machine by appealing directly to frustrated workers and peasants. Calles had the last laugh, however. The popular movements were soon incorporated into the ruling party, which enabled it to remain in power and stifle popular demands until the end of the century. As evidence, Buchenau records that President Carlos Salinas de Gortari, in an apt but tone-deaf reference, announced that his neoliberal presidency was modeled on that of Calles.

*Plutarco Elías Calles and the Mexican Revolution* fills a very important niche in the history of postrevolutionary Mexico. Buchenau portrays Calles as a leader who evoked little affection, but whose passion for order filled the political vacuum of postrevolutionary Mexico. And he credits Calles with the creation of Mexico’s secular founding myth: the idea of the “revolutionary family.” The ruling party that Calles inaugurated claimed to embody the ideals of all of the Revolution’s leaders—Francisco I. Madero, Venustiano Carranza, Pancho Villa, and Emiliano Zapata—despite the fact that in life they were often bitter enemies and despite the fact that in practice the ruling party largely ignored their most popular ideas. This excellent and well-researched biography leaves the impression that the noncharis-
matic Calles may have cast a longer shadow over Mexico’s history than any of these more heroic figures. Whether that is to Calles’s credit is another matter.

Calvin College

Daniel Miller


Popular and scholarly interest in Thomas Jefferson continues unabated, and that is a good thing. If, as he once declared, “the earth belongs to the living,” then historians ought to have no qualms about adding to an admittedly massive body of work on the man and his times. Certainly Francis D. Cogliano’s Thomas Jefferson: Reputation and Legacy evinces no such anxieties. Covering ground familiar to most historians of Jefferson, Cogliano nevertheless arrives at an instructive and comprehensive synthesis, both of his subject’s thoughts about history and of history’s own thoughts about the third president. This interplay of self-presentation and the verdict of Jefferson’s heirs is the central occupation of the book. The result is a compelling study in the dynamics of reputation, through which readers are invited to reexamine not only the Sage of Monticello, but their own shifting sensibilities.

Merrill Peterson’s The Jefferson Image in the American Mind inevitably casts its formidable shadow over Cogliano’s project. It does not, however, darken its insights, if only because the author chooses to focus rather more tightly on several of Jefferson’s writings and attend specifically to his treatment by generations of academic historians. At times this approach can feel like an extended historiography, but the overall impression is more positive. Convinced that, in Jefferson’s view, “the success of his reputation was ultimately tied to the success of the global republican movement,” the author persuasively traces how that reputation was forged and reforged through generations of conflicted American culture (4). To this end, Cogliano posits four stages characterizing the reception of Jefferson’s legacy: 1) from his death in 1826 to the Civil War, during which he served as a lightning rod over the question of slavery and states’ rights; 2) from the war until the 1920s, when he suffered a decline owing to his alleged complicity in bringing about that benighted episode; 3) Jefferson’s rehabilitation in the period from the Depression until the 1960s, when he was thought to embody the best and liberal values of freedom and the prospects of global democracy; and 4) the revisionist critique advanced by a generation of scholars during and after the 1960s, who brought to bear on Jefferson’s image disturbing
questions about his relationship to slavery, tactical partisanship, and disregard for political opposition.

In the main, Cogliano’s argument is sound, his conclusions just, and his evidence solid. Inevitably in a synthesis such as this, generalizations must be made, and some are bound to flatten out otherwise more complex considerations. Where the author is insistent on Jefferson’s commitment to the power and importance of history, for example, some readers may wonder whether he overstates the case: this most enlightened of the Founders could take a dim view of the heavy hand of the past; indeed he spent no little energy in freeing America from its unwelcome weight. Jefferson, curiously, was at once a stubborn and ambivalent thinker, and this reader had hoped for more in the way of acknowledging this trait. And a minor matter, but one perhaps worth noting: the prose can be a bit redundant at times, and sentences or parts of sentences are repeated verbatim at several points in the volume.

On the whole, however, this is a book worthy of its subject and its author’s own talents, and readers, no matter how well versed in the relevant scholarship, will find much to contemplate within its pages.

The Pennsylvania State University

Stephen Howard Browne

West from Appomattox: The Reconstruction of America after the Civil War. By Heather Cox Richardson. (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2007. Pp. xi, 396. $30.00.)

Contemporary historians of Reconstruction often look beyond the 1876 election and the removal of federal troops from the South to examine the impact of Reconstruction after the Civil War. Heather Cox Richardson broadens the concept of Reconstruction in her survey history of the United States from 1865 to the opening years of the twentieth century. The purpose of this book is to demonstrate that the tremendous changes that occurred throughout American society during the postwar decades represent the fundamental reconstruction of the nation. She recognizes that attempts to reform the Southern states and establish a legal basis for equal citizenship for African Americans were important, but emphasizes that they were part of the broader transformation of all regions of the country that helped to create a predominant middle-class ideology. In particular, Richardson stresses the values and mythologies of the American West and the bitter conflicts in the economic, political, and social arenas as forces that ultimately reunified the nation. They redefined American citizenship and the relationship between Americans and their government.
Richardson relies on published memoirs, diaries, fiction, and contemporary newspapers and periodicals as the basis for a vibrant, fast-moving, but often repetitious narrative. The experiences of “actual Americans” are used to explain and interpret the conflicts and issues of the time (6). The activities and ideas of Carl Schurz, Julia Ward Howe, Wade Hampton, Charles Goodnight, Nat Love, Andrew Carnegie, and Theodore Roosevelt exemplify the conflicts in race relations, free labor, women’s rights, industrialization, and the government’s role in meeting the needs of an increasingly complex society. The gradual formation in America of a middle-class ideology defined by self-reliance, individual responsibility, and equality of opportunity competed with government activism to help groups of citizens. Richardson emphasizes the constant drumbeat of protests against the influence of interest groups, particularly African Americans, Native Americans, suffragists, farmers, workers, immigrants, and big business, which, it was assumed, sought favors and assistance to the disadvantage of the hard-working majority. The developing middle class wanted the federal government to promote individualism, self-help, and egalitarianism, rather than trying to ensure equal opportunity for all. The Sherman Antitrust Act was one attempt to rein in the power of big business and ensure a better commercial environment. Even the federal government’s move to preserve large areas in the West as national parks was widely viewed as a way to stop big business from permanently destroying unique public lands. This same attitude, however, contributed to the federal government’s acquiescence with state and local laws denying African Americans both the right to vote and security from racial violence.

Historians will likely debate Richardson’s views on the influence of the American West on the formation of broad American values of freedom, the role of government, and the persistence of late-nineteenth-century values today. However, this author provides a provocative and succinct narrative for students of the post-Civil War development of the modern American society and worldview.

*The Ohio State University*  
David A. Lincove


This work is a creative attempt to rescue Reagan from both liberal critics and conservative ideologues that does not quite work. John Patrick Diggins regards Reagan as “one of the most inspiring political leaders in the second half of the twentieth century,” and ends the book with a coda that compares him to Abraham
Lincoln (xx). He claims that liberal historiography has been unfair to the president in its view of him as a lightweight. Yet he also suggests that Reagan was not so much a conservative as a classical liberal, a thinker in the tradition of Ralph Waldo Emerson and Thomas Paine. “American history has seen nothing like Reagan’s achievement over two centuries of unrelenting military conflict,” he declares (13). But his evidence does not always support his argument.

After staking out his overarching position in such glowing terms, Diggins provides a relatively standard treatment of Reagan’s early life and career. He has a careful eye for detail and includes such classic comments as the actor’s response to the query of how he intended to govern California. “I don’t know,” he said, “I’ve never played a governor” (116).

Some sections are better than others. The chapter on neoconservative intellectuals draws on Diggins’s strengths but shifts the focus away from Reagan. The chapter on “The Reagan Doctrine and the Third World” provides more detail than is necessary and sometimes becomes muddy. The chapter on “Politics, Economy, Society” acknowledges Reagan’s curious choice of Calvin Coolidge as a model and calls his racial policies “puzzling” (313). It also notes that in an age of “aristocratic affluence, Reagan’s domestic policies appeared almost mean” (334). With that kind of assessment, his overarching thesis seems less persuasive.

But the most effusive analysis revolves around Reagan’s role in ending the Cold War. The chapter “From Deterrence to Dialogue” is more fluid than earlier sections and highlights Reagan’s genuine commitment to peace and frustration with détente. It shows him shifting course as he “began to think for himself in his second term,” and sought to establish a personal connection with Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev that had been lacking before then (349). Diggins may go too far in seeing a fundamental shift in Reagan’s attitudes and may ascribe too much agency to Reagan himself, but he is on firm ground in his observation that Reagan understood he could work with Gorbachev in ways discounted by his advisers that ultimately brought about significant change.

In the end, Diggins goes over a good deal of familiar territory in the body of the book, and the evidence he amasses does not really underscore his contention that “Reagan was the great liberator of modern American history” (xvii). He shows us a man with a sunny disposition who had the ability to frame issues in ways people could understand, but is hardly persuasive in conveying his “greatness of soul” (430).

Miami University

Allan M. Winkler

In the early nineteenth century, Uriah Levy achieved the highest possible rank in the U.S. Navy despite being a Jew and surviving no less than six court-martial. He was an important figure in the abolition of that dreadful punishment, flogging. Outside of the navy, he saved Jefferson’s home, Monticello, for the nation.

For this new biography, Ira Dye, a retired naval officer, has done exhaustive research on the subject, combing through the available documents, including many records from outside the Navy Department. One principal source of information about Levy’s naval career is the findings of the inquiry conducted in 1857, when he challenged a decision that would have ended his career. He was restored to duty and was able to make his mark during his last years when he commanded a frigate in the Mediterranean and served as squadron commander, a post that earned him the titular rank of commodore.

The author endeavors to correct earlier writers who “simply repeated and further embellished often-incorrect anecdotes about his life” (2). He does not repeat, for example, the charming story that when the ten-year-old Levy ran away to sea in 1802, his mother made him promise to return in two years for his bar mitzvah, which he did. Dye says Levy signed on without his parents’ consent but cannot say that they would have prevented him had they known. He corrects the impression that when Levy was a British prisoner of war in 1813, he was confined at Dartmoor prison. Actually, as an officer he was sent “on parole” to live in the Devonshire town of Ashburton. Dye implies that during Levy’s fourteen months there he was able to learn some of the social graces that he did not get as a merchant sailor.

The author writes a fascinating book about Levy’s life, but he seems to de-emphasize the significance of Levy being Jewish. Levy’s difficult personality and his occasional outspoken comments as well as his rise through the ranks created a prejudice against him on the part of many officers. Nevertheless, the 1857 court of inquiry found him “morally, mentally, physically, and professionally fit” for duty (218). Dye writes about the known incidents of anti-Semitism that were reported through the courts-martial and inquiries. Levy himself claimed that “anti-Jewish prejudice was at the root of his problems” (215).

The unique element of Levy’s naval career is that he was a practicing Jew who kept his faith in a period when Jews had to strive to obtain equality in society. His naval career was interesting but not especially noteworthy, not more than the
accomplishments of many other senior officers whose names are today forgotten. For long periods he was not employed by the navy.

He wished to be remembered for the abolition of flogging, but there were many others who helped accomplish this. He saved Monticello for the nation, a major accomplishment in which his religion was irrelevant.

Yale University

Paul H. Silverstone

_Kansas in the Great Depression: Work Relief, the Dole, and Rehabilitation._ By Peter Fearon. (Columbia, Mo.: University of Missouri Press, 2007. Pp. xvi, 316. $44.95.)

The Great Depression’s impact on American society remains a topic of considerable historic interest and ideological controversy. The New Deal programs designed for that period of crisis, as well as those older institutions for relief aimed at helping those caught in the extreme depths of economic downturn, have become staples of attacks by those on either side of the political spectrum. Most of those who make the arguments, however, posit sharply divided political support and easily separated operations of two opposing systems.

Such is not the case in Peter Fearon’s _Kansas in the Great Depression_. The author shows how the state actually provided relief in all its bewildering complexity with overlapping political support and various agencies and institutions. Heavily statistical and painstakingly researched, the book is a model of thoroughness.

Does one state deserve such microscopic attention? Fearon says yes, because Kansas’s effort in organizing and dispensing federal work relief earned the recognition of national leaders, and state efforts down to 1936 showed that there were shifting political positions concerning the New Deal programs. As evidence of the latter, he cites the continued occupation of the office of the Kansas Emergency Relief Committee, the main agency to funnel federal relief into the state, by Republican John G. Stutz, and the support of several elements of the New Deal by Republican Governor Alf Landon prior to running for president.

If Kansas was a model state, then it exposed the weaknesses and inadequacies of all relief efforts, and Fearon does not hesitate to comment on them. He faults the federal government for its continued insistence on work relief, a policy reflecting an American view of the dole as pernicious, and one not shared by Britons. He finds that such reliance made the program too expensive and less comprehensive. He also says it failed to rehabilitate those enrolled, particularly in the Works Progress Administration, citing the fact that few participants qualified for jobs in the aircraft industry that sprang up during World War II.
On the actual operations of relief programs, Fearon recounts numerous examples of the duplication of agencies and efforts as well as cases of unfairness. He finds much of the latter reflecting structural prejudice against women and African Americans endemic in the larger society.

Fearon does credit the United States with making a significant effort to blunt the impact of hard times, comparing the 6.3 percent of the GNP spent on relief programs in 1938 with the 5.6 percent spent by Nazi Germany and the 5 percent spent by England. He also claims this did not depart from earlier efforts in a radical way by citing the earlier efforts of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation under President Hoover.

*Kansas in the Great Depression* is most useful for the many details it provides of the complex and often contradictory aspects of the relief system on the local level as it was confronted with diverse problems and almost overwhelming need.

*Ball State University*

Dwight W. Hoover

---


This book begins with an unusual introduction in which the author informs the reader of his German birth during World War II, his “neurotic and self-centered” mother, and his immigration to the United States before he gets to why he wrote this book (1). He writes, “I have always considered the university a friendly and civilized institution; but that institution, like most others in America, has been radically transformed and, in my opinion, seriously undermined by the events of the 1960s.” He found the “leaders” of student protests to be “shallow, narcissistic, uninspiring, and distinctly juvenile” (6). The reader can imagine what he has to say about hippies. As for the histories of that turbulent era, the author finds them “personally disappointing; they strike me as remarkably one-dimensional and politically biased. For this reason . . . I offer a different perspective on the 1960s” (7).

What he offers is not really so new. In 1971 William O’Neill condemned student radicals in his history of the era, *Coming Apart: An Informal History of America in the 1960s*. That theme continued during the 1980s with Peter Collier and David Horowitz’s *Destructive Generation: Second Thoughts About the Sixties* and in 2001 with Kenneth Heineman’s *Put Your Bodies upon the Wheels: Student Revolt in the 1960s*. Klaus P. Fischer’s interpretation, thus, is not new and fits into the historical school that Heineman simplistically labeled the “Bad 1960s.”
Fischer asks what were the causes of the upheavals of the era and lists a half-dozen reasons: fault lines in society, economic and demographic changes, racial and ethnic conflicts, and the war in Vietnam. The baby boomers get more scorn than usual; the greatest damage to the American society was because “seventy-six million pampered young people tried to break the generational ties that usually safeguard historical continuity. Their revolt was made possible by permissive parenting, affluent times, and excesses in the consumer and mass media culture” (19).

*America in White, Black and Gray* can be as much editorial as history. Throughout the book, Fischer brings himself into the text. “This author, too, would have probably gone to the ends of the earth for Kennedy in the 1960s if the charismatic president had asked him, but being much older now, he likes to believe that, knowing what his parents and grandparents in Germany did in following another charismatic leader into the abyss, he would have avoided blind allegiance to any putative hero” (105). At times, Fischer’s editorials are amusing; at other times they are distracting, and by the conclusion they are rants against the 1960s.

The book is based on secondary sources, and there are too many errors. The historian of the Vietnam War is not Richard Herring, but George, and it is false that the Vietcong slaughter of three thousand people at Hue in March 1968 was “not widely reported in the U.S. press, which was preoccupied with the American massacre at My Lai” (178, 198). In fact, Hue did appear and My Lai was not even reported until late 1969. Fischer’s notes and bibliography list no collections of unpublished primary documents, so the book is of little use to specialists. Yet, he has picked out many stimulating quotes from other books, and so if you do not mind the editorializing, then *America in White, Black and Gray* could be of interest to the general reader who is in search of the “Bad 1960s.”

*Texas A&M University*

Terry Anderson

---


The author of this book fills a gap in the growing literature of the “first emancipation” of enslaved African Americans in the late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century United States. David N. Gellman focuses primarily on public discourse leading to the New York legislature’s approval in 1799 of the gradual abolition of slavery. This law held that children born to enslaved mothers after 4
July 1799 would not be slaves; instead males would serve as bound servants until the age of twenty-eight and females until the age of twenty-five. New York followed Pennsylvania and New England states in drawing the slave era to a close, and preceded New Jersey by five years.

Although Gellman attributes the rather late adoption of gradual abolition to New York’s sizeable slave population, his analysis emphasizes public discussion and debates about slavery over economic interest or politics. The author’s most important sources are newspaper articles and other printed works including essays, memorials, sermons, speeches, poems; acts and journals of the New York legislature; and minutes and other records of the New York Manumission Society. Gellman provides a close analysis of public discourse on slavery, suggesting how ideas linking slavery to the Revolutionary cause helped to sustain and expand antislavery sentiment in the 1790s through public discussions of the Jay Treaty, revolution in St. Domingue, and the Alien and Sedition acts.

Gellman acknowledges the contributions of many New Yorkers to the emancipation debates, writing, “Public opinion about race, citizenship, and the public sphere shaped and reflected the strategies pursued by a variety of people with an interest in or influence over the future of slavery in New York. Slaves, slaveholders, humanitarian antislavery activists, and political officeholders played critical roles in the struggle for gradual abolition” (8). Citing the work of Shane White, Gellman notes that enslaved New Yorkers escaped in increasing numbers during the 1790s, many headed to New York City to find jobs and join a “substantial black community.” By running away, African Americans placed “stress on New York’s slave system” (160). Gellman also credits the New York Manumission Society with significant contributions to the abolitionist movement, including petitions, assistance with personal manumissions, and legal help to kidnapped slaves. In the New York Assembly, reapportionment gave more votes to supporters of gradual abolition, including delegates from New York City and recently settled northern and western counties.

Gellman provides a provocative analysis of the development of support for gradual abolition in New York. His last chapter discusses events leading to the passage of the 1817 law that promised freedom within a decade to all New York slaves. His epilogue looks briefly at New Yorkers of “second wave” abolitionism, including Frederick Douglass, whose 1852 speech in Rochester reminded white Americans that “This Fourth [of] July is yours, not mine. You may rejoice, I must mourn” (221). Gellman argues here, and throughout his study, for the power of public discussion: “Change, of course, depends as much or more on what people do as what they say. Yet if history is any guide, we will have to construct our world
out of liberating discourses or the globalization of human rights surely will continue to elude us” (223).

Lehigh University

Jean R. Soderlund

Women on the Civil War Battlefront. By Richard H. Hall. (Lawrence, Kans.: University Press of Kansas, 2006. Pp. x, 397. $34.95.)

A growing literature on women in the American Civil War traces the impact of that war on women and of women on the war. Much of this scholarship focuses on the domestic and volunteer front, but the experiences of women on the Civil War frontlines are now also receiving some attention. In this work, Richard H. Hall, an independent writer, updates and significantly expands his earlier work, Patriots in Disguise: Women Warriors of the Civil War (Charlottesville, Va.: University of Virginia Press, 1996).

Historian James McPherson estimates that approximately four hundred women fought in the war. Women like Rosetta Wakeman and Sarah Emma Edmunds, disguised as men, endured the full hardship of war. Most of these women were eventually discovered and discharged, although some served through the war and won honorable discharges and pensions. Wakeman, like so many other Civil War soldiers, died of dysentery during the Red River Campaign after having served undetected for two years with the 153rd New York State Volunteers. More surprising still, she remained undiscovered in death and was buried under her assumed name of Lyons Wakeman. Edmunds deserted after a year in the 2nd Michigan Volunteers to become a nurse and spy and did not reveal her military service until she applied for a pension several years after the war. In addition to serving in the armed forces, women also worked as spies—Belle Boyd, Rose O’Neal Greenhow, and Elizabeth Van Lew being the most famous.

With a few notable exceptions, many of these women remain anonymous. But the glimpses the reader gets of their lives add still further to the reader’s understanding of gender, class, race, and the social environment of the mid-nineteenth century. Hall demonstrates that, indeed, thousands of women participated in various frontline capacities as soldiers and spies, as well as saboteurs, smugglers, and scouts.

Hall has done extensive research to uncover as many stories as possible about the women who served in the war, and has included an honor roll with short biographies on each of the women he has identified. Indeed, because he does not attempt to situate his own work within the context of other scholarship on women in either this war or other military conflicts, or to include any theoretical analysis,
the value of the book comes from the accumulation of these stories of women who served their country on the frontlines of the American Civil War.

Although not as methodologically sophisticated as much of the recent scholarship on women and the Civil War, and without a clear narrative thread, Hall has nonetheless provided a useful service in collecting and cataloguing as much of the information on women participants as possible. His book will serve as an important and helpful starting point for the increasing number of scholars wanting to know more about these remarkable women.

Dartmouth College

Sheila Culbert


There are several questions that must haunt the imagination of most Lincoln scholars at one time or another. What if the Republican convention in 1860 had done the predictable thing and nominated a nationally prominent figure for the presidency, such as William Seward or Edward Bates? What would we then know of Abraham Lincoln? Is Lincoln’s place in history dependent on a fluke?

In Lincoln’s Rise to the Presidency, William C. Harris shows that the convention’s choice of Lincoln, though surprising, was no fluke: it was based on a well-grounded assessment of the Illinoisan’s political strengths—as well as the weaknesses of his rivals. Lincoln was judged the most electable of the candidates, the most acceptable to potential Republican voters of all antecedents across all regions of the North. Lincoln’s background was unimpeachable: a popular figure in the West, he was untainted, either by nativism or by antislavery radicalism. As such, Lincoln was able to gain the endorsement of both disaffected antislavery Democrats and conservative former Whigs.

Harris characterizes Lincoln’s own stance as broadly conservative—a characterization that, in view of the Southern reaction to his electoral victory in 1860, might seem to require a defense. Having made this point in the introduction, however, Harris refrains from burdening his narrative with argument. Instead, he shows how Lincoln’s political career evolved with the developing circumstances of his state and the country in the decades preceding his rise to national prominence.

A disadvantage perhaps inseparable from the advantages of Harris’s approach is that he gives relatively little attention to Lincoln’s speeches. The 1838 Lyceum speech, for example, is covered in less than two pages, although it sheds considerable light on Lincoln’s views on slavery during a period when they are otherwise less than clear. (Harris reports, without comment, Lincoln’s legal work for Robert
Matson, a Kentucky slaveholder who in 1847 sued in an Illinois court to recover his slave property.) Although hardly a pressing issue in American politics in the 1830s and 1840s, slavery, Lincoln argued, presented a danger to the longer-term survival of the American polity by its encouragement of lawlessness. 

Harris’s account of the critical years following the repeal of the Missouri Compromise leaves the impression that what distinguished Lincoln from the antislavery radicals was above all his willingness to make strategic concessions to negrophobic public opinion for the sake of defeating the Democrats: “the political and, paradoxically, moral stakes were too high” to do otherwise (131). But “moral stakes” suggests that Lincoln’s differences with the radicals went deeper than strategy. More attention to Lincoln’s words might have clarified these differences. 

As Harris shows, Lincoln was indeed conservative in his appeal from the views of his contemporaries back to the views of the Founders. The Founders, however, were not conservatives at all, at least in the ordinary sense: “Though Lincoln’s approach to resisting slavery was fundamentally conservative, he expected that . . . the republic would again be placed on the progressive road of freedom and equality that the Founders had envisioned for it” (161, emphasis added). Lincoln’s success, both before and after 1860, lay in the ability to combine conservatism with progressivism. Harris’s work—especially when supplemented by study of Lincoln’s speeches—reveals the wisdom of the Republicans’ choice, and does so in a manner accessible to a broad readership.

Bowdoin College

Thomas E. Schneider


This book is a collection of five short essays describing civilian activities—from keeping diaries to collecting scrap iron—from 1865 to 1973, during different wars. Included are the Western Frontier Indian Wars, World War I, World War II, the Cold War, and the War in Vietnam. Each essay, written by a different scholar, will challenge readers to make their own generalizations about American behavior during times of hostility and stress. What may be particularly valuable to U.S. history teachers is the chronology of principal events printed as an introduction, citing specific Indian raids, military atrocities, and expedient laws that shaped activities on the home front during each of these periods. Although decisions like
the Marshall Plan or the ousting of Premier Kruschev may seem to have little impact on small-town America, people need to think more about how such happenings contribute to a more complex definition of American life.

The Indian Wars described in Susan Badger Doyle’s essay have been neglected as “modern.” Brought to life in a number of novels and movies (such as *Bury My Heart at Wounded Knee*), these confrontations belong with a long tradition of struggle for Native American lands. What is especially useful here is a table surveying all the Indian raids, killings, and captivities from 1865 to 1890, the date Doyle identifies with whites being able to settle the West without fear. It may be hard for students, who have been taught to sympathize with Native Americans forced on to reservations, to appreciate the courage and success of these late pioneers.

Michael Neiberg, author of nine books specializing in World War I and the global dimensions of history, has added a comprehensive essay on civilian life during that conflict. He underlines the contributions of women that led to the acceptance of women’s suffrage in 1920. And, he reminds readers that the period’s population exodus from farm to city included the “great migration” of African Americans who left the South in droves. The number of blacks in Chicago increased from 44,000 to 109,000 during the war years. Neiberg discusses the importance of movies as a propaganda tool, emphasizing the fierce nationalism that characterized patriotism on the home front at a time when people burned German books and spied on immigrant neighbors as part of a new Sedition Act. Making the world safe for democracy, as Neiberg demonstrates, also meant making taxes an important part of American life.

Particularly engaging is Judy Barrett Liftoff’s essay on World War II. She makes good use of the personal letters she has collected to enrich the social dimensions of this war. As she notes the injustice of the moment—the racial tensions and the Japanese internments—she also manages to convey the hope and human possibility that emerged during the “good war.”

The Cold War, as described by Jon Timothy Kelly, ended whatever unity characterized the 1940s. Americans again confronted fear and mistrusted neighbors. More might be said, though, about cultural creativity (Arthur Miller, Jack Kerouac, etc.) in this decade of military-industrial awareness.

James Landers’s concluding essay on Vietnam and American life emphasizes technology and media, as well as education, which proved so important in recent wars. Perhaps readers will realize from these collected statements how much government shapes home-front activities in wartime, even as it makes policies and weapons.
During the past decades, scholarly interest in histories of advertising and consumption has peaked. Most studies, however, have focused on the period before and, to a lesser degree, immediately after the Second World War. Thus, Cynthia Lee Henthorn’s well-written and extensively illustrated book about “American commercial propaganda” from 1939–1959 fills an important gap in the emerging historical narrative (4).

Drawing on a wealth of sources, including an impressive number of institutional advertisements, Henthorn explores how corporations promoted a strong consumer ethos during the war and beyond. She shows how “the technological progress of World War II became attached to social meanings of hygiene, leisure, and the ideal middle-class type” and how contemporary advertisements reflected these “symbols of progress” (15).

In the first part of her book, Henthorn explores the mobilization period from 1939–1943. She discusses the ideological struggle between Roosevelt’s New Deal and a corporate vision of “The American Way” and how the industry’s fears of losing ground were reflected in the visual idioms of the day. Manufacturers demonstrated their patriotism by announcing the transformation of consumer commodities into war-related products. Stressing the superiority of American consumer society, advertisements showed how products that had been used to clean and cleanse during the 1930s could serve by “purging the world of the Axis mess” (60).

Advertising that stressed hygiene and streamlining as a war-winning strategy continued as American businesses began their postwar planning. Hoping to keep their brand names during a time when few consumer products entered the market, corporations used their advertising, which stayed tax deductible for the war’s duration, to impress on consumers that products and technology presently used for the war effort would translate into new and improved consumer commodities once the war had ended. In the second part of the book, Henthorn shows how preparation for war and preparation for peace were “paralleled as two sides of the same evolutionary trajectory” (104). Through imagery and text, ads told how materials and new technology developed during the war would translate into
clean and orderly postwar environments, especially on the domestic front. However, as Henthorn poignantly points out, the fruits of postwar victory were reserved for white Americans only.

In spite of hype, most advertisers failed to deliver on their promise of personal airplanes and automated kitchens. Determined to absorb returning soldiers into the workforce, get war bond savings into circulation, and avoid a postwar economic depression, manufacturers prioritized their prewar product lines instead of wasting time on their retooling. This, however, did not deter the advertising rhetoric, and Henthorn spends the last part of her book showing how postwar images of American domesticity and hygienic superiority were used as a bulwark against the communist threat.

Although the book has considerable merits, there are times when the author takes a focus that is too narrow. The ongoing interactions between the government and the advertising community through the tenure of the (War) Advertising Council receive short treatment, as do consumers’ negotiations with wartime advertising. This, however, should not detract from the importance of a book that the reviewer predicts will find an interested audience among historians, sociologists, and communication scholars.

University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

Inger L. Stole


The quest for economic justice was basic to Martin Luther King Jr.’s mission. Although significant references to King’s economic philosophy and opposition to economic injustice can be found in numerous books and articles, no scholar has explored these issues as perceptively and extensively as Thomas F. Jackson. Jackson treats King as a champion for the poor and exploited, while also highlighting the sheer complexity and magnitude of his vision of economic democracy.

Jackson’s central argument is that King’s public ministry, extending from the Montgomery Bus Boycott [1955–1956] to the Memphis Sanitation Strike [1968], intersected black demands for freedom with global aspirations for political and economic equality. This thesis, brilliantly advanced, underscores the interrelationship between national and international concerns, which, despite claims to the contrary, always figured prominently in King’s consciousness and activities.

Several important points are developed by Jackson. First, he shows how King’s vision of economic justice emerged out of both his intellectual pilgrimage and his
early experiences in the black South. King’s exposure to the social gospel, Gandhian philosophy, left New Deal liberalism, and other intellectual sources is acknowledged, and so is his early sense of the interconnections between racial injustice and economic injustice. Unlike some scholars, Jackson respectfully considers both King’s experiential/cultural sources and his academic/intellectual sources.

Second, Jackson challenges the claim that King became radicalized only during the last three years of his life [1965–1968], particularly in terms of his assault on economic injustice. The contention is that King, from the time of the Montgomery protest, was consistently a radical concerned about both the national political economy and economic justice issues worldwide. The point is valid because King, from the beginning of his organized social protest in Montgomery, critiqued capitalism, classism, corporate greed, unfair wages, and other problems that caused glaring economic disparities and prevented true democracy.

Third, Jackson carefully explains how the failures of President Lyndon B. Johnson’s war on poverty in the 1960s coalesced in King’s thinking with America’s misadventure in Vietnam and imperialistic ventures abroad. As Jackson points out, these developments compelled King to turn to nonviolent sabotage, mass civil disobedience, and other more militant protest methods. This discussion is essential for understanding why ruling elites ultimately conspired to eliminate King.

Finally, King’s effort to unite Americans across racial and class lines in a major Poor People’s Campaign is discussed. King was assassinated in the planning stages of the campaign, but Jackson concludes nonetheless that his final effort should remain an inspiration for those struggling to end poverty and racism today. A more sensitive treatment of King’s legacy and its implications for advancing economic democracy does not exist.

Academics, ecclesiastics, social activists, and everyone concerned about the continuing plight of the poor can benefit from Jackson’s insightful, provocative, and well-written work.

Vanderbilt University

Lewis V. Baldwin


There is much in the pseudoliterary marketplace that both defends and opposes the 2003 decision of the George W. Bush administration to go to war against Iraq. From Michael Moore to Ann Coulter, both sides have their fair share of nonsensical, often dangerous polemic. It was thus with pleasure that this reviewer saw that Robert G. Kaufman, perhaps the intellectual Right’s leading scholarly
voice, has penned a brief work setting out the case in favor of Bush’s doctrine of preemptive force. Readers have come to expect from Kaufman, author of a biography of Henry “Scoop” Jackson and a ghost writer for Richard Nixon, reasoned, passionate argument. On both scores, his In Defense of the Bush Doctrine does not disappoint.

The title is Kaufman’s thesis. Arguing that “the mark of prudence is the capacity to discern when changing times require different measures to achieve the same goals,” Kauffman offers a spirited defense of Bush’s policy, which demands an option for regime change through preemptive force when faced with a tyrannical foe that can do damage to the United States (99). Kauffman defends Bush by articulating a foreign policy of (Kaufman’s term) “Moral Democratic Realism”—that the United States, with its superior political philosophies grounded in the Judaeo-Christian ethic, should feel no compunction against protecting its own self-interest by acting in a unilateral manner to eradicate any potential threat from a nation of inferior values. Thus, to Kaufman, Bush’s decision to invade Iraq represents a moral imperative, and Kaufman predicts that the United States will ultimately invade Iran for the same reasons.

There are many opponents to the Bush Doctrine, and Kaufman takes them on one by one. In successive chapters, he slaps at the anti-Bush arguments of Pat Buchanan, A. J. P. Taylor, Stephen M. Walt, Brent Scowcroft, the United Nations, NATO (because France is still a member), Jimmy Carter (special bile here), John Kerry, and Bill Clinton. He claims Thomas Aquinas, George Washington (in a fascinating revisionist analysis of the Farewell Address), Theodore Roosevelt, Harry Truman, and Pope John II to be in his corner.

Supporters of Bush will cheer Kaufman, as his logic is strong, his prose passionate, and his quotes well chosen. Yet for many, this reviewer included, he is ultimately unconvincing, as there are too many areas where Kaufman’s argument or evidence must be challenged. To cite but a few: Kaufman gives NSC-68 [1950] high marks for focusing Cold War foreign policy against the Soviet Union, but neglects to remind his reader of the debilitating arms race that the directive initiated—an arms race without which readers might not need the topic of this book. He undersells the United States’ failure in Vietnam in one dismissive sentence (89). It is also a bit absurd for Kaufman to give William F. Buckley and the National Review credit for “shift[ing] the center of gravity of the Republican Party to the [S]outh and West.” Although his argument that Reagan was the “indispensable” precursor to the development of the Bush Doctrine has merit, he downplays the fact that Reagan yanked troops out of Lebanon after the 1983 barracks bombing with a speed that shocked even his advisors, who thought the
Gipper would dig in for the type of regime change that Kaufman claims Reagan supported (117). Yet these points pale when compared to this reviewer’s disagreement with those like Kaufman who argue that the United States has the market cornered on morality, as if God has blessed this nation and few others.

Nevertheless, In Defense of the Bush Doctrine comes from this reviewer highly recommended. He devoured this fascinating book in one sitting. Kaufman is passionate without being polemical, and is quite evenhanded, consistently pointing out arguments and examples that disagree with his point of view. He is solidly grounded in the historical background of his subject and explains that background in a manner that is completely accessible to his reader. Moreover, the reviewer was impressed with the author’s epilogue, which, without backing one iota off his argument that Bush was correct in invading Iraq, nevertheless argues that the situation in Iraq, which has no clear measure of victory or means to achieve it, will lead to defeat unless the “administration decides to stay and win” (153). This is a provocative book written by a first-rate mind; that the reviewer did battle with it is a tribute to the author’s power of argument; that the reviewer was left unconvinced does not diminish the book’s value.

Cazenovia College
John Robert Greene


This study is an important contribution to the literature on both the ACLU and twentieth-century U.S. politics. Judy Kutulas has extensively researched accessible primary sources (the papers of key ACLU leaders, the ACLU, and FBI records) and the relevant secondary literature. In her tightly reasoned monograph, Kutulas focuses on the crucial decades of 1930–1960, years marked by the institutionalization of the organization and its leaders’ responses—at times controversial and at times compromising—to the critical developments of the New Deal, World War II, and the early Cold War. Her stated purpose is to examine the “ACLU’s role in making civil liberties a pivotal liberal value and consider the costs of the organization’s journey from the radical fringe to the liberal mainstream” (2). Kutulas achieves this goal by tracing the ACLU’s evolution from a numerically small New York-based organization to a national mass-based membership organization with nationwide affiliates that commanded broad influence.

In alternating chapters on the actions of the national organization and state affiliates, she examines how the national leadership’s responses to the major civil
liberties issues that arose during these decades at times compromised its principles and integrity. In the process, it affected the relationship between the national Board of Directors and headquarters staff with local and state affiliates. The national leadership’s timidity and occasional quest for respectability, as well as the militant anticommunism of some of its key leaders, undercut its role as defender of civil liberties while creating morale problems and tensions between the national leadership and local and state affiliates. These ranged from the responses of the national directors to World War II Japanese internment and early Cold War federal employee loyalty programs to the covert relationship between the staff members of the ACLU’s Washington office and senior FBI officials during the Cold War years. The organization’s growth (in membership and state affiliates) combined with the controversies engendered by the national leadership’s compromising stands and resistance to demands by state affiliates for a voice in shaping policy led, Kutulas argues, to a more democratic, national, and mass-based organization that during the 1960s reaffirmed liberal principles. These developments were triggered as well by that decade’s twin developments in the rise of the civil rights movement and anti-Vietnam War dissent. Kutulas’s judicious and insightful study extends the reader’s understanding of the status of civil liberties and the politics of the World War II and Cold War eras. It offers a cautionary perspective that is particularly timely for post–9/11 America.

Marquette University

Athan Theoharis


Nearly thirty years ago, as a nascent historian, this reviewer absorbed every word of William J. Cooper’s work, The South and the Politics of Slavery, 1828–1856. Cooper’s thesis, that slavery dominated Southern antebellum politics, Democrat and Whig alike, continues to influence this reviewer’s thinking. So it was with great interest that he read Matthew Mason’s Slavery and Politics in the Early American Republic, wondering if it was something of a prequel to Cooper.

Mason challenges the notion that slavery held little, if any, political sway in the nation prior to the Missouri Crisis of 1819–1821. Using extensive primary resources, he carefully makes the case that slavery and politics were intertwined in early American life, even during the War for Independence. He goes so far as to state that there was never a time between the Revolution and the Civil War in which slavery went uncontested between North and South.
Following the Revolution, the South defended slavery as a necessary evil rather than embrace it as a positive good, in part because of the fact that many still struggled with the moral and practical dilemmas that slavery posed. Most Northerners acquiesced to slavery’s expansion because they believed it was an economic necessity in the Deep South. Although some pushed for abolition in their respective states, few were willing to interfere with the institution beyond their state boundaries. Slavery was, at this point, a sectional issue, not a national one.

It was during the early Republic period that Mason sees partisan national politics and the issue of slavery becoming intertwined. During the Southern-dominated Republican ascendancy, Federalists used slavery as a means of attacking Jeffersonians. Some New England Federalist leaders even claimed that slavery’s sinfulness was the primary reason that another war with Great Britain was fought. Mason aptly demonstrates that the demise of the Federalist Party did not lessen Northern attacks on slavery. In this, he makes very effective use of an 1817 book, A Portrait of Domestic Slavery, by abolitionist Jesse Torrey. But it was the Missouri Crisis that truly clarified the position of the two sections on the issue of slavery and set the stage for increasing agitation and extremism on both sides, eventually leading to civil war.

This book has the unmistakable fingerprint of Ira Berlin, and the profession should look forward to more from Mason. His work is thought-provoking and backed by exhaustive documentation. He presents a compelling story of the change in the Northern attitude on slavery during the early Republic, from defending itself against the peculiar institution to agitating for its abolition. Inevitably, then, the South also changed its ideology as Southern leaders threw off the last vestiges of nationalism and engulfed themselves in the doctrine of states’ rights and strict constructionism. Mason’s first book does an excellent job of setting the stage for the disastrous decade of the 1850s, noting that the sectional schism began decades earlier, during the early Republic. In this regard, it is a worthy prequel to William Cooper.

The College of the Ozarks

C. David Dalton


This ambitious work examines economic, political, and social trends in the United States in the late twentieth century. The period from 1973 to 2001, this author contends, should be viewed as a “second Gilded Age” because its defining
features—economic elitism and social conservatism with a populist flavor—mirrored the central characteristics of the late 1800s.

Although Michael McHugh gives most of his attention to the era from 1973 to 2001, he sets up that analysis by looking at two earlier periods. He begins with a brief look at the first Gilded Age. McHugh’s main themes will be familiar to anyone who has studied or taught this period—economic polarization, a celebration of the market, nativism, racism, and an evangelical Protestantism that sought social control. He then surveys the era from 1945 to 1973, which he terms the “Historical Exception Period” (58). These years, he argues, were characterized by the growth of the welfare state, increased power of unions, income gains for all classes, and a relatively strong political consensus in both major parties on the need for government to mitigate the worst effects of capitalism.

This period, McHugh insists, stands in sharp contrast to what followed. The late twentieth century, he maintains, was marked by sharply increased polarization in income and wealth, stagnant wages and longer work hours for most Americans, and conservative political leaders who glorified the private sector. This period was also notable for an emphasis on individualistic explanations for crime and a turn toward tougher punishment of criminals, revived racism against African Americans, a growing anti-immigrant backlash, and a burgeoning evangelical Protestantism that went on a “morality offensive” (233).

McHugh attempts to situate this era into a larger analytical framework. “Gilded Ages are the norm in U.S. history, the default setting, given the relative brevity of liberal reform periods,” he maintains (2). In this regard, he falls into line with an emerging historiographical trend that portrays the middle of the twentieth century as a brief time of reform rather than a harbinger of an expanding liberal or social democratic order. More problematic is the overly pessimistic view McHugh offers of the 1973–2001 era. The economic problems, he notes, are indeed substantial, but he undervalues the improved standard of living that most Americans have experienced. Evangelical Protestants are vocal influential members of the Republican Party, but their impact on the broader culture is more limited. For McHugh, both Gilded Ages are times when “the elite manipulates various backlash and right-wing populist movements in its own interest” (5). Such a view understates the sincere concerns that many middle- and working-class Americans have about social and moral issues, especially the perceived influence of popular culture on youth. Critical of a Democratic Party that he feels offers tepid opposition to the Republicans, especially on economic matters, McHugh yearns for a class-based politics but remains doubtful that a new era of economic reform is imminent.
This work of synthesis will be of interest to teachers looking for a broad overview of the late twentieth century, and scholars of this period will profit from engaging with his interpretative framework.

Virginia Commonwealth University

Timothy N. Thurber


People rather take for granted today the existence of a reliable electricity supply. And they know that the alternating current supply received through the socket in the wall must sometimes be converted to direct current in order to run much of the electronics found in a modern home or office on which we write book reviews and watch news and entertainment. People have largely forgotten that the AC system used to supply our needs was established only after a bitter contest over standards, AC versus DC, and this excellent author provides a reminder as entertaining as it is valuable.

The battle between George Westinghouse, champion of AC, and Thomas Edison, champion of DC, was (as can be imagined) a clash of the titans of invention and industrial innovation. What is less expected, and which Tom McNichol presents in such a lively manner, is the range of underhanded actions and acts of skulduggery employed (mostly by the Edison camp, though not always by Edison himself). These days we are more used to competitors using fair and foul means to try to extract some advantage over competitors, and standards are part of the armory of competition that yield endless examples. The European Union provides some of the more colorful examples, such as standards specifying the necessary curvature of cucumbers (which advantage the Netherlands’ horticultural industry), or those specifying the size of sieve through which sauces must pass to avoid differential tariffs on imported vegetables (the latter adopted in the face of fears that salsa-style sauces were a little too like vegetables for comfort). The selection of a standard for electricity systems promised an enormous competitive advantage for either Westinghouse or Edison.

Unfortunately for him, Edison backed the wrong horse, because his preferred DC was technically inferior. Direct current would have necessitated the construction of numerous neighborhood generating stations and many of the advantages of large-scale centralized generating stations, which became a feature of electrification during the last century, would have been lost. In fact, it was not a horse, but dogs and an elephant that featured in the contest as unfortunate casualties of the attempts by Harold Brown, with at least the tacit approval of Edison, to
demonstrate the dangers of AC current. Brown performed all manner of inhumane “experiments” on dogs and Topsy, a rogue Coney Island elephant, undeterred by the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, in order to prove that AC constituted far too great a risk. Even Brown’s success in having the State of New York adopt AC as the basis for its introduction of the electric chair could not overcome the superiority of AC.

In this highly entertaining book, McNichol reminds readers that science and research ethics have come a long way, that great men are sometimes wrong, and that putative risks are often used by industry to harm competitors’ products. This is an excellent book. The reviewer’s only minor complaint is the claim that this was the first standards war: the Australian colonial railways had already by this time discovered the advantages of incompatible railway gauges as a means of preventing interstate commerce.

University of Tasmania

Aynsley Kellow


In this brief but thoughtful study, the author asserts that John Witherspoon, the only clergyman to sign the Declaration of Independence, has been overlooked as an important founder of the American republic. Indeed, “among the founders,” Morrison argues, “there was no better representative of the intertwining of religion and politics than Witherspoon” (19). And perhaps more than any other founder, he embodied all of the major intellectual movements behind the establishing of the republic.

Jeffry H. Morrison’s book is not a full-length biography. It is an analysis of Witherspoon’s political thought from his arrival in America in 1768 when he became the president of the College of New Jersey to his role in supporting the Constitution in 1787. The charismatic Witherspoon, who came from a long line of distinguished reform ministers in Scotland, combined careers as Presbyterian pastor, college president, and politician. He was a well-rounded man of the American Enlightenment, who preached influential sermons while writing and lecturing on moral philosophy and political economy. According to Morrison, he provided the first systematic treatment of moral philosophy in American education. Moreover, he served periodically in the New Jersey colonial and state legislatures [1774–1789], in the Continental and Confederation Congresses [1776–1782], and in the New Jersey ratifying convention of 1787. His political
and pastoral careers made him “arguably the leading figure in New Jersey politics and religion during the founding era” (98).

Morrison demonstrates that Witherspoon was influenced by Lockean liberalism, classical republicanism, Protestant Christianity’s resistance theory, and the Scottish Enlightenment’s moral and common sense philosophies. In particular, Witherspoon believed that morality and virtue could be promoted through the development of the God-given moral sense. But he also believed that Christian ethics were critical for maintaining individual liberty and for sustaining the republic. “Witherspoon subscribed to a sort of theological-political creed in which there could be no civic happiness without holiness” (43).

As the president of the College of New Jersey, Witherspoon had the opportunity to spread these ideas to future leaders of the country. Among his students were five delegates to the Constitutional Convention, one U.S. president (James Madison), one U.S. vice president (Aaron Burr), seventy-seven members of the U.S. Congress, three U.S. Supreme Court justices, and numerous other national and state officeholders. Indeed, Morrison argues that the College of New Jersey under Witherspoon’s leadership was a de facto national university, and that his “influence on early American political thought (and practice) is difficult to overestimate” (48). Morrison’s lack of evidence, however, suggests that he exaggerates Witherspoon’s part in shaping the worldview of these future officeholders.

Yet Witherspoon was a distinguished political and intellectual leader. So why has he not been recognized as an important founding father? Morrison’s most persuasive explanation is the dearth of personal papers, which has limited scholarly interest in Witherspoon’s career. But Morrison’s very useful analysis of Witherspoon’s political thought is a significant start toward a better understanding of his impact on Revolutionary America.

Baldwin-Wallace College

Steven E. Siry


This author’s lively and celebratory biography of Samuel Adams will likely appeal to a popular audience. Drawing heavily from nineteenth-century biographies by Adams’s great grandson, William Vincent Wells, and by James K. Hosmer, Mark Puls portrays the “Father of the American Revolution” more heroically than most recent historians have done. Puls’s Adams sets his mind very early to American independence. By 1743, he begins to contemplate a break from Great Britain; by 1764, he schemes “to defy a king and parliament, and split an empire”; and by
1768, he makes independence “his life’s mission” (27, 189, 209). Contrast Puls with Revolutionary historian Pauline Maier, who asserts that Adams did not predict independence until the late 1760s and did not advocate it until 1775.¹

Puls’s Adams marches at the vanguard of American resistance, and at times, it seems, he marches alone. He is the first to speak out against the Sugar Act, the first to advise a boycott against Great Britain, the first to propose intercolonial committees of correspondence, and the first to call for an American congress. More remarkably still, this favorite son of Massachusetts, who had never left home before setting out for Philadelphia at the age of fifty-two, developed, in spite of his fierce provincial loyalties, a far-reaching and apparently compelling vision of American nationhood. As early as 1769, Adams had “united the disparate colonies along a harmonious theme of individual rights and a collective consciousness ardently fond of liberty” (96). This interpretation is problematic, not only because it exaggerates Adams’s leadership, but also because it underestimates conflict within and among the various colonies, whose political and economic interests continued to diverge long after they had united in opposition to Great Britain.

In this biography, Adams emerges as a pure democrat, equally committed to liberty, popular sovereignty, and the rule of law. In the statehouse, Adams was a great builder of consensus. His success owes not to any parliamentary sleight of hand, but rather to the force of his ideas. In the streets, Adams was a man of the people, but not a man of the mob. Puls recounts the story of a Boston innkeeper who alleged that, amidst the Liberty Riots of 1768, Adams urged his fellow townsfolk to take arms against crown officials; Puls also credits Adams with organizing the so-called Boston Tea Party. But aside from these episodes, the author distances Adams from the tarring-and-feathering crowd. Certainly no one can question Puls’s depiction of Adams as a champion of liberty, but even lay readers may balk at the author’s efforts to trace the lineage of Mahatma Gandhi’s and Martin Luther King Jr.’s nonviolent resistance campaigns back to the “Grand Incendiary.”

These interpretive criticisms aside, Puls has written a crisp and well-paced narrative, augmented by a very useful dramatis personae and a nine-page photo section of engaging black-and-white images, including a charming photograph of Samuel Adams’s christening blanket from the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston. General readers fond of the “brace of Adams”—Samuel, John, and more recently, Abigail—will find much to enjoy here.

University of Arizona

Benjamin H. Irvin


The focal point of this book accentuates Marcus Garvey’s Universal Negro Improvement Association (UNIA), its supporters in the rural southern United States, and the intensification of Garveyism and African American thought during the 1920s. Mary G. Rolinson, centralizing her arguments within the context of black thought in the South during the era prior to the Garvey movement and the post-1954 civil rights and black nationalist movements, provides an enriching examination of the experiences, characteristics, circumstances, and appeal of the UNIA that not only presents “a clear picture of who the American Garveyites were but also a deeper understanding of the evolution of Garveyism” (3).

Rolinson analyzes distinct features of Garveyism—the acceptance of the UNIA by black people in the South, when and how the UNIA spread in the South, and the idea of African redemption as the long-term solution to the Negro problem in the United States—to address her principal lines of inquiry: how “Garveyism remained so popular despite its controversial tactical and rhetorical adjustments” and how Garveyism became “a catalyst to movements that followed the UNIA’s heyday” (7). These questions are important and go to the heart of why Rolinson chose the UNIA in the rural South as the foundation for her study. She reasons, throughout the book, that emphasizing the growth and development of Garveyism in the rural, black South during the 1920s not only challenges much of the historiography on Garvey, but also constructs a new platform to view the wide-ranging influence of grassroots activism.

Rolinson begins the exploration of her primary argument by highlighting the foundations of black thought in the rural South (emigration, racial pride, self-defense, self-reliance, and economic nationalism) prior to the Garvey movement. These ideas, instilled in the South by men like Booker T. Washington and bishop Henry McNeal Turner, were embraced by the charismatic Garvey and disseminated by UNIA affiliates, and its journal Negro World, primarily (but not limited to) to black tenant farmers, sharecroppers, and agricultural wage laborers in the southern states of Georgia, Mississippi, and Arkansas.

In two especially strong sections that reflect the continuity of Rolinson’s organization, there are well-documented and enlightening appraisals of the editors of Negro World and the wide appeal of the Garvey movement. Because Garvey made few personal appearances in the South, the editors of Negro World, including John Edward Bruce and the opinionated Timothy Thomas Fortune, “helped
to define the editorial content of the paper during its most crucial years” (78). Indeed, it was the editorial organization of the paper that at least partly accounted for the sustained growth and appeal of the movement, especially during and after Garvey’s imprisonment.

On the whole, Rolinson’s largely intellectual history is a success. The book is technically solid, with clear writing and organization, and would be ideal for classroom use with undergraduates. Drawing from an array of sources, from original manuscript collections, newspapers archives, and census reports, Rolinson nicely balances more general social history with well-timed accounts from inside and outside the UNIA.

*University of North Carolina, Wilmington*  
Glen Anthony Harris


For the last several decades, most of the best work on the early American Republic has emphasized social and cultural history with a good deal of neglect of political and economic history. But recently a few scholars have turned toward taking a renewed interest in the political economy of this formative era. In this work, Andrew M. Schocket makes an important contribution by studying the origins of the most significant economic institution of the late-nineteenth through the twenty-first century: the corporation. To get some depth on this rather complex subject, the author examines the role the corporation played in Philadelphia, the largest urban center in early America.

Schocket concludes that the economic elite in the city used their control over these new instruments to concentrate economic power into their own hands, thus largely negating the democratic reforms generated by the American Revolution. He argues that students of the postrevolutionary era have overestimated the existence of egalitarianism in American society. Schocket views corporations as important to the increasing class distinctions between wealthy and poor, but he does concede that the middle class also grew larger.

To get at the founding of the first corporations, Schocket traces them back to England and the readings done by Philadelphians such as Robert Morris, Thomas Willing, and James Wilson in English writings. These men and their descendants used this knowledge to create early corporations in banking and in internal improvements. Before 1776 Britain granted no corporate charters except to the City of Philadelphia; afterwards, the Pennsylvania legislature
only slowly began to issue charters to the Bank of North America and to the Philadelphia Bank.

Two of the most interesting chapters of *Founding Corporate Power* deal with the Philadelphia Waterworks and the Schuylkill Navigation Company. The Waterworks brought fresh water from the Schuylkill River and distributed it throughout Philadelphia County. Owned by the City of Philadelphia, and one of the most creative and important public utility projects in the early nineteenth century, the Waterworks revolutionized how municipal governments borrowed money and how they paid off debts. The utility, besides providing water for the citizens of Philadelphia, proved quite beneficial for the elite who made money from bonds issued by the city. Incorporation of the Navigation Company not only opened the path for the transportation of coal and other minerals down the river, but also allowed the business leaders of the city to tap the wealth of the hinterland and turned the region into their virtual fiefdom.

Schocket has written a valuable book for anyone interested in the economic development of the early Republic and for persons interested in Philadelphia, particularly graduate students and specialists. It is a useful corrective to the many studies of early America that neglect economics and politics and to those that make the end of deference and the rise of equality in the North their major paradigm. He has read widely in primary sources and has done a reasonably good job in the secondary literature. He has probably exaggerated the almost conspiratorial nature of the elites in acquiring wealth through corporate building; in the age before general incorporation laws, he does not do enough with the wealth acquired by lawyers and legislators in working with the economic elite in creating charters. But despite some factual errors and neglect of secondary sources that would have improved his historiography, this is a valuable contribution to the history of the early Republic.

*Temple University*  
Herbert Ershkowitz


Once upon a time, the history of the American Revolution and Constitutional Convention told by historians was an epic story filled with larger-than-life men, performing godlike feats to create a democratic nation. This epic approach has long been abandoned by academics in favor of a more realistic perspective through which the faults and elitist biases of the “Founders” come to light. Yet, in the popular imagination, the older view of the country’s beginnings retains
some clout. In *The Summer of 1787*, David O. Stewart bridges the gap between both views. The author crafts the events of the Constitutional Convention into a suspense story during which delegates painstakingly hammered out compromises between proslavery and antislavery forces, and between the lightly and densely populated states. Carefully, Stewart interweaves personal aspects of the delegates’ lives and contemporaneous events in Philadelphia to illustrate how they influenced the decisions made in the Pennsylvania statehouse. Stewart’s characters are mortals with foibles, but his account of the document they created is awe-inspiring.

Stewart is not a professional historian, nor is his book written specifically for an academic audience. As such, some historians may be frustrated with aspects of its construction. Stewart relies heavily on online and published primary sources. The footnotes are not numbered in the text, and, more disconcertingly, the book lacks a strong thesis. If a central argument exists, it is a traditional stance almost reminiscent of consensus history. Stewart suggests that Convention delegates succeeded only through a series of concessions between democratic and elitist forces creating a middle path between the extremes. For example, he details the negotiations between pro- and antislavery advocates and implies that the infamous Fugitive Slave Clause was essential to garner Southern Constitutional support. Moreover, he spends three chapters highlighting that the delegates needed Southern assistance to overcome the small states’ objections to representation based on population in the House of Representatives.

Although the book lacks historiographical innovation, Stewart is a master storyteller. Readers will be delighted by his ability to construct three-dimensional portraits of the delegates. For example, the book vividly portrays Alexander Hamilton’s operatic life, from his rags to riches adolescence to his death by duel. Yet, what makes Stewart exceptional is his ability to tie such biographies seamlessly to the events of 1787. Immediately after outlining Hamilton’s melodramatic existence, he describes Hamilton’s impassioned but outlandish Convention speech during which he pleaded with the delegates to eliminate state governments. Thus, short biographies provide character development in a book that self-consciously emulates the prose of a popular novel. Stewart steers readers through the rising tension of hard-fought Constitutional measures to the climax of the Constitution’s signing, occasionally detouring to describe the delegates’ evening tavern haunts and weekend garden strolls.

In short, although *The Summer of 1787* is not an exceptionally unique contribution to the historiography, it is well researched and provides a creatively written account of the Convention’s events. It will delight popular audiences and
remind historians that an essential component to writing good history is telling a good story.

_Purdue University_  


For historians trained in or working out of a history department, visiting the book exhibit at the Association for Educators in Journalism and Mass Communication (AEJMC), which has a History Division that serves as the principal organization for historians of journalism, can be a disorienting experience. The usual lineup of major university presses is largely absent, replaced by a host of commercial publishers, many of them completely unfamiliar. Entities not known for having their own book publishing operations apparently do. It is, in short, an alternate universe, accessible only to the schools and departments of journalism and/or mass communication where historical scholars of journalism are typically based.

Aurora Wallace’s _Newspapers and the Making of Modern America_ is a product of this alternate universe. Although Wallace teaches at one of the nation’s more well-situated and prestigious institutions, New York University, her book was produced by the bare-bones but high-priced commercial academic publisher Greenwood Press, a venerable institution that historians at major research university history departments nevertheless treat as a publisher of last resort, especially when writing about mainstream subjects like the one at hand. Although Greenwood and its offshoots have published some excellent and useful books over the years, their quality filter appears to be loosely woven, and their distribution and marketing limited, even by academic standards. Yet, by custom or design, many journalism-school-based historians seem to use outfits like Greenwood as their publisher of _first_ resort, making _Newspapers and the Making of Modern America_ the latest of a long series of would-be basic references on the history of journalism destined to languish on a handful of library shelves, virtually unknown and unknowable to all but the most determined outsiders.

The purpose of the volume at hand is not clear. Although replete with footnotes and other scholarly apparatus, it appears to be a kind of textbook for a not terribly creative survey course on newspapers since the 1920s, stitching together capsule histories of various significant publications. As seems to be typical in the journalism school universe, the narrative is heavily present oriented, becoming far more sure-handed as it progresses through the century. A sense of what came before 1920 is almost completely absent, allowing absurd passages like a remark
that “the convergence of business, politics, and newspapers was common in the early days of Florida expansion” (105). Of course, this was the norm nationwide for most of the previous century, rather than anything unique to 1920s Florida. Likewise the chapter on “Small-Town Reform Newspapers” proceeds as though crusading local editors with national reputations were a new phenomenon in a rather late Progressive Era, instead of the tail end of one that stretched back many decades.

Though the African American press and community newspapers do get chapters, heavy emphasis is placed on the business histories of major urban daily's still publishing and familiar to modern readers, including the New York Times, the Los Angeles Times, the Wall Street Journal, the Washington Post, Newsday, the Miami Herald, and the Des Moines Register. Even some of the more unusual choices included, such as the Anniston Star (Ala.) and the Hazard Herald (Ky.), are approached through dry recitations of publisher biographies and business transactions. The capsules are based largely on secondary sources, often one per topic, with a somewhat randomly selected smattering of clippings from the papers themselves added for coloration. Certain sections on particular topics do appear to be based chiefly on primary sources and benefit from it, notably a nice discussion of the East Village Other and its role in defining its New York neighborhood. Unfortunately, and distractingly for the well-trained historian, Wallace devotes much space to rather shaky and superficial sketches of larger historical trends and events that involved the newspapers.

Wallace does take a useful interpretive approach, attempting to tell “the story of how newspapers from metropolitan dailies to rural weeklies have been influential in constructing the places where they operate” (4). This is an ambitious idea that the author carries out in an inconsistent and thinly researched way. One of the better-written chapters details the direct involvement of the publishers of the Los Angeles Times and Long Island’s Newsday in not only promoting urban and suburban development in their regions, taking in millions of real estate advertising dollars in the process, but also in creating the actual developments themselves. As is typical of the book, the implications of this relationship are left largely unconsidered.

As an early draft, slated for the further revision and elaboration and editing that a more demanding publisher would have required, this text would have had a great deal of potential. In its present form, it mostly stands as an example of how impaired standards of historical scholarship can become when the discipline is practiced within the narrow limits of a vocational training program tied to a single industry, perhaps especially one as myopic as the modern news media. There are
many fine, rigorous scholars working in the history of journalism, but this volume indicates that the field as a whole needs to raise its sites a good deal.

*University of Missouri*  
Jeffrey L. Pasley


This book of “tales” about the cavalry of both armies during the American Civil War is aimed at general readers who enjoy a colorful story that is well told and who are not overly concerned about the latest scholarship and interpretations of nineteenth-century cavalry. George Walsh is a man who knows all about books. He is the former editor in chief of the general books division of the Macmillan Publishing Company and author of two other volumes on the Civil War. His purpose in writing this account was to highlight the dramatic deeds and daring of Civil War horsemen, and he has succeeded admirably in that task. “*Those Damn Horse Soldiers*” will be fascinating to nonspecialists and will doubtless lead many of them to read more about America’s great fratricidal war of the 1860s.

The book is arranged into four sections, one for each year, from 1862 to 1865, and within each section the author includes roughly ten chapters on important or interesting cavalry operations and battles. In the section on 1862, for example, J. E. B. Stuart’s ride around George B. McClellan’s Federal army, Nathan Bedford Forrest’s raids in Tennessee, and Earl Van Dorn’s destruction of Ulysses S. Grant’s supply base at Holly Springs in Mississippi are all covered, along with several other stories.

Every chapter about 1862 focuses on a Confederate leader, reflecting the ascendance of Southern cavalry early in the war. Later sections provide more balance, with chapters on (among others) Benjamin Grierson’s drive through Mississippi, the titanic clash at Brandy Station, the Kilpatrick-Dahlgren raid, Philip Sheridan’s famous ride in the Shenandoah Valley, and James Wilson’s *Blitzkrieg* into Alabama—all Union operations—sharing space with accounts of more derring-do by Confederate officers such as Stuart, John Hunt Morgan, John S. Mosby, and Wade Hampton. Altogether, forty-five chapters, averaging about nine pages each, relate the stories of Civil War horsemen in the eastern and western theaters from 1862 to 1865.

Professional historians and researchers will find this book less useful. It ignores completely the trans-Mississippi theater of the war, where the most ambitious and longest cavalry operation of the conflict took place—Henry H. Sibley’s New Mexico campaign of 1862—and where Confederate and Union horsemen
frequently raided into Missouri. Some claims in the book’s prologue—for example, that Forrest “permitted the massacre of black Union soldiers” at Fort Pillow—are seemingly contradicted by the author’s own evidence and narrative (12, see 280–281). Other assertions—for example, that Van Dorn’s Holly Springs raid “kept Grant from capturing Vicksburg for another year” are simply wrong (12). (Van Dorn’s raid was in December 1862, and Vicksburg fell less than seven months later.) Important scholarship (e.g., Stephen Z. Starr’s three-volume work on Union cavalry) does not appear in the text or footnotes (there is no bibliography).

“Those Damn Horse Soldiers” will excite the interests of nonspecialists. It is well written, and the author has a good eye for significant anecdotes. Professional historians will pass over it quickly (but probably envy Walsh’s sales figures).

Richard Lowe


This is an interesting collection of new essays, many by leading scholars in the fields of immigration and incorporation of newcomers. It is in two parts, the latter including thirty-one relatively brief but statistically dense essays on the forty most numerous groups since 1965. They cover Africa, Europe, the Americas, Asia, the Pacific, and the Caribbean. There is some unevenness in these because nearly all rely on Public-Use Microdata Samples (PUMS), 2000 Census data, immigration reports, and so on, whereas the coverage of the social and cultural features varies with the groups’ time in America and the extent of community development, cultural adaptation, and the presence of an adult second generation. Still, half do include considerable, compact discussions of adjustment and incorporation experiences (11).

As useful as those chapters will be as a survey reference on contemporary immigrants, the most valuable portion of the volume is the first half, with its twenty thematic essays addressing broad themes of movement, integration, institutional impact, and second-generation offspring (8–10). Thus, we find essays on global migrations, immigration policy, citizenship policies, refugees, “unauthorized migration,” settlement patterns, ethnic and racial identities, intermarriage, incorporation, transnationalism, pluralism, religion, language, education, gender, economy, politics, media, and second-generation children. Some pieces are more routine (or covered elsewhere) or more speculative or conjectural—such as that of Zolberg on immigration policy, Gans on identity, Alba and
Nee on assimilation, and Hochschild on pluralism—or are more data-laden, notably that by Logan. Others provide suggestive themes and models, including Waldinger on the incorporation of foreigners, Morawska on variables related to transnationalism, Kaushal and the Reimers on the economic context of immigrants’ adjustment and entrepreneurship, Eck’s discussion of religions, and Foner and Kasinitz’s valuable treatment of the emerging second generation, including those returning to their parents’ homes, the “ILYAS” or “incompletely launched young adults.”

Indeed, there are a number of gems highlighting myriad points:

1) As a result of extensive dual citizenship, “the U.S. can [now] be said to share immigrants with countries of origin” (26).
2) Immigrant-receiving “Creole societies” are those “that achieved integration as ethnic nation states [but] have resisted giving a prominent place to immigration and immigrants in the shaping of national identity” (26).
3) “In every one of the five [racial] groups there are great differences in income and education, for example; among Asians and Hispanics, these correspond closely to differences in national origin and generation status. . . . [Such] differences mean that any efforts to discuss inter-marriage among [typologies] as a whole are bound to be limited in their explanatory power” (117).
4) During the current era of mass migration, America’s “conditions of membership are relatively open and demands for cultural or ideological conformity are modest . . . [because] sharply ethnicized conceptions of American identity have been abandoned, and the cultural boundaries of the American ‘we’ have been enlarged to include all the citizens of the state” (139–140).
5) “The new Americans have brought . . . the faces of the world’s religions to America” (226).

Such insights and such abundant data will certainly make this volume a valuable tool for research and instruction.

California State University, San Bernardino

Elliott R. Barkan


The author of this book covers familiar ground in unfamiliar ways. Eva Sheppard Wolf’s revisionism begins with her reduced estimate of slaves freed in the 1780s.
A tiny elite of secular revolutionaries and a small group of dissenting Protestants, chiefly Quakers, was responsible for this first wave. In the 1790s, a second wave of manumissions—larger than the first—was inspired by self-interest rather than revolutionary idealism. Masters freed their less valuable slaves, and they often promised freedom in return for an extended period of diligent and faithful service. So the record of the late eighteenth century was complicated. Most white Virginians were less “revolutionary” than their idealistic spokesmen, but they did end up freeing large numbers of slaves.

Yet Virginians grew increasingly uncomfortable with the presence of free blacks, and in a series of statutes the legislature made it increasingly difficult for manumitted slaves to remain in the state. This posed difficulties for both whites and blacks. Slaveholders claimed the right to dispose of their property as they saw fit and thus resented any attempt to restrict manumission. At the same time, free blacks risked being evicted from the state if they purchased the freedom of a spouse or child. Wolf makes imaginative use of petitions for exemption from the eviction requirement, teasing out evidence of the hard lives of free blacks as well as the ambivalence of whites who signed the petitions.

White ambivalence reappeared after 1815 with the emergence of the American Colonization Society. Here again was emancipation motivated not by any concern for the well-being of blacks, much less a commitment to universal liberty, but by an intense desire to rid the state of all blacks, free and slave alike, and to do so in a way that would not tamper with the masters’ property rights.

The debate over slavery was revived as Virginia’s population expanded westward. When demands for democratic reform were met with resistance from the conservative eastern planters, resentful westerners began to claim that slavery undermined white freedom. A revolutionary egalitarianism was reinvigorated and, once again, linked to arguments against slavery. Wolf traces the development of these arguments first in the constitutional convention of 1829, then in the series of petitions to the legislature following the Turner rebellion, and in the debate over slavery in the legislature in 1832.

However intense, this debate was still narrowly framed. Antislavery westerners never questioned the right of property in slaves as such. Rather, it came down to a contest of competing rights. Slavery’s opponents claimed that the right to personal security took precedence over the right to slave property. The masters countered that the larger threat arose from attempts to weaken their property rights. Wolf sees only “pragmatism” in the claim that slavery was economically destructive, whereas the reviewer sees the continued influence of the classical economic critique of the slavery. Nevertheless, her major point seems right.
Virginians always debated about slavery, but rarely in ways that held out any hope for blacks themselves.

*Bearing Witness Against Sin: The Evangelical Birth of the American Social Movement.*

By Michael P. Young. (Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 2006. Pp. xi, 248. $22.00.)

The author of this study, a sociologist, examines the religious roots of nineteenth-century American social reform movements. Specifically, Michael P. Young seeks to explain historically and sociologically how it came to be that during the 1830s Protestant evangelicals began organizing themselves into interdenominational societies aimed at reforming American moral and social life. During this period, and largely in direct response to the evangelical revivals that had been crisscrossing the Northeast and Midwest, a wave of reform movements (Young anachronistically terms them “protest movements”) washed over the country. Every bad habit or perceived social malady became a potential cause for evangelical-led reform, the most prominent and successful being the abolitionist and temperance movements.

In chapter one, Young draws a close connection between the religiously inspired reform movements of the early nineteenth century and the protest and activist movements of the late twentieth century. For historians, Young will seem to stumble on his first step: his eye is not on the 1830s but the 1960s. Though Young rightfully acknowledges the role that antebellum religious revivals played in inspiring and sustaining widespread social action, rather than formulate his own theory or draw on similar research by American religious historians, he relies on theories of collective action and social protest offered by political historians Charles Tilly and Sidney Tarrow. Although their theories of “contention” and “sustained interregional protests” are interesting in themselves, they do not readily apply to the history that Young traces, nor do they provide convincing explanations for these and other interdenominational and interregional religious reform activities (10, 11). Rather, the spiritual quickening that revivalism touched off led to a multitude of religious causes aimed at redeeming society from personal as well as national sins, chief among those being slavery and intemperance. Indeed, not only did revivals save souls, but they inspired efforts to create a utopian kingdom of God on earth; that is, a Christian America.

Chapters two and three lay out the religious, social, and political changes that gave rise to reform movements, with particular attention to the emerging concept
of national sins that would require national redemption. In chapter four, Young distinguishes three types of responses to revivalism, each depending on the regions in which revival took place and the different kinds of persons each revival attracted.

But the heart of Young’s book is chapter five. Here, he discusses the similar and interrelated aspects of the temperance and antislavery movements as flowing from the evangelical revivals of the period. Chapter six presents six biographies, including those of William Lloyd Garrison and the Grimké sisters, each profile intended to underscore the religious and moral dimensions of the antislavery movement. In his concluding chapter, Young reasserts the connection that he sees between these religiously inspired reform movements and later protest movements, such as Students for a Democratic Society and Earth First. Although this connection is obviously strained, readers nevertheless will find Bearing Witness Against Sin a helpful source when referencing early American social and moral reform movements.

California State University, Long Beach

Jon R. Stone

Asla and the Pacific


Paekche was a small state in the southwestern corner of the Korean Peninsula that flourished from at least the fourth century C.E. to its annexation by the neighboring state of Silla in southeastern Korea in 660. It was one of the Three Kingdoms that contested for control of Korea before Silla’s unification in 676. Since medieval times, most historians have focused their attention on Silla, unifier of Korea. Less has been recorded or preserved about Paekche. This is unfortunate, because Paekche is of considerable significance in East Asian history. Located on the strategic sea routes between China and Japan, it developed a highly sophisticated society that brought both Buddhism and literacy to Japan, and whose art traditions and institutions influenced its Korean and Japanese neighbors. Jonathan W. Best’s comprehensive study is an important contribution to the reader’s understanding of not only the history of Paekche, but of the entire region.

This, as Best states in the introduction, is really two books. Part one is a two-hundred-page history of the Paekche kingdom based on a thorough examination of all available Korean, Chinese, and Japanese primary sources and, to a lesser extent, on archaeological evidence. Part two is a 211-page heavily
annotated translation of *The Paekche Annals* (*Paekche pon’gi*) in the *Samguk sagi*, the twelfth-century history by Kim Pu-sik, his most important source. The author explains in the preface that the narrative history is designed, in part, to serve as an introduction to his annotated translation of the *Annals*. Either one on its own would be an impressive achievement of scholarship; together they present a fairly exhaustive treatment of the subject. The book also contains twenty-three appendices, a glossary of geographical place names, and six maps. The appendices deal with the problems of identifying people or verifying their historicity, reconstructing historical events, and dating and chronology. Best has also added a concordance to aid in locating information within the translated text of the *Paekche Annals* in part two. This information includes names of rulers and other people, titles, dynasties, Buddhist temples, lengths and measurements, texts mentioned in the *Annals*, and omens. The latter appear frequently in this medieval source.

There are a great many problems in understanding the early history of Korea. Modern nationalist perspectives have often obscured rather than clarified the history of this period. This is because dating and identifying the early states and peoples of Korea have been an important part of constructing both Korean and Japanese identities and in establishing historical claims to disputed territories. For example, the ethnic identity and boundaries of the third of the Three Kingdoms, Koguryo, as presented in history textbooks, has become a serious diplomatic issue between China and South Korea. Best’s careful, judicious analysis of the various sources cuts a clear path through the nationalist-charged accounts of this period. Problems such as the establishment of Paekche and its relationship with Japan and China are elucidated. The reader also realizes that there are still considerable gaps in the understanding of this period.

Best has carefully assembled most of what is known about Paekche and has made it available in English. He also places it within the larger regional context. However, Best makes few concessions to the nonspecialist. The author assumes the reader is already familiar with the basic history of the period as well as some of the historiographical issues. The importance of the study is also assumed, not explained. The prose is precise but dense, with close attention to textual analysis. There is less discussion of recent archaeological studies, although the author does examine material culture, especially tombs. Consequently, the audience for this work will likely be limited to those whose primary field of research is Korean history or East Asia during this period. For them this book should be indispensable as both a reference work and a starting point for further study.

*James Madison University*  
Michael J. Seth

This is a sophisticated study of Cambodia’s history during most of the years that the country was under French colonial rule. During this period, a sense of nationalism slowly developed. Challenging those who separate culture and politics, the author disputes the usual view that Cambodian nationalism first emerged with the launching, in 1936, of a Khmer language newspaper, Nagaravatta (Angkor Wat) and the “Umbrella War” of 1942, an anti-French demonstration led by Buddhist monks in Cambodia’s capital, Phnom Penh. Acknowledging that this is a controversial thesis, Penny Edwards asserts that the French themselves were substantially responsible for developing the culture from which nationalism emerged. “Nationalists did not produce a national culture,” she writes, “[r]ather, the elaboration of a national culture by French and Cambodian literati eventually produced nationalists” (7). Cambodian nationalism was shaped “in colonial offices, schoolrooms, research institutes, and museums” (8).

In much of the book, Edwards analyzes French and Cambodian efforts to define Khmerness. She looks for this in a variety of cultural initiatives and institutions. The ancient complex of temples at Angkor, the most well known of which is Angkor Wat, was central. These monuments fascinated Europeans, and Edwards begins with a chapter about “Angkor and the Archaeology of Colonial Fantasy” (19). Angkor had long held religious significance for Buddhists. The French built a consciousness among Cambodians that their national identity reached back to Angkor. They constructed the royal palace at Phnom Penh along Angkorian lines, for example, and they promoted new and elaborate public celebrations, such as the water festival, that centered attention around the increasingly politically powerless king. They made the Angkor temple complex into “Angkor Park,” a destination for tourists; they “re-Hinduized” the temples; in general, by the 1930s they had made “Angkor a model of national potential and Khmer racial supremacy” (126, 164). It was not surprising, then, that Nagaravatta incorporated Angkor into its letterhead.

Edwards puts much emphasis on the secular, French educational system that was introduced into Cambodia to train an elite group of Cambodians who served as “official translators and cultural advisers” (73). The new literati were tied not to the traditional monarchy, but to the new, modern bureaucracy that France brought to Indochina. Edwards is careful not to suggest that the Cambodian elites were automatons; rather, they were participants with the French in forming the new Cambodia.
In sum, Edwards makes a strong case that colonialism was important in the development of Cambodian nationalism. “Colonial rule indelibly stained the mystery of Angkor’s making and meaning,” Edwards concludes, “repackaging old lore into a new story of national glory, national decline, and national renaissance” (248). Not surprisingly, then, Cambodian leaders, including Norodom Sihanouk and the detestable Pol Pot, all used Angkor “to bolster political claims to national legitimacy” (248).

With its heavy emphasis on cultural developments, this complex and important book complements more traditional histories of Cambodia, such as the excellent works by David Chandler and Ben Kiernan.

*Northern Illinois University*  
Kenton Clymer


This work is a thought-provoking reassessment of the decision to use the atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, fundamentally reexamining how and when these bombs acquired their dreadful reputation. The author argues that previous histories, even otherwise excellent ones, have skewed the examination of the decision-making process by infusing it with contemporary conceptions of the “special” nature of the bombs that only developed after the fact. He claims that it was the Japanese surrender that shifted the emphasis from a quantitative to a qualitative difference. The development of the nuclear idea, therefore, is a traceable phenomenon and not something intrinsically or inevitably inherent in the bombs themselves.

This author fills in several significant gaps, adding to the complexity of the story. First, Michael D. Gordin focuses more intently on “the frantic and confused time that no one yet realized was the final summer of the Second World War” (15). He contextualizes the use of the atomic bomb by recalling the general brutality and inhumanity of the Pacific War and noting that the military strategy of “shock” included the intensive firebombing of Japan. He also turns to new sources, particularly from the island of Tinian, the one place where military and scientific minds dealt with the practical, wartime use of atomic bombs. Gordin persuasively demonstrates that military and political leaders did not expect the war to end as rapidly as it did. His source material does demonstrate a dramatic shift in postsurrender public language pertaining to the bomb, as Americans began talking about Armageddon even when there was only one unassembled weapon in
existence in the world at the time. However, occasionally the connections between his sources and his broader argument feel a bit strained.

One of the most thought-provoking chapters in the book is the final one, ironically titled “Beginnings,” in which Gordin explores the legacies of the type of nuclear thinking that became prevalent after surrender (124ff). In this conclusion, he raises the way in which the “special” status of nuclear weapons has warped military strategy, intensified the Cold War arms race, and excused conventional weapons from their moral burdens. He calls for reexamination of the nuclear question using the tools of historical analysis rather than the political and moral overtones that are themselves products of history.

Gordin’s thesis has implications for “diplomatic history, history of science, military history, Soviet history, Japanese history, and American history,” historiographies that he attempts to draw together (13). Both his notes and his “Coda” on the scholarly literature demonstrate a thorough knowledge of previous theses. This book is not a replacement for that literature, but a supplement. Five Days in August is brief and accessible, effectively communicating even technical and scientific concepts, and would be of use to the history or international relations classroom. This reevaluation of “nuclearism” is a timely study, worthy of consideration and discussion.

Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University

Stephanie L. Trombley


The events leading up to and following the transfer of British power to leaders of the new independent states of India and Pakistan have been traced by numerous scholars inside and outside those two South Asian countries, but no author has attempted to record in such intimate detail the impact of partition on Lahore and Amritsar and their populations before this rendering by Ian Talbot. Talbot draws on his own rich and dedicated body of work that in its combination represents some of the most detailed analysis on the history and aftermath of partition. Long fascinated with the decision to divide British India into two sovereign states, Talbot’s attention has been most sharply focused on the colonial decision also to divide two of the subcontinent’s most celebrated provinces, most notably the Punjab. In this most recent volume, Talbot pieces together the events surrounding the march toward independence and reveals the particular conditions and circumstances that led to the destruction of whole populations as well as the vast material devastation of two of India’s most distinguished cities.
Talbot chronicles the ongoing conditions in major part through the use of area newspapers and reinforces his findings with interviews conducted with people who recall their personal stories from those now distant times. The author moves from such accounts to the issue of the more general status of the cities, of necessity transfigured after the great divide that compelled their reorientation from cooperative to adversarial actors. Informed by the literature of the period, especially the reminiscences of people clinging to a lost past, Talbot juxtaposes the plight of the inhabitants of the twin cities, the interaction between Muslim, Hindu, and Sikh, and their helter-skelter flight from areas under dire stress to those offering relative safety and refuge.

Talbot explains why Lahore more so than Amritsar metamorphosed into more than a border town and grew in stature and importance in the new Pakistan. He carefully follows the trail of the refugee population that moved from India to Lahore and not only found new economic opportunities in the characteristically Moghul city, but also domicile in the wake of the Hindu and Sikh exodus. According to Talbot, Amritsar, on the other hand, lost its status as a major economic and commercial center and thus was less able to absorb the substantial refugee population. Amritsar therefore remained a significant Sikh spiritual center, but New Delhi’s decision to build the new city of Chandigarh and enhance the livelihood of Ludhiana confined Amritsar to lesser status.

Talbot, however, is more concerned with the people inhabiting the region and, although avoiding the more grisly details, he describes how people long conversant with one another were mobilized into opposed groups, radicalized, and urged to bring mayhem on their neighbors. This is a story of how ordinary people were primed to commit the most heinous atrocities in the name of faith and territorial aggrandizement, how Sikhs came to see Muslims as their enemy, and how Muslims targeted Hindus and Sikhs in an orgy of blood. Although understated, this book nevertheless addresses the failure of the colonial authority to protect the people most impacted by the decision to divide, and divide again, before quitting the most heralded of the British colonies.

Talbot has added still another dimension to the reader’s understanding of the decision to partition the subcontinent in the immediate aftermath of World War II. The history of the period, as this book demonstrates, is still being written, but it is already obvious that contemporary issues are a consequence of times and events now decades old.

*Western Michigan University*

Lawrence Ziring
As the title proclaims, this book aims to examine Vietnam without reference to its frontiers, and by extension to challenge the state and nation as historical subjects. In their introduction, Nhung Tuyet Tran and Anthony J. S. Reid claim that a new (English-language) generation of historians has cast aside national history in favor of ambiguities, interstices, margins, and previously shrouded Vietnamese pasts. This is said to be a break with the older generation that emerged during the Second Indochina War [1960–1975] and preoccupied itself excessively with Vietnamese resistance to foreign aggression.

Here the reviewer must declare himself a member of that older generation of historians, still trying to understand what happened during thirty years of war and revolution in Vietnam. Curiously, Tran and Reid do not apply their borderless model to 1945–1975. Nor do any of the ten following essays address Vietnam’s history after 1918. Perhaps the editors found it difficult to recruit specialists on twentieth-century history to their cause.

The first contribution by Phan Huy Lê, doyen of Hanoi historians, skillfully reviews research on the Vietnamese village in a national conceptual framework. Yu Insun then employs traditional textual analysis to contrast a thirteenth-century and fifteenth-century history of Vietnam. He concludes that the “spirit of resistance” has continued unaltered up to the twentieth century, which hardly supports the Tran and Reid argument. Sun Laichen links Vietnam’s decisive late-fifteenth-century defeat of Champa to incorporation of Chinese gunpowder technology. Nhung Tuyet Tran takes aim at senior male scholars of the fifteenth century Lê Code for overstating the property rights of women, and calls for future writing of Vietnamese women’s history from their own perspective. Li Tana examines the pivotal role of the lower Mekong delta in late-eighteenth-century regional Chinese junk traffic, suggesting that ambivalent “pre-nation-state” political status facilitated profitable commerce.

Charles Wheeler employs Vietnamese and French sources to tease out the role of indigenous Cham people in the sixteenth-century development of the port of Hôi An in present-day central Vietnam. Wynn Wilcox pictures the late-eighteenth/early nineteenth-century course of Nguyễn Ánh/Gia Long as multiethnic and transnational, contrary to subsequent French colonial and Vietnamese nationalist interpretations. George Dutton introduces us to the fascinating Fr. Philipê Binh [1759–1832], who wrote prolifically about his homeland when exiled in Portugal, only to have his texts sequestered in the Vatican Library.
Loan Hill trawls the records of World War I French mail censors to describe the daily life of Vietnamese soldiers and workers in the métropole. Finally, James P. Daughton contrasts the commitment to God and church of a prominent late-eighteenth-century French missionary with the political campaign one hundred years later to remember him as a great French patriot.

Taken together, these essays neither justify the book’s title of *Borderless Histories* nor substantiate the introduction’s fashionable message of globalization, localization, ambiguity, and political neutrality. Fortunately, a number of contributors are more interested in learning the necessary languages, ferreting out new sources, and showing readers what remarkable vistas await future historians of Vietnam. The book contains a quite useful thirty-four-page bibliography of sources in English, French, Vietnamese, Chinese, and Japanese.

*Australian National University*  
David G. Marr

**Europe**


Twenty years ago, archaeologists in the United States paid scant attention to warfare in prehistory, but that is not true today. This volume’s temporal, geographical, and cultural breadth—thirteen chapters by fifteen authors—makes it an excellent introduction to current thinking about the conduct, intensity, and causes of prehistoric warfare. It mostly consists of case studies based on archaeological, ethnographic, and historical material from the Americas, Africa, China, and Oceania. These regional studies are sandwiched between provocative essays emphasizing current controversies and recent findings.

Those accustomed to modern conflicts might not recognize hostilities among small-scale societies as being true warfare. But they are indeed examples of warfare, if it is defined as culturally sanctioned and potentially lethal fighting between physically separated communities where potential antagonists and victims are identified simply by group membership. Objectives, tactics, participants, and casualties varied from one cultural context to another. The cumulative effects of fighting should not be dismissed as being of little consequence just because most attacks consisted of ambushes of a few vulnerable people. Over time, conflict-related mortality could be quite high, and it disrupted the functioning, hence survival, of normally self-sufficient communities.
The case studies mostly focus on warfare’s association with the emergence of hierarchically structured chiefdoms and states. Teasing apart causal relationships is always difficult, but warfare among these organizationally complex societies was certainly common. Yet warfare has been with humankind since the days of their hunting-and-gathering ancestors. R. Brian Ferguson’s argument that inter-group fighting increased as people began to settle down in long-lasting settlements, first as hunter-gatherers focused on a few key resources and then as village agriculturalists, is probably correct. It is difficult, however, to measure any such increase, because skeletal evidence is generally sparse for the mobile hunter-gatherers that preceded sedentary peoples. Ferguson’s grand narrative is precisely the fusion between archaeological and ethnographic evidence that defines future research directions.

Steven A. LeBlanc argues that the causes of conflict among prehistoric societies are ultimately reducible to pressure on resources; that is, a balance among environmental productivity, the means of resource extraction, and population size. All are archaeologically measureable. The many proximate causes—to seek revenge, increase one’s prestige, abduct women, or steal livestock—are largely invisible to archaeologists. What is important is not what motivated individuals, but what established conditions that promoted peaceful interactions as opposed to those that favored conflicts breaking out and intensifying.

This outstanding volume will certainly fuel increased interest in the systematic study of warfare in prehistory. One of the most pressing tasks is to document temporal and spatial patterning in evidence for warfare in as many places as possible. It is also necessary to see what distinguished particularly troubled or peaceful times in terms of population pressure on resources, the capacity to intensify production to satisfy those demands, sociopolitical institutions, and the like. The case studies in this book are important steps in those directions. By pursuing such topics, archaeologists can provide much needed long-term perspectives on this very real, if deplorable, aspect of human existence.

George R. Milner

*The Hanged Man: A Story of Miracle, Memory, and Colonialism in the Middle Ages.*


When, in 1290, the English lord William de Briouze hanged a Welsh rebel named William Cragh at Swansea, a miracle occurred, according to several witnesses who testified in 1307 to a papal commission. The dead Cragh revived, so he claimed,
through the heavenly intercession of Thomas de Cantilupe, bishop of Hereford, who had died in 1282 and whose candidacy for sainthood was the subject of the papal inquiry. The commission’s examination of Cragh’s resurrection provides the framework for Robert Bartlett’s fluently written history, which examines miracles, sainthood, political struggles, and, most importantly, the mental world of rebels, nobles, soldiers, and clergymen in primarily the fourteenth century.

Bartlett seizes on the commissioners’ questions and the witnesses’ often conflicting accounts to explore these issues. Each individual’s story deepens the reader’s understanding of the events surrounding Cragh’s revival and of medieval society more generally. Cragh’s execution, for example, resulted from Welsh rebellion against English colonialism, but the cruelty of forcing Cragh’s own relatives to lead him to the gallows reflected the special hatred inspired by Cragh’s share in attacks on Briouze estates. Given this recent strife-ridden past, Lady Mary de Briouze’s prayer to Cantilupe on Cragh’s behalf seems puzzling, although Bartlett cites the intercessory role often played by highborn women to explain her actions. Nor did the miracle meet universal approval; as the war-hardened steward who led the execution squad bluntly told Lady Mary, “it was evil that an evil man should be brought back to life” (33).

The Cragh inquiry was one part of a lengthy and painstaking canonization process. When Thomas de Cantilupe’s body was translated to Hereford Cathedral in 1287, miracles began at the new tomb. Pilgrims followed, and high-ranking clergy and nobility supported his candidacy for sainthood. Although such an extensive cult helped to promote canonization, papal commissioners had to gather evidence of the miracles, which a group of cardinals then assessed. The commissioners who heard about Cragh’s resurrection as evidence of Cantilupe’s sanctity were not easily convinced that a miracle had occurred. They asked several probing questions. Could Cragh have survived his hanging without supernatural aid? How did he know it was Cantilupe who intervened, and not another Thomas? Such questions highlighted the university education and legal experience that shaped the perceptions of these men who traveled throughout Europe and beyond as emissaries of the church.

From the English domination of Wales to the papal court’s process for creating saints, Bartlett deftly sketches a nuanced picture of medieval society. Perhaps most impressive is his reconstruction of medieval people’s mental universe. Clocks and calendars disappear as he recovers from their seven hundred-year-old testimony the means by which fourteenth-century people used personal, often bodily, experience to structure time and measure space. The great Christian festivals marked their memories of past events, as the distance one could walk in a given period...
provided a gauge of time. Such insights make Bartlett’s story of William Cragh’s death and revival a profound and always engaging study of this era.

University of Iowa

Kathleen Kamerick

The Culture of Cleanliness in Renaissance Italy. By Douglas Biow. (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2006. Pp. xxiv, 244. $35.00.)

In a well-conceived and engaging book, the author brings literary scholars low, down from the elevated perch of classical authors into the muck of Renaissance literature. Noting the importance of cleanliness to the cultural history of the European West and the dearth of literary studies of cleanliness, Douglas Biow offers “a new, unified interpretation of Italian Renaissance literature” (xi).

In making the claim, the author provides several caveats delineating the parameters of the book, which is not a comprehensive survey of everything dirty. For example, religious cleanliness, scatology, and the classical underpinnings of Renaissance perceptions of cleanliness are not explored in depth. Rather, Biow employs selective case studies in thematic chapters with a focus “on the symbolic uses of cleanliness as a topic—in rhetorical terms, a ‘topos’—in a host of different writings of the period” (3). Although Biow mentions practical measures taken to clean Italian cities, the primary focus remains the ideas of dirty and clean in Italian prose and poetry. Informed by anthropological, sociological, and historical studies, Biow argues that his study of cultural cleanliness will inform us how Renaissance Italians tolerated disorder, defined bodily and territorial boundaries, and policed behavior and speech.

Biow’s thought-provoking introduction explains the organizational principle of the three chapters that follow, which progress from the most pristine ideals to the filthiest realities of Renaissance Italy, roughly defined as the period between 1350–1600. The first chapter, “Households and Cities,” begins with the most socially and linguistically elevated members of Renaissance Italy: family patriarchs, aristocratic ambassadors, and humanists. Biow analyzes dialogues on the household and descriptions of Florence to demonstrate the rhetorical relationship between cleanliness and social order. Chapter two examines liminal people, the washerwomen who soiled their hands cleaning the dirty linen of others and consequently lived in a tension between clean and dirty behavior. The third chapter, “Latrine and Latrine-Cleaners,” focuses on low and dirty people and places. The journey from Dante’s cosmic cesspool to secular carnival songs traces the evolving notion of cleanliness from a spiritual virtue to a social one.
Biow’s theoretical construct, however, is not as neat and tidy as he outlines. The chronological progression from messy medieval theology to refined Renaissance manners downplays the concern for hygiene in medieval secular legislation and the disorder expressed in Renaissance religious literature. The relationship between epidemic disease, changing political realities, and the new rhetoric of cleanliness also requires further clarification if scholars are to appreciate the Renaissance creativity that “bequeathed to the modern world its varied reflections on cleanliness in so many different forms” (185).

Like many of the Renaissance authors he cites, Biow revels in the use of scatological language while constructing a highly articulate and elevated scholarly argument. In rescuing Renaissance dirt from the dustbin of history, Biow ably demonstrates that new approaches to well-trodden material can still enlighten. As the best scholars do, Biow has digested a massive amount of primary and secondary literature, articulated an insightful new paradigm, and produced theoretical debris for other scholars to clean up.

Oklahoma State University

David D’Andrea


In recent decades, diplomatic and military history has fallen out of fashion and yet, as this author reveals, a thorough examination of the interplay between the Russian army, government, and public has much to tell readers about this under-researched period. In the relatively short period that is examined in some detail here, Russia made serious inroads into formerly Ottoman territories both in the Caucasus and in the Balkans. The apparent triumph of Russian arms and policy in direct contact with the Ottoman and Persian Empires masked, however, less positive developments, in particular the deterioration of Russo-British relations, which would influence Great Britain to side against Russia in the Crimean War two decades later. The present work is a detailed and very competent examination of a period and topic familiar to few specialists.

Alexander Bitis sets as his goal the examination of “the role of the Russian army, government, and society... in the Russo-Turkish and Russo-Persian military and diplomatic struggle in the Near East” (1). As his introduction shows, few Western historians have considered this topic in a serious way and Russian-language historiography was hampered first by constraints of czsarist censorship, then later by Soviet historiography’s shifting, but always obtrusive, political
considerations. Perhaps the most valuable novelty that Bitis brings to this book is his extensive work in Russian archives, in particular at the Russian State Military-History Archive (RGVIA), but also at several other archives in St. Petersburg and Moscow, supplemented by work in British repositories. It is difficult to imagine this work being superceded any time soon: the bibliography of works in Russian, English, and other languages is admirable.

Bitis’s approach is straightforward and generally chronological; each individual chapter concentrates on a single topic. For example, after a discussion of the background of the “Eastern Question” up to 1821, the author turns to developments within the Russian army under Nicholas I [r. 1825–1855], then narrows the focus to the Main Staff (glavnyi shtab) of the Second Army, in particular the theories of A. H. Jomini and F. N. Glinka on the proper organization and strategy of the Russian military forces. Other chapters examine in some detail the Russo-Persian War [1826–1828] and the subsequent Russo-Turkish War that ended with the Treaty of Adrianople. Of particular interest is Bitis’s coverage of the impact of this latter conflict on Russian civil society, the Balkan peninsula (through the use of Balkan irregulars as well as the occupation of the Danubian provinces for several years), and on Russia’s relations with the European powers. Bitis convincingly shows that the Russo-British rivalry of a half century later—the so-called “Great Game”—was in many ways anticipated by British distrust of Russian expansion at the expense of the Persian and Ottoman Empires in the 1820s and 1830s.

This book is recommended for readers from university students to professors wishing to deepen their knowledge of Russian military, diplomatic, and political history in the 1820s and 1830s. Bitis’s careful, thorough, and detailed arguments, well supported with numerous archival and published sources, are a model of good old-fashioned historical writing. The book’s organization also lends itself well for assigning specific chapters, for example, “The Russo-Turkish War 1828–1829,” for class reading and discussion. In short, this book is a serious contribution to understanding the development of military and diplomatic policy in Russia in the generation after the Napoleonic Wars.

Southern Illinois University, Carbondale

Theodore R. Weeks


Visual evidence from the Middle Ages has long provided windows into the complexities of that historical period. In particular, the Luttrell Psalter presents
vivid images of a fourteenth-century English manor, the people, both high and low, who populated it, and their daily lives. Grotesques march along the margins of the Psalter, adding intrigue to its overall intent. Modern art historians see the Luttrell Psalter as a vitally important example of medieval manuscript illumination, evident in the number of books that both replicate its illuminations and decode its imagery and symbols. The appeal of the manuscript, however, now stretches beyond scholarly interpretation to lay interest. Depictions from the Psalter inhabit Internet entries, and videos based on the work pop up on YouTube.

Michelle P. Brown’s study appeals to both audiences. Her academic credentials and association with the British Library, where the original Psalter manuscript resides, buttress her scholarly analysis, making the book appropriate as an introduction to the manuscript and for teaching purposes. At the same time, the style of the brief book—vibrantly written, stripped of footnotes, and including color reproductions from the Psalter—provides a ready avenue to a more general audience. By delving into the greater context or “world” of the document, Brown presents the manuscript’s importance as a tool for understanding a fourteenth-century family of status, good deeds, and piety. Further, she does so in a way that highlights the “human interest story” it contains (6).

The reader soon discovers that the Luttrells had built their world on service to the crown, and it came to include attendant mendicants, dynastic marriages, land disputes, brutality, peasant service, and religious devotion. Brown expertly shows how the memorial Psalter touched all these facets. Still, the world she presents remains more constricted than the Psalter might suggest.

Although the author touches on Sir Geoffrey Luttrell’s place in English society as that of a new man, she does not resolutely connect Geoffrey’s status to his need to affirm his place in England’s social hierarchy or to depict his dominance over vast (for him) lands (57). For example, she sees an image of a rabbit warren through the lens of “sexuality and promiscuity,” rather than suggesting that it might be a symbol of the fertility of the Luttrell lands and the blessings the lands and family have received over time (71). Also, when she dissects the portrayal of a young man and an old woman at a mill as a symbol of the disparity of possession between the two, she might widen the analysis by looking at the burden of taxation imposed by the Luttrells and borne by the users of the mill (68, 69, 71). This would enhance her comment on how the locked door of a watermill underscores Sir Geoffrey’s ownership and involvement (71).

Finally, the lives of the Luttrell women might have been more prominent than as the peripheral figures Brown discerns from the manuscript. The depiction of the “castle of love” could have as much to do with real-life needs of women to protect
properties as with “being a metaphor for human sexuality” (84). Also, some suggestion that the educated women of the Luttrell family had a role in commissioning or providing information for the Psalter would fit with recent scholarship in that area.

Brown’s work presents seven sections, each touching on an aspect of the Psalter and expanding it to people and events in the Luttrells’ world. The book, although brief, provides abundant information as it builds on previous analyses of the manuscript and concludes with suggestions for further reading. Overall, written and visual materials intertwine, allowing nuances of medieval life to emerge and engage a variety of readers.

University of West Florida

Marylou Ruud


This book is not so much about Richard Hooker as it is about later interpretations of him. Recently, Hooker has been variously claimed as a Reformed theologian, the defender of a “via media” Church, and the creator of a distinctive Anglicanism. Michael Brydon, after acknowledging that Hooker’s classic work, The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity, is an open-ended text amenable to different significations, approaches the matter by examining the ways Hooker’s seminal book was interpreted during a little more than one hundred years following his death. In doing so, he concludes that the different understandings of Hooker now current were already present and disputed in the seventeenth century.

Brydon finds that during the reigns of James I and Charles I, Calvinists disagreed as to whether Hooker was one of them or not, although Roman Catholics maintained that he had made enough concessions to Rome that he had undermined Protestantism; meanwhile “avant-garde conformists” such as Lance-lot Andrewes and, especially, William Laud used Hooker to rebut Puritan criticisms of the Established Church and to develop a theological perspective distinct from Calvinism. In the middle of the seventeenth century, both the Irish Calvinist Archbishop Ussher and the liberal Anglican circle formed at Great Tew discovered in Hooker grounds for a moderate, comprehensive Church of England. With the Restoration, the Laudian Hooker came back into fashion, abetted by Isaac Walton’s biography of Hooker and by Lord Clarendon’s promotion of Hooker as a kind of norm for the restored Church of England. But others, claiming the authenticity (which modern scholarship has confirmed) of the last three books
of *The Ecclesiastical Polity*, where the High Churchmen had discounted them, resurrected a moderate Hooker who would have accepted modifications in the *Book of Common Prayer* in order to comprehend Dissenters in the Church of England. Yet later, political radicals such as Locke and Algernon Sidney called attention to passages in Hooker that supported popular sovereignty and contractual views of government. With James II, who avowed that reading Hooker had led him to the Roman Church, a spate of books from Catholics revived the notion that Hooker was implicitly on their side. During the Glorious Revolution and its aftermath, Hooker was used against divine right monarchy by supporters of the Revolution and for divine right episcopacy and monarchy by the nonjurors. The Tory revival under Queen Anne refurbished the High Church Hooker, and during the Sacheverell case a Whig Hooker emerged.

Clearly Hooker became important in the century after his death insofar as so many claimed his support. Brydon’s book is a fascinating and thoroughly researched treatment of the manifold uses of Hooker, and it leaves the reader wondering whether that much-vaunted luminary of the English Church had become a nose of wax, albeit an important one. The reader has to look hard to find fault with this book; on the whole, it tellingly illuminates the story of English religion in the seventeenth century simply by tracing what was being said about the “judicious Hooker.”

George Washington University Dewey D. Wallace Jr.


Conferences and their consequent published papers are frequently troubled by a lack of cohesion; however, the four-hundredth anniversary of James I’s accession offered a sharp focus for the 2003 conference in Hull from which these essays come. The central concerns are admirably laid out in the editors’ introduction and in Conrad Russell’s opening essay. Any accession in the early modern period brought with it the possibility of abrupt cultural and political change, but James’s was especially significant in that his was also a change of dynasty, and it brought England into an uncertain relationship with Scotland, with whom it now shared its king. The “union” of the two kingdoms is the oft-recurring concern of these essays, whether they are treating literary or political matters, and whether the focus is on England, Scotland, or even Wales in the construction of a “British” identity.
A number of essays find English ambivalence about the accession reflected on the stage. Tracey Hill shows how Anthony Munday’s 1605 Lord Mayor’s Show was not an unproblematic celebration of James’s accession and the idea of union, but instead a work that emphasized the “Englishness” of London and the city’s independence of the king. Using King Lear as an example, Philip Schwyzer shows how the idea of union often looked back to myth and legend for a foundational idea of “Britain”; Schwyzer also offers a revisionist reading, seeing King Lear not as emphatically Unionist. John Kerrigan explores the often overlooked implications of 1603 for Wales, the continuing locus of “Britishness,” and finds Cymbeline “compensating for the failure of union” (128). Roderick Lyall offers a rich comparative study of two Scottish poets who chose different paths in the post-1603 period. Robert Ayton followed his king down to England to a life as a court poet, while William Drummond chose to remain in Scotland, writing verse far more attuned to the broader European poetic world.

Some of the literature-based essays (Hill, Schwyzer) may strive too hard to find ambivalence, and Matthew Baynham’s essay on equivocation in Macbeth adopts the breathless Richard Wilson/Michael Woods approach to Shakespeare biography, where all reads lead, inevitably, to Rome. However, a number (Schwyzer, Lyall) present fine, close reading, of a sort too often lacking in recent historicist literary studies.

The constitutional and political scope of the collection is reflected in essays by Arthur Williamson and Michael Hulsebosch. Williamson’s account of David Hume of Godscroft’s De Unione eloquently explains the “radical Britain” imagined by Hume as possible in 1603, based on the legacy of Buchanan and Andrew Melville, a vision far removed from the more common mythological vision of “Britishness” promulgated by the masque writers and poets. Hulsebosch effectively challenges assumptions about Edward Coke’s legal theory in regard to the colonies, as Coke responded to the new imperial reality that emerged with James’s reign.

A number of essays trace the changing reputations and roles within James’s new English court. Maureen King describes the rehabilitation of the earl of Essex’s reputation that began with James’s accession and also how the legacy of Essex came to be used against the king. Curtis Perry offers a more nuanced understanding of Jacobean favoritism, as presented in a variety of genres, than has hitherto been available.

The essays rightly focus on the changes brought by the accession, but also note the continuities, as in Pauline Croft’s essay on the 1604 peace agreement with Spain, which she convincingly shows was the “last chapter of Elizabethan foreign
policy,” and more dependent on Robert Cecil than James (140). Similarly, Jenny Wormald argues that Scotland functioned quite well despite its absent king in the post-1603 period. She finds relative continuity in church, state, and culture, and convincingly shows that the “real impact of union” for Scotland only came after 1625 (84).

Occasionally these essays slip and reveal that they have been wrested from another project to fit this conference, and a few are only tangentially connected with the accession itself. However, overall this is a solid and well-edited collection.

*Brescia University College*  
James Doleman


In this rich and multilayered study, the author offers an overview of the church in Florence during the time of Dante, c. 1250–1330. He examines the institutional, economic, social, and cultural contexts of the church during the decades when Florence rocketed to affluence and influence in the Italian peninsula and beyond it. George W. Dameron focuses on a deceptively simple question: “What part did the Florentine church . . . play in this rapid and stunning transformation?” (4). In over five chapters that examine the institutions, personnel (vocations), economics, and piety of the Florentine church, as well as church relations with the commune, Dameron argues that Florence’s economic and political fortunes were deeply intertwined with the actions of the church. He meticulously traces the complex relations between Florentine ecclesiastical institutions and the different facets of Florentine life with which they intersected, concluding that “the church played a constructive role institutionally, economically, culturally, and politically in the process by which Florence became the dominant commune in Tuscany. It was complicit and deeply involved in this transition, not resistant or peripheral to it” (5).

In proposing that the intersection of the economic and spiritual served the best interests of the commune, Dameron clearly offers a reassessment of the anticlerical and influential views posited by Robert Davidsohn [*Geschichte von Florenz* (Berlin, 1896–1927)]. Davidsohn had argued that the church of Dante’s Florence played a “divisive, corrupting, obstructionist and negative” role in the city’s extraordinary economic and social development (4). Dameron bases his challenge on the examination of both rural and urban areas, with a particular focus on the secular clergy. He shows the range of ecclesiastical responses to the needs of a city
experiencing a rapid increase in wealth and emphasizes how ecclesiastical communities were increasingly in positions to provide much-needed charity and comfort to those abandoned or trampled in Florence’s rise to prominence. In so doing, Dameron illuminates the often ignored or difficult-to-explore experiences of those on the margins of medieval society. Church institutions not only provided food and shelter, as might be expected, but also contributed to dispute mediation and peacemaking among all social classes. Such assistance encouraged overall stability.

Dameron does not ignore or underestimate the complexities of and tensions within the church of Florence; the church was not a “single monolithic organization”; rather, “it was a living, diverse and often unruly set of communities that was as divided as the society of which it was part” (7, 8). Dameron, unlike Davidsohn, does not consider such conflicts “signs of social disfunction” (26). Rather, the Florentine church modeled reaching collaboration from conflict. To illustrate one way that the Florentine church responded to the spiritual needs of the commune, Dameron discusses the doctrine of purgatory. Purgatory and charity offered the Florentine community—especially the newly rich—a means of coping with their new circumstances.

Throughout his narrative, Dameron threads the personal experiences of four extremely well-documented Florentines. Ranging in status and religious function, these figures offer vivid examples to anchor Dameron’s argument, bringing his history to life. Dameron peppers his analysis with periodic comparisons of medieval Florentine life with the texts of Edith Wharton, John Updike, and others, in an admirable attempt to draw connections across the centuries. Overall, Dameron achieves his goal, to reintroduce economic analysis to the historical study of this period and to provide a comprehensive, if controversial, account of church involvement in Florentine success.

University of Richmond

Joanna H. Drell


In this work, Barry Eichengreen attempts to unravel a puzzle: why did Europe exhibit such remarkable economic growth following the Second World War, only seemingly to run out of breath in the early 1970s? His answer: what worked then is unsuited to what works now.
What worked then was an emphasis on extensive growth, which was fueled by adding more labor and capital. This success also benefited from inherited economic and social institutions that allowed Europe to overcome obstacles to growth. Primary among these institutions was *corporatism* — a system by which government, management, and labor collectively negotiate wages, working conditions, and other issues. Taken together, these institutions enabled Europe to engage in extensive economic growth for a sustained period.

These same factors also account for Europe’s relative economic slowdown after 1973. Today’s economy is global and information based. The spoils now go to risk takers, small firms unfettered by excessive government regulation and high labor costs. Yet European businesses are burdened by their governments’ preference for supporting existing technology rather than radical innovation, high labor costs, a focus on vocational education, and a tangle of laws and regulations. Not surprisingly, Europe trails the United States, which embraces an entrepreneurial-friendly economy, in many important aspects. Although extensive growth served Europe well in the past, it is intensive growth — developing new markets and products — that will guide the way in the future.

Eichengreen rightly places his renderings in a political and social context. This approach explains why countries that appear similar on the surface pursue very different economic policies, which can result in dissimilar outcomes. For example, British history and culture help explain why it has taken a somewhat different path than its continental peers.

Although Western Europe remains the focus, Eichengreen devotes two chapters to Eastern Europe. But rather than simply condemning the command economy model and stopping there, he explains both the causes as well as the repercussions of its failure. He also discusses these economies’ transitions to market-based systems and what they mean for Europe as a whole. Although Western Europeans fear job losses to lower-wage economies in the East, the author suggests that this competition could spur the West to make needed changes.

Eichengreen concludes the book by summarizing the arguments that optimists and pessimists have offered about Europe’s economic fate. Europe must do several things right in order to adapt to a global and information-based environment. Making the right choices and seeing them to fruition is not a sure thing. However, Eichengreen implicitly sides with the optimists, noting that Europe has already begun to take steps in the right direction.

Despite a few minor missteps, Eichengreen has produced a readable and informative account of Europe’s post-1945 economy. Drawing on a lengthy and up-to-date bibliography, he embeds a wealth of economic theories into a political
and social context in a way that an intelligent layperson can understand. These strengths should enable the book to find its way into graduate courses on economic history.

*Florida State University*  
Michael H. Creswell


This author presents a thoroughly researched and clearly organized and written volume focusing on the history of republican opposition movements between the French revolutions of 1830 and 1871 in the Narbonne region (the eastern part of the southern department of the Aude, which specialized in viticulture). Christopher E. Guthrie’s book, thirty years in the making, and based on extensive archival research as well as a wide reading of contemporary and secondary sources, is obviously highly specialized, yet it will be of considerable interest to many students of nineteenth-century European history (going beyond French specialists)—especially those focused on urban and/or social history, on the growth of political opposition, and the emergence of “civil society”—and/or to those lacking the ability to access specialized studies, which usually only appear in European languages.

Although it would have benefited from a short summary rather than simply abruptly ending, Guthrie’s work is an excellent example of the “bottom-up” school of historiography, and succeeds in demonstrating how national French political developments were reflected in the Narbonnais over a forty-year period. Thus, just as the February 1848 Revolution led to a well-documented explosion of newspapers and political clubs in Paris, it witnessed similar developments in the Narbonne region, followed there, as elsewhere, by a crackdown on the press, political association, and electoral freedoms after the election of Louis Napoleon Bonaparte as French president in late 1848 (thus, the 1850 electoral law, which disenfranchised a large percentage of voters nationally, deprived 1,500 out of 3,800 formerly enrolled Narbonne residents of the suffrage).

The book is especially good in giving vivid examples of the inventiveness of opposition groups in expressing their views during the frequent French periods of severe repression, instances similar to those witnessed in many other European regimes during the nineteenth century, including in Vormärz and Bismarckian Germany, czarist Russia, and Italy before unification. Thus, as was common elsewhere when freedom of assembly was highly restricted, during periods of
intense repression French militants turned the funerals of republicans into political demonstrations, complete with speeches, red scarves, and cries of “Vive la République!” Officials closed all Narbonne cafés in 1837 on learning that they were being used as the sites for political meetings, and during the post-1848 general political crackdown, Narbonne republicans expressed their views of the newly elected President Louis Napoleon during Carnival celebrations by including in the traditional Mardi Gras parade a float that featured a mannequin in Napoleonic dress riding backwards on an ass (eventually the authorities banned all celebrations of Carnival to avoid such demonstrations, along with the singing of democratic songs and displays of red flags and the Phrygian cap).

University of Michigan at Ann Arbor


The interests, accomplishments, and significance of William Ewart Gladstone [1809–1898], four-time British prime minister, are so extensive and varied that no one study can capture the whole. Hence, the large genre of “Gladstone and” studies. This study describes the statesman’s relationships with his mother, sisters, wife, and daughters, and with aristocratic ladies, prostitutes, courtesans, an alleged spy, and Queen Victoria.

On the last page, Anne Isba declares that Gladstone’s attitude toward women “encapsulated one of the nineteenth century’s major anxieties”: in an age of rapid change he exemplified medieval values “in a lifetime’s campaign to celebrate the virtue of honorable women; or, where their virtue seemed threatened by prostitution, opium, or simple feminine weakness, to do his best to save them” (212). But Isba does not argue these claims or explore the significance of this thesis with respect to either Gladstone himself or Victorian society in general. Rather, drawing heavily on (and often quoting in extensio) family correspondence and the published diaries, Isba provides a succession of narrative miniatures of Gladstone’s sundry and mostly well-known involvements with women.

At points, Isba states that Gladstone acted in a medieval chivalric mode, but adduces no evidence that, consciously or unconsciously, he actually held such values. The quoted material makes clear Gladstone’s strong and complex (and very nineteenth-century) religiosity, but the book does not probe the theological and doctrinal influences on his views of women. Isba also makes no attempt to assess what Gladstone may have learned from his various relationships with women, or how these relationships influenced one another. There are no
comparisons with his male affective associations. The book’s case-by-case organization (rather than, say, a more chronological approach juxtaposing the multiple interactions of a given period) impedes deeper understanding of the topic. Moreover, it is difficult to make any sense of Gladstone, who appears variously as reverent (toward his pious, invalid mother), overbearing (with his troubled sister, Helen), quixotic (toward the wayward Lady Lincoln), zealous (about prostitutes), and bewitched (by the ex-courtesan Laura Thistlewaite). Isba’s own sympathies one way or another can be intrusive, and in places cause her account to lack balance (e.g., she is highly critical of Gladstone’s treatment of the opium-addicted Helen, but she does not consider the devastating dilemmas families must face when loved ones suffer long-term drug dependency).

This study offers only superficial contextualization for Gladstone’s experiences with women and therefore sheds little light on Victorian society, politics, religion, and sex. There is no serious engagement with the robust historiography in these areas, or even with studies of Gladstone. Those expecting a book with this title to draw on the insights of gender theory will be disappointed. At times disorganized and repetitious, the book also suffers from numerous editing and proofreading lapses. At many levels, therefore, this work does not realize the fascinating possibilities offered by its subject.

The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation

Joseph S. Meisel


Commerce builds prosperity and peace, this author informs readers at the start of his work, but it also generates inequalities and rivalries that simultaneously undermine its legitimacy and tempt dominant powers to abandon consensus building for imperialism. Such hegemonic reactions have rarely been sustainable, yet—as the title of this work suggests—they have an ancient pedigree and were famously the subject of investigation by both Adam Smith and Edward Gibbon in their 1776 seminal works. Although Smith focused on the “Wealth of Nations” and Gibbon on “The Rise and Fall of the Roman Empire,” each highlighted the dilemma facing Britain at the time of the American revolt. Harold James now seeks to examine the problems that are facing the aging postwar U.S. order.

In the case of the United States, James argues, the predicament is compounded by globalization. The greater complexity of contemporary human relations makes
it harder to generate trust and to avoid destabilizing inequalities or contain their consequences. New antisystemic alliances emerge rapidly and everywhere, even in the center.

These differences should alert readers to the limitations of historical comparisons. Rome drew its wealth from conquered territory around it. Britain never enjoyed the same hegemonic status, while the United States has relied much more on cultural and economic influence. Nonetheless, both Rome and Britain discovered limits to imperial sustainability, which brought war and what today we might call deglobalization.

Does history repeat itself? The question occupies James in his final chapters, where he examines the European Union as a possible nonimperial model based on values of solidarity and consensus. The EU has many weaknesses, not least its trade-off of efficiency for stability. Yet it does provide a mechanism by which an expanding group of states can reform and engender trust. With respect to external relations, this might not be so obvious, although James makes the case that a lumbering bureaucracy minimizes the risk of being regarded as an imperial threat. Whether such a bureaucracy is additionally able to contain the transition costs associated with globalization is less immediately certain, although again the EU’s focus on regional forms of identification does enable scope for greater community responsiveness than national priorities often allow.

Nonetheless, James argues that managing change in an increasingly interconnected world necessitates the development of strong global common values. Herein lies both the strength and weakness of James’s book: its strength is the argument that draws readers to this conclusion; its weakness, the actual identification of cross-cultural commonalities that might serve to constrain future violence and give coherence to an emerging new world order without recourse to imperialism, the very Roman predicament that is the subject of this work. For this reviewer at least, the book promised more than it delivered.

LaTrobe University

Robbie Robertson


The portraits of “Medici women” presented in this book are paintings of the mother, wife, and daughters of Cosimo I, as well as of two girls raised at his court, Giulia, the illegitimate daughter of his predecessor, Alessandro, and Dianora de Toledo, his wife’s niece. Gabrielle Langdon’s aim is “to approach the portraits as
documents of a specific court culture and to explore them in as many ways as their artistic and cultural contexts demand” (22). The emphasis throughout is on reading the portraits according to theories of the principles and purpose of portraiture current in the sixteenth century, not through theories current today. Particular attention is paid to the theme of “decorum,” the means by which the artist would convey to the viewer the status of the sitter in a manner appropriate to their sex, age, and rank in society.

Each chapter is devoted to the detailed description and analysis of one painting or a small group of paintings, some of them identified by Langdon for the first time as portraits of women associated with Cosimo. These include two portraits by Alessandro Allori that the author argues are of his daughter, Isabella de’ Medici, the wife of Paolo Giordano Orsini, and a miniature that Langdon argues is a depiction of Dianora de Toledo, who married his youngest son, Pietro. Both women were accused of marital infidelity and were murdered by their husbands or at their behest, and the author believes that the identities of the subjects of these portraits were forgotten because the disgraced women were subject to “damnatio memoriae.”

The interpretations offered of the significance of the pictures are elaborate and densely written. In particular, Agnolo Bronzino’s renowned portrait of Eleonora de Toledo with one of her sons, here identified as Giovanni, is laden with multiple meanings: as the depiction of a regent, with imperial associations; as an image of fecundity and chastity; as evoking identification with the “Virgin Mary as the Star of the Morning,” “the Madonna with the Christ Child,” and “enthroned on the sedes sapientiae”; as the “Apocalyptic Woman clothed with the Sun and Moon”; as “the goddess Diana,” “the goddess Juno,” as “the consort of Apollo,” as “Venus and her son Amor,” as “Petrarch’s Laura,” as “Earth and Water to Cosimo’s Fire and Sun,” as “Air to Cosimo’s Earth”; while the marshy landscape is viewed, inter alia, as an idealized rendering of Tuscany and a eulogy to beauty. This density of interpretation may be excessive to some tastes.

With so much emphasis on what the paintings were intended to convey, more consideration of who would actually have seen them would have been desirable. Emphasis on the political significance of some of the portraits is undermined by an inadequate grasp of the political realities of Cosimo’s position, especially of his difficulties in dealing with Charles V and Philip II. Nevertheless, there is much of value in this book—not least the excellent illustrations—for scholars interested in Renaissance portraiture and those interested in the Medici court.

University of Cambridge

Christine Shaw
June 1941: Hitler and Stalin. By John Lukacs. (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2006. Pp. x, 169. $15.00.)

In this short book, the author of numerous books on Hitler and World War II analyzes why Nazi Germany invaded the Soviet Union and why Stalin deluded himself into believing it would not. This is a good introduction for the student who knows little about the origins of what the Russians call the Great Patriotic War. John Lukacs captures the drama leading up to the German invasion on 22 June 1941, despite such quirky, baffling statements as this: “Yes, and no; or, rather, no; true, but not true enough” (138). What is most distinctive about the book is how forcefully Lukacs presents his views on the thinking and motives of Hitler and Stalin. In doing so, he is quick to make sweeping judgments without providing much support. His assessment of Stalin is based on a surprisingly limited number of secondary resources along with some Russian documents that were translated for him.

Lukacs correctly dismisses the notion that the German attack was to preempt Stalin’s own plans for a preventive strike. He also correctly argues that all the critical decisions in German–Soviet foreign relations, from the signing of the Nazi–Soviet Pact until the invasion, depended on Hitler and Stalin. More controversially, Lukacs argues they were not ideological fanatics, but rather calculating statesmen who respected one another.

As is commonly accepted, Lukacs argues that Hitler decided to invade the Soviet Union to knock Britain out of the war without having to cross the English Channel. After Russia was quickly defeated, Hitler believed Churchill would realize he had no choice but to make peace. But if that was Hitler’s primary objective, Lukacs needed to explain why Operation Barbarossa was planned as such a murderous war of annihilation. Stalin, for his part, is stereotypically portrayed as a compound of a “caucasian chieftain and a peasant tsar” (57). His disastrous failure to heed the steady stream of accurate warnings or the seemingly irrefutable evidence that Germany was preparing to launch a massive attack was based on his antipathy toward Britain and belief that Hitler would not risk a two-front war by attacking Russia before England was defeated. This intensely suspicious leader, who nonetheless trusted Hitler, viewed reports of the German buildup as a British plot to draw him into the war he was trying desperately to avoid, or at least delay.

After providing these sketches of the two dictators’ decisions, and Churchill’s and Roosevelt’s responses to them, the author examines the events of 22 June 1941, in Berlin, Moscow, London, and Washington. He concludes with a look at
what he considers “unintended consequences” of Hitler’s decision to invade the Soviet Union, such as the mass murdering of Jews, in which, according to Lukacs, Hitler showed little, if any, interest. After a mere 145 pages of text, Lukacs devotes an appendix to arguing that a recently published letter, in which Hitler assured Stalin he had no intention of invading, is a forgery.

Lukacs frequently and harshly criticizes the work of other historians. For example, Alan Bullocks’s one-thousand-page study of Hitler and of Stalin is dismissed as “useless.” But students engaged by Lukacs’s concise account should afterwards turn to works such as Bullocks’s for a more balanced view of the ideological and strategic elements in Hitler’s decision to attack the Soviet Union.

University of Texas, Austin

Charters Wynn


If books are to be judged by their power to transport the reader into other worlds and times, then this is a very good book, well worth the attention of serious scholars of many different interests and backgrounds. It is a collection of narratives about five men whose lives intersected briefly in the early to mid-1960s in connection with the environment that is poignantly called “the Western world’s most austere monastic order.” The book is fascinating and—in the way that powerful books should be—somewhat disturbing reading. It is disturbing in terms of what it reveals about the monastic life, about the Carthusian order, and about the particular community located at Parkminster in England in the 1960s.

The author draws on personal interviews, notes and journals, and other sources, and creatively integrates them so as to tell rather interesting stories. The organization of the book—with chronological chapter divisions and with section divisions within each chapter that follow each of the five men—is clear, logical, and easy to follow. Although the reviewer thinks better care is needed to be taken to help the reader follow the name changes that are characteristic of monastic societies, the overall clear organization and clarity of presentation of the book generally holds up. The writing itself is a reader’s gift; it is crisp, simple, straightforward, and vivid. Perhaps even beyond the intentions of the author, the book transports readers into other worlds and to other times: that other time that the author intended to make vivid is the monastery; the world the monastery claimed to keep alive is the eleventh-century world of the founder figure of the Carthusian
order, Bruno of Cologne. This dynamic makes the book all the more fascinating as it throws light on what history is in its most basic and fundamental terms: storytelling and performance. The author tells the stories of those who, through their ascetical performances and structured hourly observances, continuously recreate another world.

As much as the reader can appreciate, and even find riveting, the clear and vivid storytelling of this book, as much as the reader might be transported to other fascinating times and places, along the way the reader expects from the transporting agent some assistance with translation or perspective as well as a way back. Although the author does provide in some places needed pertinent historical background (regarding the Carthusian order and regarding the backgrounds of the five men whose stories are told), what is missing is some larger critical perspective that might provide the reader clues about how the author herself understands and would like the reader to understand the experiences of the five men and the larger complex phenomenon—the monastic life—behind their experiences. Taking into consideration the lives of those who “made it to the top of the mountain,” and those who did not, what does it mean? What is the history of consequences—for monastic culture and for all of us—when the significant moments (civil rights, wars, space exploration, and so forth) shared by large segments of humanity are missed by persons who orient themselves so intensely to the daily and hourly performances and regimens of a spatially and psychically other world? How does one name and judge the history of the effects of such a phenomenon? Readers are not given direct answers to or perspective on these questions. However, this reviewer thinks the richest clues and insights are to be found, not in ascetical theology or in philosophy, but in circling back to and excavating what readers are given in this book: stories. Because of what it sets in motion for important excavation work, the reviewer recommends this fascinating book with enthusiasm.

Claremont Graduate University

Vincent L. Wimbush


Fascination with the Roman Empire, and especially with its early decades, shows no sign of abating. This is perhaps not surprising. As Philip Matyszak observes, the popular caricature of the empire after Augustus is of a Rome ruled by “a sexual degenerate [Tiberius], a raving lunatic [Caligula], a dribbling idiot
[Claudius] and a murderous tyrant [Nero].” Unfortunately, there is a belief that a nonspecialist book on this colorful first dynasty, the Julio-Claudians, can almost write itself. Nothing could be further from the truth. This is a particularly intractable period of history. The information passed down from the ancient sources is rife with overt or, more dangerously, latent hostility, enriched by a good supply of injudicious nonsense. It is no easy task for the scholar to strike the right balance between skepticism and credulity, and to present the results to general readers in a way that instructs without overwhelming. It is a task in which Matyszak acquits himself admirably; Sons of Caesar is a highly readable and informative narrative of the first dynasty of the empire, from its origins under Julius Caesar down to the death of Nero. Matyszak is unashamedly biographical in his approach, a methodology scorned by some historians, but absolutely right for this period, where the emperors did shape history in line with their own personal prejudices.

Family is an important theme of this book, and Matyszak accordingly devotes an introductory chapter to the peculiar nature of the family within the Roman social system and to the two families that make up the Julio-Claudian clan: the Julians, descendants of the founder of the Roman nation, Aeneas, and the Claudians, relative latecomers and the descendants of Sabine immigrants. Matyszak believes that the Roman Republic was hijacked by the Julio-Claudians. This happened because the Republic was essentially aristocratic in its ethos, but the senatorial classes showed themselves to be corrupt and self-serving, and there was consequently no popular will to sustain the old system when it was threatened. The ruthlessness of Caesar, the man who started the process, is brought out. Augustus was no less a military dictator than Caesar, but he was a skilled and tactful politician, who created an illusion of freedom while he destroyed his enemies or made them his friends, and left no place for opposition to coalesce. None of Augustus’s successors could match his skills.

The portrait of the era is essentially a negative one, but for all its faults, Matyszak points out, much of the imperial legacy was positive. The benefits were felt mainly outside Rome. During the Republic, the Roman provinces were subjected to war and exploitation. The coming of the imperial system meant that the overseas empire was no longer the arena for rival aristocrats, and the emperors checked the exploitation of the aristocratic governors. It laid the groundwork for the second century, deemed, by Edward Gibbon, the happiest period of human history.

University of British Columbia

Anthony A. Barrett

This useful study analyzes how the Labour Party’s attempt after 1918 to move from its infancy as an essentially working-class movement to a party of mass membership based on a broader constituency was reflected in the political affiliations and voting patterns of industrial Manchester. On the whole, the project reflected in the new 1918 constitution of the party had only modest success by 1931. Both Arthur Henderson and Ramsay MacDonald, however much they may otherwise have differed, envisioned a network of local parties based on individual memberships and dedicated to the promotion of a moderate “socialism” that looked to the interests of a more diverse community than the working-class supporters of the Labour Party’s early years. Declan McHugh explores the reasons for the mixed results of the initiative by looking closely at the experience of the various political divisions in the greater Manchester-Salford area.

He breaks down the area’s residential divisions into three main types. In the first, where skilled labor and strong unions predominated, there was tension between the “labourism”—emphasis on working-class bread-and-butter issues—of the party’s origins and the broader vision of party leaders. Interestingly, direct party membership appears to have been stronger among these trade unionists than among other groups, but membership for the most part did not imply any strong degree of political activism.

Divisional parties in those areas in which business people and professionals were more or less concentrated suffered from lack of funds, often associated with the absence of union branches in the area. The 1929 General Election revealed that Labour had made some progress in these divisions, much of which was negated by Labour’s disastrous collapse in the aftermath of its 1931 difficulties.

Progress was also made in those areas in which the proportion of unskilled, lower-paid workers was high. In the early 1920s, political indifference was high, and voting choices were heavily Conservative. That pattern began to change around 1925, but in general, although membership in the Labour Party had increased in all of the political divisions, there were still relatively few party members, outside the unionized working class, who were seriously motivated to become involved in promoting the “socialist” vision of the political activists. Although many commentators have criticized Labour’s “excessive” dependence on trade union support in the period before World War I, McHugh makes it clear that in the circumstances of the time, Labour could not have developed its party
organization without the involvement of the trade unions. The latter often helped create the local parties, which helped transform the Labour Party from a trade union pressure group into a genuinely national political party. Labour and the City makes clear how complicated and difficult that process actually was.

University of Cincinnati

Henry R. Winkler


In this thorough and well-written book, the author records the curious and complex intersections between Napoleon and the City of Rome from the general’s first Italian invasion to the end of his revived empire. The subject is one that cuts across a host of disciplines, and the author’s breadth of treatment should appeal to a variety of readers, including the specialist and the simply curious. Those interested in the history of the papacy and those with a special interest in the foreign policy of revolutionary and imperial France are the most obvious audience, but the author also addresses issues that urbanists and social historians will appreciate.

Although eighteenth-century Rome may have been the center of world Catholicism, it was in many ways a hateful place to live or even visit. Hector Berlioz, a fellow of the French Academy, found it dreary and listless. He thought that a good complement of British entrepreneurs might be just the thing to get it moving. Those who lived in the Holy City may well have been depressed by their community, and they were certainly repressed by the Catholic leadership. Ruling as a secular monarch, the pope combined a tyrant’s control of political life with a confessor’s intolerance of deviance in action or thought. The great philosophical topics of the eighteenth century, which were the common conversation of London, Paris, and Venice, found no welcome in Rome. Art, literature, and music all passed Rome by or entered it only through the needle’s eye of reactionary censorship. For the Jews, of course, confined to an overcrowded ghetto on the Tiber’s banks, breasting the currents of official intolerance was a constant challenge and a constant drain.

Rather than an analyst or theoretician, Susan Vandiver Nicassio is a careful chronicler of the history of the brief collision between this reactionary regime in its provincial capital and the most dynamic social force of the late eighteenth century. The results of this abrupt intersection in the first instance are meager. French sanitary engineers encouraged the transfer of corpses from in-town burial sites to a new cemetery on the periphery. On the negative side, Napoleon’s forces
seized an enormous wealth of artwork and manuscripts to be shipped to Paris where the national collections were already growing beyond the limits of the Louvre Palace.

In the long term, the revolutionary approach to the Church and its property guided the Italian nationalists who finally succeeded in uniting the peninsula under a single government in 1870. The expropriation of Church property not in immediate service to the people carried out by the unifiers was a close copy of the French expropriations of 1790. The conflict this provoked between the Vatican and the government of Italy was not finally resolved until 1929, which makes it probably the longest standing legacy of the brief French presence in Rome.

University of Georgia  
James H. S. McGregor


Over the last forty years, studies of the impact of the various Reformations in Europe have shifted from general overviews, to microhistories, to large-scale comparative works, but this time with a greater sense of common themes that link very disparate movements. One such volume, _Religion and Cultural Exchange in Europe, 1400–1700_, edited by Heinz Schilling and the late István György Tóth, offers a fascinating set of seventeen contributions, each articulating different aspects of the ways in which clergy and laypeople sought to transmit their core beliefs throughout this seminal era. According to the introductory essay by William Monter, the impetus for the volume arose out of the sense that twenty-first-century Europe is facing some of the same issues over confessionalism and religious toleration as did the populations in sixteenth-century Europe, and that religion was one of the key cultural forces shaping European history up to the eighteenth century.

The volume of essays seeks to consider the cultural impact of religion in the early modern European context, to help explain in what ways confessional allegiances decisively shaped societies in Europe at the time. Cultural exchange is defined very broadly, including papal funeral rites (Maria Antonietta Visceglia), church architecture (Heinz Schilling), bishops’ solemn entrances into their cities (José Pedro Paiva), and the work of missionaries in the multiple confessional communities of Eastern Europe (Martin Elbel). Contributors consider cultural transmission through print and various forms of manuscript writing (Ian Green, Stephan Ehrenpreis, and Mark Greengrass) and oral communication (Green,
Ehrenpreis, and Guido Marnef). One particular geographical area of interest featured in the volume is Eastern Europe, because of the intersecting confessional, linguistic, and ethnic communities whose interactions reveal a great deal about cultural communication in the early modern period. Given the continuing lack of much secondary literature in English on Eastern Europe during the Reformation era, this focus is most welcome.

The book is divided into sections, most of which have their own introduction. The volume includes a number of illustrations and a few maps. A map with early modern political borders would have been helpful, especially for readers unfamiliar with the political geography of central and Eastern Europe at the time. Each essay is written by an expert in the field, who lays out the key issues of his or her contribution in a compact yet very accessible fashion. Although volumes of collected essays can sometimes seem very haphazard, this one is commendably organized, with strong thematic links between the various contributions. This volume is one of four in a larger series on cultural exchange in early modern Europe, but this one on its own is well worth reading, for well-informed general readers, graduate students, and scholars in the field.

*Calvin College*  
Karin Maag


Ramsay MacDonald formed Britain’s first Labour government in January 1924. It did not have a parliamentary majority; indeed, Labour was not even the largest party in the House of Commons. However, the largest party (the Conservatives) could not secure a parliamentary majority for their protariff program. So Labour was able to form an administration that governed on the sufferance of the Liberals, who held the balance of power. Not entirely surprisingly, given this weak parliamentary base, the government only lasted for nine months; even so, it has not really had the scholarly attention it deserves.

The only previous monograph was published in 1957 by the American scholar R. W. Lyman. His was a fine effort, which stood the test of time unusually well, but he had no access to public records or the papers of most of the politicians involved, and his volume has needed to be replaced for some time. John Shepherd, biographer of George Lansbury, and Keith Laybourn, author of many works on aspects of the history of the Labour Party (not least in West Yorkshire), have produced a volume that is a solid successor to that of Lyman. Carefully related to
the current state of the historiography, and based on extensive research on a wide range of archival collections, the volume offers a detailed account of its subject. A useful first chapter outlines Labour’s development from its formation in 1900 to the 1923 general election. This is followed by two chapters on Labour’s move into office. Chapters on the parliamentary position, domestic policy, and foreign policy follow. The final chapters look at the government’s downfall, particularly in relation to the Campbell Case and Zinoviev Letter, and the political aftermath. The authors conclude that Labour’s first spell in office was an important stage in the party’s development, particularly in dispatching any threat of a Liberal revival. The government had achievements to its name: these included, as every student essay on the subject would tell us, not only the Wheatley Housing Act, but also the pacification of Europe after the traumas of 1923. On the other hand, in areas like economic policy, the empire, and Home Office affairs, there was a good deal of continuity with previous and succeeding governments. There are also some intelligent comments about the ways in which the involvement of Communism—at home and abroad—in the fall of the government helped to ensure the exclusion of Communists from the Labour Party after 1924. At the end of the day, the party leadership was able to use the excuse of the government’s weak parliamentary position to excuse their failings in office, but, as the authors show, these were failings that would probably have manifested themselves in any case. Overall, the verdict is broadly positive; at the same time, however, it is noted that there were warning signs that a future Labour government might not get away with similar failings again.

There is little in any of this to which the reader can take serious exception—indeed, if there is an overarching criticism of the book, it is that in many ways it is rather predictable in its approach and conclusions. There are also a few places where more careful editing would have improved the flow of the book, as with the repetition of the references to Lord Haldane’s home at Cloan; and there are odd errors, such as calling the Duke of Devonshire “Lord Devonshire” (51–52, 147). Nonetheless, this is a very serviceable account, and will probably stand as the standard work on its subject for some years to come.

University of Exeter

Andrew Thorpe


This is a small book about a large life, or more specifically, about arguably the most famous death and memorialization of the Victorian era—that of the Duke of
Wellington, who passed away at age eighty-three in September 1852. No expense, superlative or gimmick, was spared at the duke’s funeral at St. Paul’s Cathedral in London two months later, and during the following decade, many monuments to the most celebrated soldier-politician of his age were erected in the principal cities of the United Kingdom and as far afield as India. Peter W. Sinnema recounts and interprets the iconic status of Wellington’s life and death, as well as his legacy across the Victorian era, arguing that Wellington’s demise came at a particularly significant moment in the shaping of ideas about national character.

First, he shows that at a time of international rivalry—nowhere better exemplified than in the Crystal Palace Exhibition of 1851—Wellington provided a reminder of a heroic era when British values conquered Europe. Second, he describes how Wellington’s perceived personality traits—self-discipline, frugality, and bravery—fed an emergent “muscular Christianity” of the type celebrated in Hughes’s *Tom Brown’s Schooldays*. Although Sinnema’s is not the first account of Wellington’s immortalization—there are fine studies already of the duke’s funeral by Harry Garlick, Cornelia Pearsall, and John Wolfe—Sinnema is particularly good on newspaper coverage of the event (especially in the illustrated press) and on the commodification that accompanied the national mourning (what Charles Dickens famously called the “trade in death”). Sinnema also shows the limits to the general mood of back-slapping bereavement: Irish reactions were muted at best, and mostly negative.

However, it has to be said that for all its pace and interesting conjectures, this book represents a missed opportunity. Readers are told nothing more than is already known about the role of Lord Derby and Prince Albert in the choreography of the funeral, despite the abundant untapped archival material that is available. There is no sustained analysis of the literally hundreds of sermons up and down the land and across the empire that took the duke’s death as their subject. And the curious and revealing history of all the statues and memorials that were erected to honor Wellington—in his own lifetime and posthumously—is not related, except for the amusing story of the removal of the equestrian statue at Hyde Park Corner in 1883.

Elsewhere, the author does not seem at all sure-footed. Tennyson and Russell are elevated to the peerage a generation too early in each case. Walmer Castle, home to Wellington’s famous deathbed scene, is located in the wrong county (Essex, not Kent). And the reliance on work on the subject of “Englishness,” which is twenty years old, is simply lazy. No comparisons are offered with other great nineteenth-century deaths: Sir Robert Peel’s death two years earlier would have been salutary, as would some discussion of the cult of Napoleon, now the
subject of a major study. For these reasons, this book complements but by no means replaces the existing scholarship on the subject.

*Miles Taylor*

*University of York*


The author of this study relishes the scene she sets when Alfred Rosenberg, the Nazi grandee from Berlin, came to little Buchau in Württemberg in the year 1937. Before he was scheduled to speak, Alois Wieder took his dung cart, “with its leaky barrel of liquid manure,” and drove across the tidy, decorated market place (351). For Jill Stephenson, this sort of pluck represents “a kind of guerilla warfare” in which local communities “persistently undermined” Nazi policies (10). The dribble of manure traced the gulf between “the Nazi obsession with cleanliness and hygiene” and the dirtiness of unmechanized farming, between the ideology of “blood and soil” and the reality of rural enterprise (351). Indeed, Stephenson quite plausibly argues, National Socialism was an overwhelmingly urban movement that strove to protect urban, working-class interests, not least in order to avoid a repeat of the alleged “stab in the back” of November 1918. As a result, the Nazis ended up colliding with the interests and expectations of rural Württembergers, who resented the interference, bureaucratic regulation, and price-fixing of party and government officials.

There was no coherent political resistance to National Socialism, Stephenson acknowledges, but she emphasizes the degree to which National Socialism never really laid down roots in rural Württemberg. This was a region still governed by traditional mores and practices. In her precincts, most farmers and artisans did not actively support National Socialism. Moreover, Stephenson is attentive to the fact that most Germans suffered during the war. She discusses horrors the Nazis perpetrated and insists there was little reason for Württembergers to stick with the Nazis who first took their men, then their horses, and finally their shoes and church bells. Ultimately, Stephenson wants to lay the foundations for an overall argument that bucks the current historiographical tendency to measure support for the Nazis much more generously.

However, to make her argument, Stephenson ends up retreating to more and more isolated communities. She has little to say about Stuttgart or its surrounding industrial suburbs, and even leaves the towns behind in the effort to reach the unalloyed tradition of village and hamlet. But even there the problems of modernity had intruded, as the biggest problem facing Württemberg’s small farmers was
the absence of young people to work their fields and stalls. Throughout this period, men and women were drawn to the city, to its entertainments, in short, to the opportunities the Nazis claimed to oversee and guard. In other words, large parts of the story of rural Württemberg are missing in Stephenson’s account. The lack of enthusiasm cut both ways, withholding support from the Nazis in Stephenson’s villages, but also emptying those same places.

Stephenson’s consideration of Nazism in terms of the conflict between rural precinct and urban neighborhood is extremely useful, and her discussion of the local men who left during the war and of the conscripted foreign workers, prisoners of war, and refugees from bombed-out north German cities who took their places is compelling and dramatic. Her narrative account of the hardships of 1943–1945 is unparalleled. But the larger assessment of how Germans encountered Nazism is incomplete. From Stephenson’s vantage point in the village, the Nazis are easily, but unconvincingly, plotted as outsiders. Yet they had to come from somewhere. Action and motivation are also endlessly qualified or else argued out in an utterly uninformative way. For example, Stephenson concludes that “there were constraints which set limits to the extent to which the new party elites could wield effective power” (85). Finally, Stephenson says little about the nature of her evidence, which is drawn heavily from party and police files that are littered with incidents such as Wieder’s drive across the market square. Stephenson passes these along, but does not adequately evaluate or weigh them. Indeed, the perspective of Jewish victims or forced laborers or prisoners of war might have led Stephenson in different directions. For them, Stephenson’s half-empty glass looked at least half-full.

_University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign_  
Peter Fritzsche

_The Admiral’s Secret Weapon: Lord Dundonald and the Origins of Chemical Warfare._  
By Charles Stephenson. (Rochester, N.Y.: Boydell Press, 2006. Pp. 179. $47.95.)

Admiral Thomas Cochrane, the tenth Earl of Dundonald, was a larger-than-life character whose colorful story has helped inspire fictional characters such as Horatio Hornblower and is already the subject of a number of biographies. Charles Stephenson’s study is a curious book that takes a different slant on Dundonald by focusing on his role as a chemical warfare innovator. This story is also reasonably well known among chemical warfare enthusiasts, but it has not been before this the subject of a focused work.

What makes this book so curious is the inaccuracy of its assertion that the origins of chemical warfare lies with Dundonald. Stephenson is convinced, but the
reader will not be so sure. The key threshold that the author overlooks is that Dundonald never actually engaged in chemical warfare. On more than one occasion he did advance detailed plans for the seizure of coastal fortresses through the discharge of noxious and poisonous vapors, yet the Royal Navy never undertook even a test run of his proposals, not to mention an actual attack. In fact, Dundonald’s ideas never advanced beyond the level of a well-argued report. Given this, it is unclear how influential a legacy Dundonald left for the chemical innovators of the First World War, and this reviewer must conclude that the title of “father of chemical warfare” still belongs to Fritz Haber.

It is unfortunate, too, that Stephenson’s style weakens his narrative. The author is a believer in the block quote, and some of these extend for more than a page. Although some might consider this a minor quibble, the effect is that Stephenson relies on his sources to do his speaking and provides little interpretation of his own. It would have been beneficial if the author had provided more of his own ideas and insights, and had challenged his sources. Instead, Stephenson remains silent and is content to orchestrate the voices of others. The book is also remarkably slender. The main event is over after ninety-one pages, and the final three chapters, although amusing, are little more than filler.

Even with these criticisms, however, The Admiral’s Secret Weapon does have value and is worth reading. How armed forces innovate, or fail to do so, is a question of some importance, for both historians and military professionals. Dundonald was a maverick who advanced his ideas against considerable institutional resistance. It is admirable that he got as far as he did, even if he was unsuccessful, and his perseverance contains lessons for present-day innovators. Maritime scholars will also find Dundonald’s ideas on sea warfare of interest.

Despite its problems, The Admiral’s Secret Weapon offers compelling reading. It is fast paced, well illustrated with maps and drawings, and offers insight into an obscure yet interesting aspect of the development of chemical warfare.

Land Warfare Studies Centre

Albert Palazzo


Those who know Jerome principally through his letters and his infamous polemics—and the two categories often overlap—will find it rewarding to turn to this new volume on Jerome and the culture of learning. This author provides fresh perspectives on the great controversialist’s place in the history of Christianity and monasticism, incidentally taking in the history of material culture in the shape of
book production in late antiquity. Megan Hale Williams’s thesis is intelligent and frequently persuasive. Although historians have long been conscious of the tension between elite classical culture and Christian asceticism postulated in Jerome’s own writings, Williams brings a sharp eye to bear on his claims and seeks to move beyond them to reflect on the reality—insofar as it is possible to establish this—of his life and achievements.

At the heart of her argument lies the insight that Jerome’s devotion to what he called the *Hebraica veritas*, or “Hebrew truth,” was aimed at distracting attention from the contradictions in his own behavior and lifestyle. Having set himself up as an exegete, Jerome “abased himself” before many of the authorities on whom he relied; but such parades of ascetic humility could not alone mask the contradictions implied by the monstrous expense of the libraries needed for his task. By presenting Hebrew as lacking in aesthetic refinement, and by emphasizing his Hebrew studies, Jerome could frame his potentially high-cost activities in textual research as a form of ascetic self-mortification. One of the greatest pleasures in reading Williams’s book was to find, in its first chapter, an intriguing demolition of Jerome’s later claims that he had begun to study Hebrew in the 370s as a means of suppressing his carnal desires.

Williams also seeks to explain Jerome’s intellectual legacy to the monastic world. She believes his attempts to marry the ascetic rigor of monasticism with his extensive textual and exegetical activity bore little fruit. He seems to have made no effort to train a successor as head of his Bethlehem monastery, and he shared his studies of Hebrew apparently only with his patient—sometimes too patient—female patrons, Marcella, Paula, Blesilla, and Eustochium. She argues that he left no legacy outside his own writings and that he had no intellectual offspring in the next generation—the later Roman Empire would have to await the work of Cassiodorus in the sixth century before it saw a marriage between monasticism and the library on the sort of scale that Jerome had hoped to achieve.

On the one hand, it is not surprising to find that Jerome was so self-centered, but on the other there were other parts of this analysis that this reviewer found a little less than convincing. Origenist monasticism may (should?) have rejected classical learning and the *de luxe codex*, but the basis of its contemplative work was nevertheless the text. Benedict is unlikely to have thought in terms of a marriage between textual research and the cenobium, and there may have been more similarities between Jerome and some Western monastic developments in the century or so between his death and the establishment of Vivarium than Williams recognizes. Nevertheless, the author has greatly increased readers’ understanding not only of Jerome, but also of the nature of the Biblical commentary itself. She
should be congratulated on providing readers with an intelligent, highly readable, and thought-provoking book.

*University of Glasgow*  
Marilyn Dunn

**GENERAL, COMPARATIVE, HISTORIOGRAPHICAL**


Readers whose shelves have filled in the last decade with books on the history of second-wave feminism will want to make room for this author’s sophisticated and detailed study of flight attendants. Kathleen M. Barry argues that the gender and racial notions that ordered the working world of these glamorous icons of femininity resonated in American society and culture generally as their “wages of glamour” legitimized the still-popular notion that women’s paid labor was somehow not real work. The reality, Barry shows, was that, behind the façade of an adventure-filled and carefree lifestyle, the all-white flight attendant workforce faced heavy regulations, including marriage and age restrictions that ended their employment at the age of thirty-two.

One of the many strengths of Barry’s book is the incorporation of the history of technology into her social and cultural analysis. With the arrival of passenger jet aircraft in the late 1950s, for example, the shape and character of flight attendant labor changed dramatically. Crews worked on larger planes, with more passengers, and on longer flights. Their work became “taylorized.” At the same time, flying became safer and more routine. Airline executives sought new ways to address perceived passenger boredom in an increasingly competitive market. Their solution was to transform flight attendants from “surrogate wives” into “sexpots.” The “hypersexualization of airline marketing” manifested itself in the form of advertising campaigns such as National Airline’s notorious “Fly Me” message, provocative uniforms, and inebriated male passengers who believed flight attendants to be promiscuous (176). In confronting these challenges, flight attendants found themselves at the center of cultural and sexual politics in the 1960s and 1970s.

Barry portrays these women workers as subjects, not objects, of their history. Their activism in the labor movement and feminist organizations is especially impressive given the geographically dispersed and highly mobile nature of the workforce. They were hobbled by hostile or indifferent male labor leaders who did not address their grievances sufficiently. Flight attendants were frustrated by
the limited effectiveness of antidiscrimination laws such as Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 in addressing inequality in the areas of age, weight, and pregnancy policies. A small group of women formed “Stewardesses for Women’s Rights” in order to publicize their plight. Their eventual successes in the courtroom, and in establishing more autonomy in the labor movement, came as the process of deregulation of the airline industry beginning in the late 1970s threatened their ongoing efforts to shore up their identity as safety professionals.

Readers will learn much from this deeply researched book, but they may come away wishing the author had explored the class or union consciousness of flight attendants. Barry contends that, at least in the early years of union affiliation, they avoided identifying themselves as working-class; by the 1980s they emerged as a vocal, sometimes militant, segment of the labor movement. For all of her discussion of organizational changes and workplace issues, however, Barry includes little about how these women thought of themselves in relation to other workers and whether they created a unique flight attendant union culture to defend themselves in an increasingly antiunion climate.

Franklin & Marshall College

Dennis A. Deslippe


The author of this book is a journalist with long stints at the *Far Eastern Economic Review* and *Asian Wall Street Journal Weekly* to his credit. During the 1990s, globalization loomed large in his work. *Bound Together* is Nayan Chanda’s breezy account of the historical background of contemporary globalization.

Globalization, in Chanda’s view, is a long-term affair. He dates it from the migrations of *Homo sapiens* out of Africa, and he characterizes it as the result of “a basic human urge to seek a better and more fulfilling life” (xi). He argues that four groups of agents have driven the process of globalization: merchants, missionaries, travelers, and conquerors—the traders, preachers, adventurers, and warriors of his subtitle. The author devotes most of his chapters to the work of these globalizers—by surveying cross-cultural trade from Mesopotamian times to the twenty-first century, for example, or by discussing the work of pilgrims and missionaries from the early Buddhists to human rights advocates of the present day. In the last seventy-five pages (almost one-quarter of the book’s text) he focuses on contemporary globalization.
Chanda’s broad view of globalization is welcome, and he makes a contribution for popular audiences by emphasizing the significance of cross-cultural interactions and exchanges in premodern times. Professional historians, however, will wince at Chanda’s unsophisticated handling of historical issues. Beyond focusing on four broad groups of driving agents, Chanda offers no analysis of globalization. Is there a periodization for the history of globalization? Are there identifiable historical or social dynamics that have promoted globalization? Is it possible to identify historical processes such as migrations, biological exchanges, and technological diffusions that help to explain the course of globalization? On these and similar questions, Chanda is silent.

Even more troubling is Chanda’s insistence that globalization in earlier times was basically the same as globalization today. In leaving Africa, early *Homo sapien* migrants “walked to find a better life,” Assyrian merchants traded over long distances in hopes of building houses larger than those of their neighbors, and European mariners sought royal support for exploratory projects just like contemporary “entrepreneurs anxiously queuing for a meeting with investor ‘angels’ in Silicon Valley” (20, 40, 160). This unremitting assimilation of past to present has the effect of flattening cultural, social, and historical differences between past and present, and it serves to create a legitimizing genealogy for contemporary capitalist globalization. Chanda carefully distances himself from the inequities and excesses that contemporary globalization has generated, but his work sends the clear message, much like that of his journalist friend Thomas L. Friedman (who supplied a laudatory blurb for *Bound Together*), that globalization in its contemporary capitalist form is inevitable and irresistible. Chanda’s book offers vignettes from the history of globalization, but a deeper analysis of that history has yet to be written.

*University of Hawai’i*

Jerry H. Bentley


This is a collection of papers originally prepared for a conference held at the Shelby Cullom Davis Center at Princeton. The papers are quite diverse in their foci, their methodologies, and to some degree their quality. The editor summarizes:

The contributions to this volume draw on scholarly literature on race, class, consumerism, landscape studies, and the [human] body to deal with
such questions as the racial and class conflicts in urban public spaces; the cultural construction and control of public spaces by economic and government powers; and the idealization of cities as separate from nature. The methodology ... is syncretic, combining an interest in cultural history with urban and environmental historians’ long-standing focus on the material world ... [They explore] the intersection of cities and the natural environment from a variety of analytical perspectives, in an array of places, including New York, San Francisco, London, New Orleans, Venice, and Seattle, across a broad period from the seventeenth century to the present. (xiv)

All that is contained in less than two hundred pages. There are any number of interesting and provocative issues raised. What reader would not be morbidly interested in the environmental consequences of crematoria exhaust gases (Ellen Stroud) or chickens and plague in postearthquake San Francisco (Joanna Dyl)?

However, because the papers are so diverse in topic and methodology, they do not, as a volume, build any coherent theme or argument. Because they are so short, several draw broad conclusions beyond the limited evidence they present. They are more conclusion than case. For example, in Ari Kelman’s article on “New Orleans Phantom Slave Insurrection of 1853,” the author asserts at its end that “[p]eople, New Orleanians learned to their horror, could become public spaces, their bodies as subject to reworking, contestation, and negotiation as a community park, marketplace, or waterfront” (20). Perhaps, but that is a very broad conclusion far beyond the evidence actually presented in the paper.

Short papers written with diverse methodological foci also mean that each paper is presented without the benefit of either explicitly spelling out, or defending, the validity of its theoretical lens. In his paper on outdoor recreation in Seattle, Matthew Klingle can assert that “[o]ne side deployed the cultural power of leisure by producing particular spaces and cultivated particular behaviors to promote outdoor play. The other side deployed the cultural power of labor to delimit specific locales where they could literally consume nature to advance producers’ rights” (146). That may be the most potent explanation of the events it seeks to explicate, but that interpretation requires acceptance by faith rather than persuasion. In too many of the papers that is the case.

Specialists who have encountered the larger arguments, have seen more thorough presentations of more complete evidence, and have been participants in methodological debates may find the papers to be interesting embellishments.
Those seeking a solid examination of environmental history that can stand on its own will find this volume to be more a sample buffet than a satisfying meal. The whole is somewhat less than the sum of its parts.

Smith College

Randall Bartlett


The advent of the steam engine and the railroad in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries changed the world almost as dramatically as the birth of the Internet in the twentieth century. As with the Internet, the birth of the steam railroad was not without its challenges. The daunting task of converting steam power to locomotion and then developing an extensive system of railroad lines is the focus of Christopher McGowan’s work.

Early steam locomotives for the conveyance of commodities and passengers were developed in the beginning of the nineteenth century, but it was not until the late 1820s that these were brought into regular service. McGowan artfully recounts the events of October 1829, when five newly developed steam locomotives competed for the exclusive right to transport along Britain's new Liverpool to Manchester line. The competitors brought a variety of unique ideas in their trial engines. The placement of the boilers and the positioning of the flue tubes as well as the overall weight of the locomotives were all factors in the success of each participant. Some suffered serious mechanical failure and were unable to complete the trials. Among these was *Novelty*, an engine designed and built by Braithwaite and Erickson; failure of its boiler led to its withdrawal from the competition, even though the managers of the Liverpool to Manchester line declared that “it is the principle and arrangement of this . . . engine which will be followed in the construction of all future locomotives” (222). In the end, it was Robert Stephenson’s efficient and speedy *Rocket* that won the competition, reaching speeds well over twenty miles an hour without significant mechanical failure.

McGowan provides extensive detail regarding the development of each of the competing engines along with details of the rise of the steam engine on the horizon of England’s Industrial Revolution. Focusing the bulk of his work on the winners in the trial, McGowan provides moving biographies of George Stephenson and his son Robert as well as some of their closest friends and competitors. The book climaxes with a detailed account of the opening day of the world’s first passenger railway along with the untimely death of William Huskisson, a member of
parliament who was participating in the festivities along with the Duke of Wellington and other dignitaries. He was killed when he tripped and fell on the tracks and was struck by the *Rocket*.

More comprehensive diagrams might have augmented the scientific explanations and made detailed explanations less necessary. McGowan’s well-written book is, however, an excellent resource for those who want to know more about the developments that led to the creation of the first locomotives as well as the machinery and physics that made these early mechanical marvels work. This work will also be helpful to those who would like to learn more about the Stephensons and their rivals, from both a scientific and personal aspect.

*Parkland College*

Marsh Wilkinson Jones


An unabashed celebration of the Anglo-American “special relationship” with lip service to Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and the Anglophone Caribbean, this doorstop volume by *Sunday Telegraph* writer Andrew Roberts purports to pick up where Winston Churchill ended his multivolume *A History of the English-Speaking People*. The author proceeds chronologically, starting with the Boer War and ending with the “War on Terror,” arguing for continuity and partnership between British and American hegemons facing off against a series of antagonists, from Wilhelmine Germany to al-Q’aïda, “for the good of Civilization” (xi).

Addressing a popular rather than a scholarly audience, the author eschewed explicitly engaging the ongoing debate between Niall Ferguson and other apologists for Anglo-American neoimperialism and their critics, although he clearly supports the former. Despite the author’s apparent access to numerous prominent public figures from Henry Kissinger to the late Benazir Bhutto, an extensive bibliography, and even a smattering of archival research, the integrity of the scholarship is undermined by heavy reliance on nonstandard sources to support a series of dubious arguments. For example, the rather generous account of Britain’s role in the postemancipation Caribbean is based on a memoir by Colin Powell, without reference to key works such as Thomas Holt’s *The Problem of Freedom: Race, Labor and Politics in Jamaica and Britain, 1832–1938* (Johns Hopkins, 1992), while the highly debatable interpretation of the origins of the Cold War appears derived from a memoir and a letter to the *Times Literary Supplement*, again failing to address the abundant scholarship on this question (15, 387). This produces numerous risible interpretations, such as blaming high mortality rates in
Britain’s notoriously squalid concentration camps on Boer detainees’ use of home remedies (31). Likewise, the account of de-Nazification in chapter eleven appears ignorant of the fact that it was abortive at best.

The book degenerates rapidly into a self-parody of right-wing positions, defending, for example, the U.S. role in Vietnam, and characterizing the bombing of Cambodia as “perfectly justifiable” (179, 494). What the 1973 Chilean coup against Salvador Allende has to do with the English-speaking peoples is never explained, but several pages are devoted to defending it (501–504). Unsupported by conscientious engagement with the relevant scholarship, the book cannot be recommended either to novices, whom it would mislead, or to specialists, whom it would simply annoy.

Partial responsibility must lie with the press for failing to edit a meandering and undisciplined manuscript, or to obtain proper scholarly assessment of its content. It is a sad testament to the condition of our profession that this shoddy book has received widespread paperback distribution on both sides of the Atlantic.

University of Arizona
Laura Tabili


For the past thirty years, legal scholars, feminists, historians, literary critics, and philosophers have tried to make sense of the nature, function, and impact of pornography. Because pornography has largely been created for men, most interpretations have considered it in relationship to masculinity. Accounts that consider women’s relationships to pornography have largely considered women as subjects, objects, or victims of the materials. Clarissa Smith, in One for the Girls!, fights for women’s ability to speak for themselves about their relationships to such sexually explicit materials. Smith explores the recent phenomenon of pornography created for women. Smith uses For Women, a British pornographic magazine, launched in 1992, as a case study. Her examination focuses on the magazine’s heyday in the mid-1990s before Northern & Shell—the parent company—gutted content because of financial concerns.

To consider the magazine, Smith interviewed members of the publication staff, worked with print sources about the magazine’s launch, examined the magazine itself, and considered letters to the magazine. To develop a sense of readers’ reactions, Smith conducted a number of interviews via the post and in person. Although the number of readers with whom she spoke remained quite small,
Smith argues that their responses demonstrate readings that diverge from most scholars’ assessments.

Smith uses these interviews to show that readers have more complicated relationships to pornographic materials than generally acknowledged. Readers use the magazine to vent frustrations, to learn about others’ takes on sexuality, to get a sense of fairness regarding gender relations, to try to find a lost sexual self, and yes, to look for masturbatory materials. However, as Smith and the readers make clear, they do not arrive at the materials tabula rasa and they do not make simple-minded assessments of the materials—they come to the materials thinking about sexuality, power, gender, relationships, meanings; and they leave the materials satisfied, angered, interested, and hopeful. There is no moment of complete closure and there is no one final interpretation that stands above the others. This corrective matters more for pornography than most materials because pornography has been vilified as simple-minded masturbatory materials that appeal only to the most base and primal part of human nature.

Despite the strengths of the methodology, it will not be broadly applicable to historical studies. Interviews, follow-ups, and e-mail “question and answers” do not present a viable path forward in most historical case studies since few historians work with living informants. In some sense, although historians can appreciate this kind of work, the book is not a history—the book does not concern itself with the ways that women’s pornography changes over time or with the ways that meaning is formed in relationship to culture. Nonetheless, Smith’s work will provide historians with much to think about before approaching pornography and assuming that there are simplistic or singular ways to understand it.

DePaul University

Lisa Z. Sigel