
This study traces various traditions of feminist writing about women and nature. It begins by reviewing the ways in which, for many feminists “nature is a problematic terrain because of the historically entrenched discourses that bind us to nature.” Alaimo’s response is to pick out a diverse series of texts where, in different ways and in precise historical circumstances, women’s relationship with Nature is more imaginatively formulated. The book is made up of three sections: “Feminist Landscapes” in which Alaimo considers how Catherine Sedgwick, Sarah Orne Jewett and Mary Wilkins Freeman, and, finally, Mary Austin respond critically to the restraints of domesticity through envisioning, in different ways, women experiencing a close relation to nature; “Nature as Political Space” where Emma Goldman and some of the radical writers of the thirties are shown tackling debates about Woman’s nature within the birth-control and conservation movements; and “Feminism, Postmodernism, Environmentalism,” where Alaimo picks up a miscellany of contemporary texts to evoke the fragmentation and complexity of late twentieth-century negotiations, fictional and in the popular cultural sphere, of the meaning of Nature and, in particular, its relationship to sexuality and ethnicity.

As the above summary suggests, this is a resourceful investigation. In pursuit of her argument, Alaimo links writers with strands of contemporary thought in such a way as to break out of conventions of feminist criticism of their work, as in, for example, the discussion of Orne Jewett and Darwinism. At the same time, Alaimo’s very precise agenda allows us to look at particular episodes in, for example, Emma Goldman’s work, without becoming embroiled in the mass of the subject’s work. She is ingenious, too, in positioning her chosen writers as radically recasting nature as a feminist space, by setting their work against a mainstream of conventional thought. Particularly interesting in this context is Alaimo’s positioning of Mary Austin’s writing in the 1920s in relation to the reactionary rhetoric of female conservationists.

Having said this, the sweep of the book leaves contexts sketched rather than examined. The framing of writers within precise historical contexts is germane to Alaimo’s project, yet this seems sometimes to consist of a few very general statements about the period and a discussion of only the most conservative elements in the field in question. Against such a backdrop, Alaimo’s writers emerge as innovators, even in radical clothing; but one is left to reflect on
whether this positioning would survive a consideration less heavily weighted in their favour.

King Alfred’s College, Winchester


Labour history in the United States, no less than elsewhere, and some would argue a great deal more than elsewhere, is flourishing despite the struggles of trade unions to adjust to the changing work conditions of post-industrial societies. Jo Ann Argersinger’s study of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers’ Union (ACW) in Baltimore is testimony to one of the newer styles of labour history. She has produced a quasi-institutional history of an important union, but one which is enriched by a greater understanding of ethnicity and gender and by an ability to look beyond the minute books and papers of leading figures in the union. This is a culturally sensitive volume, but one which still retains the depth of scholarship that flourished in the early part of the twentieth century when academics had more time to bring their findings to fruition. It is particularly sensitive to the role of women, more than half of the workforce, who remained loyal despite continuing to be marginalised.

The men’s ready-made clothing industry has always been and still is a volatile, competitive and seasonal activity where manufacturers seek out the cheapest labour supply. At the turn of the twentieth century Baltimore was the third leading producer of men’s garments in the nation. Thus, in some ways, the history of the city’s industry and its main union illustrates national trends. Formed in 1914, the ACW aimed to organise all workers, regardless of skill, race, ethnicity, religion or gender. As much tailoring had become sewing undertaken by recent immigrants using new machines, it was of no avail for the clothing union to be limited to white male craft workers. Yet it adopted the “new unionism” of bringing law and order into the industry by promoting employer-co-operation. To ensure that small sweatshops with their appalling conditions were squeezed out of business the union co-operated with owners of larger factories offering better conditions. Yet the success of the ACW in Baltimore was brief. The Baltimore industry was badly hit by the 1920 post-war recession and manufacturers started establishing runaway shops in rural areas to avoid the union. Sweatshop conditions returned here, though elsewhere in the United States larger units remained and the ACW was able to retain a stronger foothold. Baltimore unionists continued to struggle into the 1930s. They managed to rebuild the union, but they “lost the industry.”

University of Nottingham

Margaret Walsh
I still have the pink flyer a young woman thrust into my hand several years ago. “You Don’t Have to be Jewish to Love Jesus” proclaims the hand-drawn banner, under which a cartoon figure waves an Israeli flag. “But It Helps!” trumps the punchline on the back. This intriguing blend of Judaism and Christianity forms the subject of Yaakov Ariel’s book, Evangelizing the Chosen People, an important new history of efforts to Christianize Jews in the USA.

Ariel locates the impetus to convert Jews to Christianity squarely within the pre-millennial dispensationalism that gained popularity among conservative evangelicals in the nineteenth century. In this messianic view, Jews play a crucial role in the End Times events through which God will establish his Kingdom—the Rapture of the true believers, the seven years of Tribulation and rise of Antichrist, and Christ’s return. During these events, Jews, God’s chosen people, will come to know Jesus as the true Savior and will ultimately serve as the “administrators and evangelists of the millennial era.” A crucial prerequisite further entangles Jews in this narrative, which states that God will not call his own to heaven until Israel stands as a nation. Reading this cosmic narrative into ongoing human history, dispensationalists have been encouraged that the End Times are imminent by such signs as the rise of Zionism, Jewish settlement in Palestine, and, of course, the establishment of Israel.

Within this ideological context, proselytizing among Jews has provided conservative Protestants a means of participating in divine history. Christian missions to Jews appeared in many US cities during the 1890s as Jewish immigrants from Eastern Europe settled within them, and, by 1910, forty-five missionary societies existed within the country. Their efforts were moderately successful, particularly among young men. Jewish converts to Christianity also promoted conversion, founding such organizations as the American Board of Missions to the Jews in the 1890s and its more widely known offspring, Jews for Jesus, in the 1960s. The latter illustrates the coalescing of a messianic Judaism embracing Jewish identity and traditions as well as dispensationalist Christian thought. This type of organization produced my pink leaflet.

Ariel’s thorough, well-researched account of the changing strategies employed by these missions over the course of the twentieth century is particularly helpful in its exploration of the multivalent relationships that existed between Protestant missionaries, converts, and the Jewish community. Although tensions existed, the extent to which these groups engaged each other is striking. Cooperation emerged in part because dispensationalist views of the seminal role Jews would play in the End Times mitigated the anti-Semitism growing within other Christian communities. In presenting this history, Ariel substantially furthers our understanding of Jewish–Christian relations.

*Macalester College*  
*Jeanne Halgren Kilde*
Committed as he is to the disruptive strategies and discontinuous forms practised by the avant-garde, Arnold Aronson begins this survey of experimental American theatre from the 1940s through to the 1990s by a trashing of narrative. Indeed, in one significant slippage, all narrative becomes fixed as “plodding time-bound narrative.” It is paradoxical, then, that, rather than emulating the avant-garde’s fractured structures or associative clusters, Aronson should choose for his own book the form of a linear, firmly plotted story. After some bizarre early pages in which he casts the exploration of American geography as the first avant-garde activity (Lewis and Clark as precursors of Stein, Cage, and later twentieth-century experimenters), he finds a narrower historical focus in the post-war period and vividly recounts the struggle of various practitioners and collectives to sustain a radical theatre in the USA. As in the stories Aronson mistrusts, there are major protagonists, significant enemies, internecine struggles (Robert Wilson’s formalist suspicion, say, of the ritualistic drama produced by the Open Theatre or the Performance Group). Underlying these historically contingent details, and motivating their selection and deployment, is a particular type of plot structure. For the narrative Aronson tells here is a precisely ironic one, a story of the progressive “mainstreaming of the avant-garde.” By the end of the book Wilson’s scenic designs have been appropriated by the furniture and fashion industries; deprived of their socially critical force, avant-garde strategies survive largely as styles open for use by consumerism.

Just as Aronson’s use of narrative to describe non-narrative kinds of theatre generates discontinuities, even tensions, so, too, the book raises problems of mimesis. Despite the detailed reconstruction of particular productions, the reader is perhaps more aware here than in surveys of mainstream theatre of disparities between print’s relative fixity and performance’s sheer fluidity. The body itself is crucial to much of the work Aronson describes, but can only be a ghostly presence in his own text. Similarly, given the close relationships he traces between avant-garde theatre and kinds of art such as minimalism, one might have hoped for more lavish – and coloured – illustration. Astutely, however, Aronson notes that even the most experimental artistic practice is now liable to domestication in the form of a coffee-table book. Thus the traditional narrative form and the visual austerity of his study may, in the end, still represent the least commodifying approach to these bold movements in American theatre.

Loughborough University

ANDREW DIX


Alan Bennett writes of his mother’s disapproval of Blackpool holidays (“people enjoying themselves”) contrasted with her approval of Grange (“enjoyment not
really on the agenda”). Aron’s study of American vacationing suggests transatlantic cultural similarities – but only to a point. American vacationers seek, she argues, to combine enjoyment with self-improvement, or rather need to present themselves, as her title indicates, as hard-working even when they play. In the nineteenth century vacationing was democratised: no longer the preserve of an elite minority, it became a “marker” of middle-class status, claimed as a privilege to which industriousness entitled them. Yet leisure was problematic, Aron claims, since middle-class ideology affirmed work as accountable for the success “not only of individuals … but of the nation itself.” She attributes such assumptions not only to Puritan “virtue” but also to the valorisation of self-reliance in the American psyche, both nationally as a founding principle of the Republic and individually as the work-ethic supporting the American Dream.

Part I explores how vacationers attempted to resolve tensions and contradictions in attitudes to work and play through structured leisure activities, which hid pleasure-seeking behind the disguising mask of opportunities for self-improvement. Part II explores early twentieth-century changes in vacation patterns as different classes and races accessed this white, middle-class “privilege.”

Aron’s prodigious research provides a wealth of insights; particularly illuminating are the disingenuous, often amusing and – one suspects – self-deceived comments of “hard-working” vacationers in diaries and letters. Argument-driven chapters are compelling: her analysis of tourism’s function as a means “to reaffirm connection to America’s past and validate belief in America’s future” is cogently developed. Yet, in other chapters, arguments (nineteenth-century resorts were “laboratories for contesting gender codes”; police “patrolled class as well as gender boundaries”) are frustratingly suspended in favour of admittedly engaging descriptive example. Aron thus misses opportunities to explore the wider significances of culturally transgressive liminal spaces such as the beach. Structurally, the text seems unbalanced: ending at 1940, two-thirds is devoted to the nineteenth century. This is regrettable, since Aron’s introductory and closing reflections on the “cultural work” of her own multigenerational family vacations, which also function as “exercises in self-definition,” are sufficiently insightful to leave this reader wanting more. Nonetheless, the careful detail of Aron’s work provides rich fare. She comments that many Americans, fearing the sin of idleness, take a “serious” book on vacation; her own work would constitute a stimulating addition to any self-improver’s vacation baggage.

University of Derby

JENNIFER ROBINSON


James Barrett has provided a gripping account of America’s most important radical of the first half of the twentieth century. Foster’s life is synonymous with the history of American socialism, syndicalism and communism. Barrett details the evolution of Foster from syndicalist to Communist, and analyses the continuities and differences involved in the process. But why another book on
Foster? It is only six years since Edward P. Johanningsmeier’s, *Forging American Communism: The Life of William Z. Foster* covered similar ground. Barrett started researching his book long before Johanningsmeier’s monograph appeared and, although not a rebuttal of the latter, there are differences in methodology and interpretation. To some extent Johanningsmeier tended to concentrate on the continuities between Foster’s syndicalism and his subsequent adherence to communism.

Barrett does not ignores the continuities; he relates how Foster, a former member of the Industrial Workers of the World, the most Americanised form of anarcho-syndicalism, in 1912, “introduced American workers to the purest form of syndicalism the nation had seen.” Foster is the most American of radicals, yet his conversion to communism raises issues that cannot be answered by stressing the continuity of his American radicalism. Historians, such as Theodore Draper, had no such problem, seeing the question of continuity as insignificant since, in his view, American Communists simply did the Comintern’s bidding. Maurice Isserman and Paul Buhle have contested this, arguing that indigenous American traditions and experiences remained paramount. Moscow was far away and its diktats could be ignored. American Communists could only be understood in, for the most part, the domestic context. In turn, they have been accused of writing a social history of American Communism with the communism removed.

Barrett takes an entirely different approach, arguing for a continuity between Foster’s radical American roots and his communism. However, he stresses the tension that existed between the former and the latter. The contradictions created by this tension are not solved with a false synthesis; instead he argues that at certain times disjuncture becomes key. It is this emphasis on disjuncture, with a greater emphasis on Foster’s communist ideology, that makes his biography very different to Johanningsmeier’s. For Barrett, as the Communist Party of the USA went into decline, under the impact of McCarthyism and the Soviet invasion of Hungary, Foster became “strangely isolated” from American life. Thus Foster, the “most American of comrades,” saw himself as a world figure, corresponding with leaders such as Mao, and fêted by Soviet dignitaries. This “world” view, in reality a Stalinist one, becomes central in Barrett’s account. This is at odds with Johanningsmeier’s view that Foster’s commitment to communism had been mainly instrumental – it had been necessary to go along with the Soviets as their support was “vital to the success of the American movement.”

For Barrett, “the tragedy of Foster’s political life was to suppress his own initiatives and instincts and those of two generations of political activists in the name of Communist discipline. But it would be a greater tragedy, to abandon the vision of a more just and democratic American society because the Communist prescription failed.” Barrett’s account of Foster provides a new synthesis in the approach to the history of American Communism, a synthesis that is not a bland compromise, but one that provides a methodology which provides historians with a valuable tool in their continued labours to understand America’s radical past.

*Colchester Institute*  

**Andy Strouthous**
Or, was there life after *Walden*? – a suitably alternative sub-title for Michael Benjamin Berger’s study of Thoreau’s writings on natural history in the late 1850s. Berger has a mission: to rescue Thoreau from the charge that his capacities fell into decline after the composition of his most famous treatise. His focus is upon “The Dispersion of Seeds,” drafted in 1860–61, an ecological essay relating animal seed dispersers to patterns of species succession in forest trees. It lay in fragmented form amongst Thoreau’s papers until finally reaching print in 1993, and even now it will be familiar only to the specialist. Berger’s is the first full-length published analysis of the essay and will do much to encourage its wider readership. Berger’s argument is that it is exemplary of Thoreau’s efforts during the 1850s (notably in “Autumnal Tints,” “Huckleberries,” “The Succession of Forest Trees,” “Wild Apples” and “Wild Fruits”) to construct a discourse hospitable to both scientific rigour and poetic imaginitiveness – the “Synoptic Vision” of his title summarises this hospitality and lays the ground for a claim on behalf of the continuing vitality and development of Thoreau’s thinking. In a Journal entry of March 1853, Thoreau declared his faith in “a science which deals with a higher law,” describing himself as “a mystic, a transcendentalist, and a natural philosopher to boot.” It is to the synthesis of these disparate roles that Thoreau strived in his later years, and the mediatory discourse which emerged provides for Berger the necessary counter to a charge of fading powers. Taking a cue from the work of Robert Sattelmeyer and William Rossi, Berger demonstrates with careful textual attention Thoreau’s “mediatory ability to continue the aspirations and inspirations of Transcendentalism under the restrictions of the modern empirical temper,” negotiating along the way the simultaneous attractions and limitations of both positivism and idealism for Thoreau’s complex apprehension of the natural world.

Thoreau’s lessons in walking and looking are given fresh light here: through his descriptions of seed dispersal, “One’s view of the physical landscape is informed with a new understanding of the processes shaping it according to ecological principles of interaction. The forest becomes more than picturesque: it becomes dynamic.” Within Thoreau’s synthesising epistemology, Nature’s design is revealed through and beyond the husks and kernels through which the world addresses itself directly to the eye. Berger places Thoreau’s science in tune with the more radical arguments of his day – in conjunction with Darwin and Lyell, principally a commitment to uniformitarianism and an opposition to theories of spontaneous generation and special creation. Indeed, he is able also to show how Thoreau’s ideas about seed dispersal were, in several important respects, well ahead of those of his contemporaries. If he is rather too eager to draw comparisons with modern ecological debates, Berger is acute on Thoreau’s belief that the key to resolving the familiar dualism of mind and matter lay in the epistemological value of experience, cultivating a realism summarised as a “multi-level holism that embraces both the mechanical and the correspondent views of nature.”
It is a pity that Berger has not allowed himself greater space. His study would benefit from a more extensive consideration of the science that surrounded Thoreau (he does not move much beyond Darwin, and I am surprised to see Jean Louis Rodolphe Agassiz granted such slight tenure); from a more comprehensive account of his views on language (Berger’s sense of metaphor is too direct, operating mainly in analogical form, rather at odds with Thoreau’s Journal entry of August 1857, proclaiming “the most valuable communication or news consists of hints and suggestions”); and Richard Poirier’s brilliant exegesis of Thoreau’s capacity for puns, first published some forty years ago, should serve as a reminder of the real action in Thoreau’s attitude towards words; and from a more detailed analysis of what he calls “a sense of permeable borders through which dualistic forces can interpenetrate,” reflecting an important body of images to which he arrives very late. Nevertheless, Berger should feel confident that his act of salvation has accomplished its task.

University of Keele

Ian F. A. Bell

Journal of American Studies, 36 (2002), 2. DOI: 10.1017/S0021875802286879


Stemming from a conference held in 1996 at King Alfred’s College, Winchester, the edited volume Domestic Space collects nine essays together with an introduction, all of which focus on what the editors term “interior architectures” in both American and British contexts. The term “architectures” here refers to not only the physical structures that people and goods inhabit, but also the social, cultural and economic structures that dictate the conditions and processes of this habitation. Taken together, the essays in Domestic Space persuasively argue for a reconsideration of the notion of “separate spheres” as an organising principle for understanding nineteenth-century domestic culture.

The authors do not necessarily reject the idea, but add nuance to it, trying to draw out distinctions between different people’s experience of the same interior spaces. Moira Donald discusses how the supposedly “tranquil havens” of middle-class homes in Victorian Britain were also sites of hard work for domestic servants. S. J. Kleinberg shows that in the American context, while domestic service in middle-class households may have declined, economic activity still frequently took place in working-class homes. Furthermore, an early emphasis on home-ownership may have actually impelled women to take on a greater role in the family economy than they might otherwise have done. While raising these questions of different experiences within domestic interiors, whether based on race, class, gender, age or other factors, the authors also complicate the ideal of privacy often associated with these spaces. Martin Hewitt brings out one of the central ironies of district visiting: that middle-class volunteers, trying to inculcate their own values among the working class, often violated working-class notions of privacy. Lynne Walker and Vron Ware discuss female abolitionists’ incorporation of their political work into the domestic sphere through material
culture, again calling into question the binary opposition of public and private, or political and domestic, spheres.

While raising similar issues, other essayists focus more on the literary representation of domestic interiors, including Carolyn Steedman’s examination of the works of Elizabeth Gaskell and Alan Louis Ackerman, Jr.’s study of Louisa May Alcott and the relationship between the theatre and the home. In fact, while “reading the nineteenth-century interior,” most of the authors in Domestic Space rely heavily on written texts as their primary form of evidence. Walker and Ware, Donald, and Sarah Milan, in a study of gas lighting, are particularly helpful in providing models for the incorporation of material evidence as well.

University of Glasgow

MARINA MOSKOWITZ

Journal of American Studies, 36 (2002), 2. DOI: 10.1017/S0021875802296875


As Mary Austin said of another harsh, inscrutable landscape, nearly a hundred years ago: “The land sets the limit.” So in Sharon Butala’s most recent work, the land – her native Saskatchewan – sets the limit not only on human activity, but also on human perception. Like Butala’s earlier work, The Perfection of the Morning: An Apprenticeship in Nature (1994), Wild Stone Heart details the growth of perception of the author as she, over long years’ association, is sometimes unwillingly drawn into the spiritual, mythical and mystical life of the land in which she lives, the grasslands of the northern Great Plains. Nature is given its own voice as Butala’s painstaking and scholarly work details the geology, flora and fauna of one particular field, a never-plowed prairie which reveals its secrets, historical and spiritual, only after years of patient study and contemplation.

In the tradition of the transcendentalists, particularly Thoreau, Butala’s journey into nature is a journey into the self. As her understanding of the life of the field develops, so her sense of connectedness with the earth grows. In what she describes as the “layers of presence” – botanical, geological, historical, archaeological, spiritual – is revealed the richness of a seemingly barren world. Interleaved with the daily life on a ranch, Butala’s exploration of the field and its Amerindian past reads almost like a mystery story, and indeed the book opens with a prologue entitled, Hauntings. “What happened here?” the author asks, and the reader joins her in the question. How the field came to be so particularly weighted with significance and presence is only revealed as the author’s own boundaries of perception widen and take in experience which, within the parameters of the Amerindian world view, might be termed visionary.

What is so significant about Butala’s experience is that she is, by her own admission, a practical, even sceptical person, a teacher and writer, a rancher’s wife. She did not seek mystical experience in her exploration of the field of Wild Stone Heart, and yet that experience came to her through her studies of it, studies which were initially botanical and geological.

Wallace Stegner lived in Butala’s Saskatchewan during his boyhood. It is there that Wolf Willow is set. He may even have walked through Butala’s field. But,
during the years in Saskatchewan, Stegner says that he learned to think of himself as a target of an almost invariably hostile nature. While respecting nature, Butala seems to be on happier terms with it than Stegner. Walter Isle suggests that Stegner was formed by his experience, but not, crucially, transformed, as Butala was. It is in this transformation that the power and inspiration of this book lie.

University of Derby

Megan Riley McGilchrist

Journal of American Studies, 36 (2002), 2. DOI: 10.1017/S002187180210687X


A generation of scholars, working at the intersection of cultural history and business history, have examined the consumer culture that flourished in the United States in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. In studies of advertising, marketing, department stores, and specific consumer goods, these historians have laid out the myriad means of buying and selling that appear central to modern American culture. Lendol Calder’s definitive book, Financing the American Dream, examines one of the mechanisms that underpinned these processes of buying and selling: consumer credit. While there have been other studies of American credit systems, most notably Martha Olney’s Buy Now, Pay Later, Calder’s engaging work is innovative in two important respects. First, Calder revises the chronology by which credit is usually considered. By so doing, Calder argues against what he calls “the myth of lost economic virtue,” a presumption that Americans were once thrifty and financially prudent, before being seduced into profligate spending by available credit in the second and third quarters of the twentieth century. Although Calder does not deny the growth of credit in these decades, he does take issue with the implicit “narrative of decline.” While focusing primarily on the period between 1890 and 1940, he situates the beginnings of modern consumer credit in the 1910s, but with roots stretching back to any instance of borrowing and lending in the nation’s history. Furthermore, Calder argues that, as monthly payments began to dictate the shape of personal finances, the growth of credit may have led to a greater sense of fiscal discipline, rather than a spendthrift attitude toward household budgeting.

Calder’s work is exceptional, however, not only in its content, but also in its approach. He is, first and foremost, a cultural historian. While he surveys and records the forms of credit available in particular eras, from personal borrowing to installment plans to credit cards, he admits to not addressing many of the technical questions that may be asked about consumer credit. Instead, Calder mines an impressive array of primary source material in order to ascertain what credit meant, and continues to mean, to American culture. Drawing on personal letters, magazine articles, cartoons, budget studies, prescriptive literature, and government statistics, among others, Calder explains that, rather than putting the American Dream within easy reach, the availability of credit instead extends that Dream indefinitely, limited only by the imagination of the American consumer.

University of Glasgow

Marina Moskowitz
Neil Campbell’s *The Cultures of the American New West* introduces new approaches and frameworks to the study of Western America and its interpretation at a time when the USA itself seems poised for internal reflection and redefinition. He begins usefully with Frederick Jackson Turner’s frontier thesis of 1893, and thereby manages to construct a coherent historiography linking some of the nineteenth century’s ideological concerns with those of our own. Here, in a wide-ranging and carefully conceived theoretical discussion, the author begins to unravel the myth-making potential of Turner’s concepts from the actual diversity of Western living and development. By means of consistent and perceptive critical analysis, a fuller understanding of the historiography of the West is made apparent. Quoting from authors as diverse as Stuart Hall, Roland Barthes, Walter Benjamin, Mikhail Bakhtin, Edward Soja and Paula Gunn Allen, Campbell uncovers the explanatory limits of any definitive frontier model such as Turner’s, and posits an alternative analytical mode in the idea of the New West. For Campbell, the New West encapsulates all that was undisclosed, hidden and written-out of the authoritative histories of the past and proposes alternative views of the landscape, American attitudes to nature and the environment, geo-history and the cultural geography of identity and place in the West.

Throughout the book, and within each of the four main chapters, Campbell manages to move easily between discussions of art, culture, history, literature and issues of representation and this freedom of reference adds weight to the new analytical and methodological terminology that he proposes. The chapters on new landscapes, visualisations of the West, alternative histories and post-modernism and urbanism in the New West, each offer fresh and convincing readings of these emerging areas of approach. The considerable space given to Western American representation in film and photography brings to focus some of the more difficult and complex theoretical positions voiced at the beginning of the book, thus enabling readers to extend his proposals further into broader areas of American culture and representation. The chapter concerned with alternative histories of the West was especially of interest. Campbell’s analyses of the significance of alternative voices in the American West comes at a crucial historical juncture for the American nation and reveals the possibilities and understanding to be gained by a re-examination of long-standing historical and cultural myths in America.

*University of Plymouth*

*Stephanie Pratt*

Following the successful conclusion of the Montgomery Bus Boycott, Martin Luther King became an increasingly visible public figure. He graced the cover of Time magazine, received a flattering profile in the New York Times, attended Ghana’s independence celebrations, delivered his first national address at a Prayer Pilgrimage for Freedom in Washington, D.C., and was awarded the NAACP’s Spingam Medal “for the highest and noblest achievement by an American Negro.”

King also continued to preach at Dexter Avenue Baptist Church, and delivered addresses across the country in which (with increasing confidence and verve) he attacked the evils of segregation, colonialism and capitalism, and expounded his philosophy of non-violent resistance to social injustice. By the summer of 1958, he had completed the manuscript of his personal account of the Montgomery Bus Boycott, and was presiding over the newly formed Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

Aware of his growing celebrity, King declared before his Dexter Avenue congregation: “Help me O God, to see that I’m just a symbol of the movement. Because if I don’t see that, I will become the biggest fool in America.” In September 1958, King narrowly escaped death when a deranged black woman stabbed him in the chest as he signed copies of Stride Toward Freedom in a Harlem bookstore. These and other episodes receive detailed documentation in this latest addition to the King Papers. Of particular interest are King’s estimates of Richard Nixon: “If [he] is not sincere, he is the most dangerous man in America,” and Billy Graham: “you have courageously brought the Christian gospel to bear on the question of race.”

In his monthly “Advice for Living” feature in Ebony magazine, King denounced capital punishment and nuclear weapons, advised a young church-going musician to choose between playing sacred music or rock ‘n’ roll, and informed the worried wife of a handsome black clergyman that “almost every minister has the problem of confronting women in his congregations whose interests are not entirely spiritual.” Only a few touches of humour brighten King’s correspondence. His close friend J. Pius Barbour informed King in 1957 that, “if you and Coretta don’t stop having babies you will ruin yourself. I will send you some birth control literature.” Following King’s stabbing, Barbour confided: “The only thing that bothered me was the thought that perhaps one of your old girl friends had decided to take vengeance on you. If that woman had been white, I would have fainted.”

If there is little here that has not already been incorporated into King historiography, Symbol of the Movement offers some illuminating perspectives on the dangers and dilemmas which confronted an emerging leader of the civil rights struggle.

University of Hull

John White
Suzanne Clark’s study is the latest in a series which examines the cultural politics of the Cold War, specifically the figuring of masculinity in the period. Her opening chapter, “Cold War Rhetoric,” discusses the “hypermasculinity of a national subject, defined in a relationship of mastery,” whether of Nature or Communism. On the one hand, Clark interestingly brings out the containment of literary modernism in the post-war period by its institutionalisation and the implicitly political view of psychoanalysis promoted by Sydney Hook and others. On the other hand, Clark is telescoping the detailed argument necessary to demonstrate that there was, in fact, a single hegemonic form of discourse in the Cold War without specifying interest groups, specific periods and so on.

By far the best sections of Cold Warriors are those where she engages with specific issues or works, contextualising them without making too sweeping historical claims. The first of these chapters presents an interesting argument that Hemingway’s later works were too complex for the critical consensus to deal with. Accordingly, novels like Across the River and into the Trees received a hostile reception because they did not match Hemingway’s emerging macho stereotype. Thus, although Hemingway read and was influenced by the writing of Teddy Roosevelt, he was by no means uncritical of the latter’s crudities. Clark’s next instance is that of Bernard Malamud’s A New Life which she relates to the loyalty investigations of the period, specifically to the case of the scientist Ralph Spitzer who lost his post at Oregon State University in 1949. In the novel Malamud’s protagonist is identified with his sacked predecessor (an “un-American radical”) and A New Life enacts a refusal of the categories confronting Levin. Here another valuable aspect of Cold Warriors emerges. Despite the perception of a hardening restrictive consensus of attitudes during the Cold War, Clark demonstrates that her chosen writers resisted this. For example, she demonstrates how Mari Sandoz critically revised the notion of the frontier and how Ursula LeGuin debated the notion of home, history and gender relations through a fictional genre which was, initially at least, dismissed as escapist. Notwithstanding, a novel like The Dispossessed constructs a drama centring on the “censorship of intellectual life.” This chapter is one of the liveliest and most informative in the book. Once again, however, the historical dating of the material needs filling out. It remains necessary to link LeGuin’s novels to the surge of women’s writing in science fiction which took place in the 1970s. Cold Warriors contains many insights and makes a valuable contribution to the ongoing discussion of gender politics in the Cold War, but through a very limited range of examples.

Timothy Melley’s Empire of Conspiracy is tightly organised around the central topic of what he calls “agency panic,” i.e. an ongoing anxiety about the cause and
Reviews

origin of actions. His focus therefore falls on the fate of a central tenet of US ideology, that of individualism, during the post-war years. Taking his bearings from figures such as J. Edgar Hoover, Melley identifies an emerging irony that a “supposedly individualist culture conserves its individualism by continually imagining it to be in imminent peril.” Whatever their overt subjects, Melley’s chosen works engage in an extended debate over the nature of personhood and human agency which involves exploration of the possible links between knowledge and power. In one of Melley’s first examples, Joan Didion’s *The White Album*, the account of Didion’s difficulties of identifying relations with the world about her, is taken as symptomatic of a broader problem in the period of understanding causality. At those points where Melley considers the gendering of such anxieties, his study connects closely with that of Clark. Thus he argues that in novels like *One Flew over the Cuckoo’s Nest*, *Invisible Man* and *The Manchurian Candidate*, ideological power is imagined as a “female force that invades, empties, and reconstructs the male subject,” where freedom, in the first of these, is conceived in opposition to domesticity. One possible danger in Melley’s topic lies in the risk of describing free-floating perceptions divorced from history, but he largely avoids this trap by drawing comparisons between literary and sociological material. Thus he cites David Riesman’s *The Lonely Crowd*, which locates the social origins of behaviour, as implying a shift away from the notion of the individual as self-created towards one where s/he is shaped or possessed by others, which was a major theme in Tony Tanner’s classic *City of Words*.

Melley’s commentary on the new significance of the corporation in this period makes up one of the most interesting sections of his study. From William H. Whyte’s *Organization Man* onwards, Melley shows how the corporation is seen to be a large, self-regulating totality beyond the control of any single individual. This perception feeds into *Catch-22* and *Gravity’s Rainbow* which both dramatise the prioritisation of methods of representation over the physical actuality of war. Indeed Pynchon takes Vance Packard’s notion of “depth manipulators” – through their common source Pavlov – to such an extreme that causes repeatedly recede out of the reader’s sight. Pynchon’s retention of individual agency, however tenuous, against corporate activity is also reflected in the voluminous literature on the Kennedy assassination to which Melley devotes a chapter. He wisely makes no attempt to sort out the conflicting explanations but instead argues that the two extremes meet. The conspiracy account posits such a “seamless coherence” of unified action on the part of agencies that we end up with a version of individualism writ large. Melley’s exemplary text here is Don DeLillo’s *Libra* which he sees as one of the most intelligent meditations on the process of explanation. DeLillo’s ironies question individualism at one end of the explanatory spectrum and deny central control to an agency like the CIA at the other. Melley could have followed this motif straight into the works of William Burroughs, but instead focuses on the latter’s writings to help identify an assimilation of addiction into the US way of life, a contemporary (and paradoxical) perception that it is “utterly normal and dangerously pathological.” It is not entirely clear whether, for Melley, Burroughs embodies this contradiction or not, especially as he argues that Burroughs’ presentation of addiction as an invading parasitic virus depends for its grotesque effects on an implicit notion of
individuality. However, Burroughs’ speculations on electronic implants as a means of control nicely introduces Melley’s concluding three works: the film *Blade Runner*, William Gibson’s *Neuromancer* and Kathy Acker’s *Empire of the Senseless*. These works share a perception common to cyberpunk that “the human body can be colonized, made into a hybrid of organic and technological elements.” Melley demonstrates that the debate over agency is continuing and notes the historical resemblances between the corporate pyramid in *Blade Runner* and the central icon in the US Great Seal, the mythic recuperation of the frontier in *Neuromancer*, and Acker’s sense-breaking strategies to counter an ideologically suspect concept of coherent identity. *Empire of Conspiracy* makes an important contribution to the current re-examination of Cold War culture, especially to the debate over human agency.

*Liverpool University*

**DAVID SEED**


Catherine Clinton’s edited collection of twelve essays does exactly what its title suggests: explore the experiences several Southern families – white and black – underwent during the Civil War and Reconstruction period. The introduction, by Clinton, begins as most works do these days, in a post-modern fashion, deconstructing the term “House divided.” Considering the eclectic nature of this collection, such an opening is appropriate. Despite this, however, the essays in this work fall broadly into the category of traditional history.

The first three essays, by Michael P. Johnson, Michelle A. Krowl and Donald R. Shaffer, consider African American families’ responses to the conflict. Johnson examines the efforts of African Americans to locate lost kinfolk in the aftermath of the war, Krowl discusses black families in Civil War Virginia and Shaffer reveals how slave marriage traditions were continued by African Americans after the war. White Southern families are discussed in the fourth and fifth essays, by Amy E. Murrell and Judith Lee Hunt respectively. Murrell explores appeals made by white Southern families to the Confederate authorities for the return of their men from the front, while Hunt’s essay tells the story of South Carolina’s Middleton family and its divisions between Union and Confederate supporters. The sixth essay, by E. Susan Barber, looks at the rash of marriages which took place in Richmond during the war, reminding one of Scarlett O’Hara’s ill-fated union to Charles Hamilton. Indeed, as Barber reveals, many such relationships ended in precisely the same way, which is the topic of the seventh essay, by Jennifer Lynn Gross: Confederate widowhood in Virginia.

The eighth essay, by Daniel W. Stowell, explores how the Fain family of Tennessee, and its indomitable matriarch, Eliza, coped with the absence of both her son and husband at the battlefield. The ninth essay, by Henry Walker, discusses a similar topic: how the war affected gender relations of the Clayton family of Alabama. The tenth and eleventh essays, by Lauren F. Winner and Anne
J. Bailey respectively, look at Southern ethnic minorities’ response to conflict. Southern Jews in the first case, and German-speaking Texans in the second. The twelfth and final essay, meanwhile, by Ted Ownby, examines Confederate views of the afterlife – an understandable concern when one remembers that one quarter of white Southern males of military age perished in the war.

As in any such collection, some essays will appeal to the reader more than others, but only in terms of interest in the subject – the quality of work is uniformly excellent. This collection will prove useful to a wide variety of scholars. It will appeal especially to those working on the Civil War, the family, gender relations or African American studies.

University of Wales Swansea


For specialists of the American Revolution and early republic, Francis Cogliano’s book is unlikely to tell them much new. For students new to this period, however, it is certain to be an informative and frequently consulted text. Arranged chronologically (except for the last two chapters, which are thematic in approach), Cogliano’s narrative starts with the conclusion of the Seven Years’ War and ends with the successful defence of the infant republic in the War of 1812. Sandwiched between these two episodes are detailed treatments of the major political developments affecting North America during this period, such as the War of Independence and the creation of the federal constitution. The structure of this book is well suited for teaching. Each chapter is essentially a self-contained unit that can be read independently of the others, thereby providing a good basis for seminar discussions. The bibliographic essay at the end, with its fairly comprehensive discussion of the major works pertinent to the study of this period, further strengthens the book’s potential as a teaching tool.

Given that Revolutionary America is “a political history,” Cogliano’s interpretation that “the American Revolution was fundamentally a political and ideological struggle” is not surprising. He tries hard to avoid writing a “traditional” history, though, by expanding his scope beyond the activities of the political elite and including two separate chapters on the impact of the Revolution on women and blacks. This is a shame, as this approach, as Cogliano himself admits, has a tendency “to contribute to the intellectual Balkanization of American history into a variety of sub-specialisms.” Here, then, was a real opportunity to write a political history aimed at “advanced undergraduates” that incorporated women and blacks into the mainstream of its narrative. Unfortunately Cogliano did not feel up to the challenge. Until somebody does, the study of such marginalised groups is likely to remain on the periphery of historical writing. As a thorough and well-written political history drawing on recent scholarship, but in the mould of more “traditional” histories, Cogliano’s book is a good example, and one that teachers will no doubt draw on. As a model
of how to write integrated histories, however, it shows that intention alone may not be enough.


These books depict the humanity and courage of former US president, William Jefferson Clinton. Readers readily understand the humanity dimension. But courage? Clinton refused to permit the media and his personal enemies to criminalize his private, personal, sexual lives. These works, therefore, are about the politicalization, then attempted criminalization, of an American president’s personal, sexual proclivities. They debate boundaries of US governments for delving into the lives of presidents—and everyone else.

US conservatives employ government power in ways that differ from progressives. Conservatives regulate personal indiscretions, whereas progressives focus on transgressions of state. Legalistic proportionality, political consensus, personal betrayal, cultural balkanization, and social hierarchy are underlying themes of both books. Bill Clinton is the antithesis of George W. Bush and George Bush in ways similar to those of Andrew Jackson whose persona contrasted lifestyles of John Quincy Adams and John Adams. The cast of characters of the post-World War II baby-boomer age, diverse in their views and behaviors, orchestrate facts of this public saga which may appear novel. Both books are fascinating reads. They make significant contributions to the literature of American government and politics. They offer explanations for the mistrust, dislike, and visceral intensity of Clinton’s enemies. Themes of shame, immorality, censorship, nonconformity, nonacceptance, and repentance dominate their pages. Conason and Lyons write a historical, detailed, and comprehensive review of the Clintons’ personal lives, political power conflicts, and American traditionalism, or right wing politics. A “loose cabal,” not a “vast conspiracy,” opposed the Clintons’, write Conason and Lyons.

The Conason–Lyons treatise differs from the Toobin book in that the former reaches into the Arkansas political career of Bill Clinton. The Toobin text takes the reader through the impeachment proceedings. Conason and Lyons provide an “all politics is local,” down home Arkansas perspective on why the Clintons’ generate so many emotions. The unique ways of Arkansas political culture create settings for further pursuits, conflicts, and accusations. As social and economic liberals, the Clintons’ were in philosophical contrast to the more traditional, economically well-to-do Americans. Most Americans, argue Conason and Lyons, maintain that Bill Clinton should never have been forced to answer questions which are considered private. The authors conclude:
Bill Clinton had lied to protect himself, his marriage, his daughter, Monica Lewinsky, and his “political viability” – to choose the meanest way of putting it – from the consequences of his all-too-human frailty. But his shame posed little danger to the republic; his falsehoods and evasions were no threat to the Constitution.

_The Hunting of the President_ is factual, bibliographic, and descriptive. The authors attempt a wholesale refutation of rumors, lies, and character assassinations on the Clintons. The book provides context for the impeachment debates by citing earlier cultural and political clashes. A culture war developed. All these things occur with historical developments – in the market, sovereignty, media, internet, and culture. Toobin writes a conceptual and analytical book where Conason and Lyons pen a “give me the facts, mam, just the facts” volume. Toobin documents a chronology of events from 1991 through 1999. Conservatives, Toobin concludes, put aside their misgivings about criminalization of political disputes. The legal system encroached on the political system. Partisan conflict was steered from legislatures to courtrooms. The political right discovered the courts as a way to advance its agenda. Feminism and the Christian right, two social movements of these times, represented cultural changes. Private lives of public people mattered as much as their stands on the issues. Selfishness replaced nobility. Immediate gratification replaced long-term good of all. These circumstances dominated the culture of Clinton’s impeachment trial. However, Clinton was fortunate in his enemies … in spite of his consistently reprehensible behavior, Clinton was, by comparison, the good guy in the struggle. The president’s adversaries appeared literally consumed with hatred for him; the bigger the stakes, the smaller they acted. They were willing to trample all standards of fairness, not to mention the Constitution, in their efforts to drive him from office.

_A Vast Conspiracy_ reveals media contributions to efforts to uncover the private behavior of the Clintons. A new field of American journalism, sexual investigative reporting, emerged. According to Toobin, Clinton’s enemies abandoned usual forms of American politics – voting, legislating, and organizing – as a means for dismantling Clinton’s policy programs and ideas. Instead, right-wing assaults on Clinton were based almost entirely on his personal behavior. Personal destruction replaced policy or program destruction. According to Toobin: “the president regarded the whole adventure, bottom line, as a victory. He thought this was a totally political attack on him from the beginning, and on those terms, he won and his enemies lost.”

In summary, _The Hunting of the President_ and _A Vast Conspiracy_ reveal the following political realities. In the United States, delineations between public and private – in private associations and public policies – are evolving rapidly. A vast right-wing conspiracy does not need development because its goals, directives, and institutions are already operating. Despite visceral reactions by his enemies, Clinton confronted the intensity of their personal vilification’s, did not return their hatreds, emerged as a very effective US president, and developed as a populist profile in personal courage.

_Ball State University_           _JOHN ROUSE_

Near the end of this brief but carefully researched monograph, Thomas F. Connolly observes that George Jean Nathan’s “half-century-long career is the best example we have of how an American drama critic functions and of what an American drama critic can do with his career.” The perspective is sociological or functional, viewing Nathan less as exceptional than as symptomatic of tendencies within his culture during the first half of the twentieth century. Indeed, some of the better parts of Connolly’s book are concerned with Nathan not as person but as a persona made possible by developments both on Broadway and in the world of small magazine publishing. Although this study certainly lacks the range and brio of, say, Ann Douglas’s Terrible Honesty: Mongrel Manhattan in the 1920s, it delineates many of the social spaces in New York, the theatrical milieux, the literary forums, in which a flamboyant critical presence such as Nathan’s could emerge on either side of the First World War.

Yet Connolly slides persistently from such sociology or history into biography. While this yields interesting discoveries about Nathan’s repression of his Jewishness, it occludes the most searching questions about American theatre. The book details Nathan’s supportive relationship with Eugene O’Neill, for example, but says little about the historical determinants both on O’Neill’s drama and on the critic’s approving response. Connolly becomes so concerned with exculpating Nathan from both contemporary and later opponents, rather than situating him historically, that in the end he risks sharing the limitations of his subject: an exclusive focus upon Broadway to the detriment of an engagement with American theatre more widely; a suspicion of modern dramatic experiment; and, above all, hostility towards theories of drama. Connolly himself refers in passing to Nathan’s “creed of personal criticism,” or “his own aristocratic aesthetic”; but, rather than exploring at length the constituents and limitations of this particular dramatic philosophy, he prefers ultimately to describe Nathan as non-theoretical and to endorse without critique his subject’s opinion that theories are not required by journalistic reviewers of plays.

Finally, a word on Connolly’s style. This is a text in which one figure may bestow a “toplofty sneer” upon his inferiors, while another is encumbered by “a bizarrely adhesive personality composed of acerbated treacle.” Opinions tend not to be uttered or stated, but “bruited.” Such stylistic strains are especially incongruous here, given the Manhattanite elegance Connolly values in Nathan’s own writing.

Loughborough University

Andrew Dix
British monographs on the War of American Independence have been remarkably sparse in recent years; in no way do they compare with the extent as well as richness of American scholarship. Jeremy Black and Stephen Conway himself have written on military aspects of the war, but, while scholars such as James Bradley have written on specific aspects of the crisis, there is less than there ought to be on its domestic consequences and politics; Peter Thomas’s superb trilogy, for example, ends in 1776. Perhaps the reason is simple. For Americans the war was midwife to their nation; for most British people it was no more than an embarrassing hiccup preceding the nineteenth-century empire and the emergent so-called special relationship of more recent times. Dr. Conway’s excellent new book redresses this imbalance by providing a systematic and extensively researched study of the impact of the war on Britain. It is important, however, for Americanists to appreciate the nature and deliberate limitations of its subject-matter. The author’s discussion does not include the politics of the revolution, nor does it explore strategic and tactical aspects of the war; rather, it is the British counterpart of studies of the internal American Revolution.

What Conway demonstrates conclusively is that the American War was a major event in British as well as United States’ history. He sets his discussion in the context of three ongoing debates among historians of eighteenth-century Britain: consideration of the extent to which warfare affected British society, argument over the pace of a growing sense of British nationhood and discussion of the degree to which a powerful central government was emerging. In each case he demonstrates that the effects of the American War were more than a minor preliminary to the brutal impact of the wars of the French Revolution. Conway’s location of the war in the context of current debates over the emergence of a sense of British nationhood is of particular interest, even to Americanists. The besetting deficiency of all national histories is that they are generally self-referencing at a time when comparisons with other societies can provide invaluable insights into local processes. Accordingly, this exploration of an emerging second nation out of the collapse of what had previously been a single transatlantic community provides much useful material to illuminate the growth of social cohesion on the western as well as eastern shore of the Atlantic Ocean.
contentious American institutions. With their differing outlooks and yet their shared attentiveness to the evolution of the legal and political aspects of the conventions of marriage in America, these two very different volumes complement each other in interesting ways. Both are concerned with the ways in which marriage is controlled as part of the public order, yet equally attentive to how that control has shifted, mutated, or disappeared over time. Cott, Professor of History and American Studies at Yale, focuses her analysis on the ways in which a Christian, monogamous, preferably intraracial ideal of marriage has shaped American marriage practices. Hartog, Professor of the History of American Law and Liberty at Princeton, provides a legal history of American marriage which concentrates on the nineteenth century, and which attends particularly to the legal records pertaining to the liminal marital state of separation (and then divorce), on the rather persuasive grounds that it is through the records of its failures that what marriage meant in the past can be understood best today.

Cott’s book is the more historically wide ranging, less anecdotal of the two. And, while Cott is deeply interested in the legal record concerning American marriage, she mines this record for the general principles it reveals. For example, in early American views of marriage, Cott discerns a “thematic equivalency between polygamy, despotism, and coercion” and “monogamy, political liberty, and consent” which then govern American discussions of marriage from the late eighteenth to the end of the nineteenth centuries. These thematics resonate deeply in various states’ legislation on marriage. Slaves were excluded from marriage because, as chattel, they could not legally consent to their marital unions. Common law and informal marriages among the free poor, however, were honoured, as they publicly enacted the consent which was the most highly valued sign of American marriage. Divorce became an American prerogative by analogy with the Declaration of Independence and its ideology of the consent of the governed as paramount in the political contract. Cott is especially good on the transformations of ideas and laws regarding marriage in the light of the linked struggles for abolition of slavery and then racism, and the establishment of women’s rights. But she is equally thoughtful and revealing about the sometimes harsh ways in which monogamy and the ideal of companionate marriage have been promoted in the United States. The volume closes with a recognition of the profound changes which have overtaken marriage in America, where fewer live in traditional marital households than ever before, and where marriage can be seen as a voluntary area of private freedom in a world overwhelmed by surveillance.

Hartog’s *Man & Wife in America* traverses some of the same territory as *Public Vows*, such as its interest in differing laws regarding marriage in different states and the legal conundrums to which this variation gave rise before the imposition of some federal uniformity. However, where Cott concentrates on general principles, Hartog presents case histories as illustrations of the fractures in general principles and established laws. This makes for a fascinating study filled with sometimes tantalising glimpses of vibrant individuals who lived curious, complex and often tangled lives. In a disarming and illuminating aside, Hartog explains how his own family history in America is grounded in a legal/sexual
puzzle. His father, he says, came to America in 1940, sent by his family in the Netherlands to “figure out what was going on with his younger brother, then in New York, who had written ... that he was going to ‘sleep’ with a prostitute in New Jersey, so that he could become ‘an adulterer’ and thereby he and his wife could get a divorce.” The sheer weirdness promoted by odd marital laws that led to practices like this, so incomprehensible to those outside the legal systems which generated them, gives Hartog’s study a disconcerting edge, one which could have been even better exploited by an author highly aware of the curiosities presented by his topic. Hartog’s stress on American habits of mobility, self-fashioning, and loneliness as shaping forces for American marriage seem absolutely right. And, by chasing the legal principle of coverture through a century of challenge and erosion, Hartog traces the metamorphosis of American women from legal invisibility to independence and full recognition before the law. As interested in duties as in rights, and in the responsibilities of husbands and wives as well as their privileges, the overwhelming effect of Hartog’s study is to emphasise the powerlessness of the law to stop change, along with its power to impede it.

Both studies conclude on much the same note, with a nod to the great changes that have taken place in marriage in America in the last century and particularly in the last forty years. This is so much the case that traditional ideas regarding husbands and wives seem odd, inexplicable, lost in history. And yet, as Hartog notes in his epilogue, “men and women still marry.” And “their marriages often look much like their parents’ and grandparents’ marriages.” The difference is that the love, hate, scheming, fighting, negotiation, desertions and returns that Hartog notes characterise marriage, are now mostly private matters which take place in a legal context far different from that of marriages in the past. This is a point with which Cott’s work concurs, and it is in this legal shift from public to private that the most fascinating features of changes in American marriage practices reside.

University of the West of England


This book focuses on the first 20 years (1944–64) of the pan-Indian political organisation, the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI). Of 6 chapters, 2–5 concentrate on this 20-year period and build towards the major threat to Indian communities of the time – termination. Cowger favours an ethnohistorical approach, using the records and correspondence of the NCAI, transcripts from an oral history project featuring founding members, and personal interviews with some of those closely involved in the NCAI.

In chapter 1 Cowger provides a context for what follows: government Indian policy from the Dawes (Assimilation) Act in 1887 to Collier’s Indian
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Reorganisation Act of 1934; attacks on religious ceremonies by non-Indian “supporters,” and discussion of earlier Indian political movements which saw assimilation as the only means of Indian survival. Early organisations found themselves facing problems which would also affect later ones – internal division and external opposition. Even in the 1920s the Interior Department was not averse to weakening American Indian movements by using FBI surveillance and infiltration, tactics which were only too successful in the 1970s. Chapters 2 to 5 look at, in turn: the main participants involved in the founding of the NCAI and preparations for the first convention in 1944; some of their early achievements (through lobbying and court cases) relating to the land claims commission, Alaskan timber, dams in the Dakotas and voting rights in New Mexico and Arizona; the struggle with the Bureau of Indian Affairs over selection of attorneys – a debate, after all, about self-determination; and, most pressing of all – termination, where the NCAI was initially concerned with the proper preparation of tribes for termination, but soon expended its energies opposing it. Chapter 6 describes the internal conflicts in the NCAI during the 1960s, resulting in factionalism and the appointment of a new leadership. Influenced by the Black Power Movement, other organisations were formed including the National Indian Youth Council (NIYC) and the American Indian Movement (AIM).

The book’s deliberately measured tone allows the author little comment on the obvious ironies, one of the greatest being Dillon Myers’ appointment in 1950 as his Indian Commissioner’s job fresh from running internment camps for 120,000 Japanese-Americans during the Second World War. The few errors in the text are, unfortunately, in important places – dates are mangled, and the title of the American Indian journal, Wicazo Sa is comprehensively misspelled. There is no bibliography.

University of Essex
SUSAN FORSYTH

Journal of American Studies, 36 (2002), 2. DOI: 10.1017/S0021875802416878

This new edition of Oliver Cromwell Cox’s classic text features only the third part of his original monograph Caste, Class and Race, published in 1948. As the editor notes in his introduction, the discussion of race and racism as a social construct is probably the most pertinent to modern day society, and it reads well as a stand-alone text. Cox’s arguments have gone in and out of fashion in the half century since they were first aired. Almost universally criticised on first publication by other sociologists, the book eventually came to be seen by the 1970s and 80s as making an important contribution to our understanding of race relations. While Cox cites examples from throughout the world, most of this text is concerned with the United States and the endemic racism within it. Cox argues that racism is a product of capitalism, and so had its origins in the USA during the colonial period when thousands of black Africans were brought to serve as bonded labour. Racism developed as a justification for economic oppression. This pattern
of exploitation based on race became fixed during the nineteenth century and has changed little despite the ending of slavery. Whites, he argued, maintained their social superiority in the USA because they were able to exploit the black workforce, while for blacks the main avenue for social advancement lay with assimilation with white culture. Cox could not foresee, of course, that the Civil Rights struggles of the 1950s and 60s would alter race relations in the USA irrevocably. Naturally the historiography has moved on since 1948. Anyone wishing to understand race relations during slavery, for example, would be well advised to read the works of Eugene Genovese, James Oakes, Jeffrey Young, and William Dusinberre, among others. Our understanding of race relations is certainly more complex and detailed than it was fifty years ago. Nevertheless, Cox’s book remains an interesting text to read, it is generally well written and provides an insight into how race relations were understood in the pre-Civil Rights era.

University of Warwick

TIM LOCKLEY

Journal of American Studies, 36 (2002), 2. DOI: 10.1017/S0021875802426874


In too many accounts, the battle over abortion is to be understood simply as a struggle between feminists and anti-feminists. The abortion rights movement is identified with the argument that it is the involuntarily pregnant woman who must decide her fate, while the anti-abortion movement’s professed concern for the “unborn child” is seen as concealing its true agenda of policing women’s bodies to ensure their continued subordination. In this book, Critchlow shows in considerable detail why we must resist at least one side of this equation. The Supreme Court’s 1973 decision to strike down state anti-abortion laws, it has often been noted, was argued in the context of its earlier decision to condemn legislation against birth control as unconstitutional. But this was not the only link. The campaigns for both contraception and the legalisation of abortion had important overlaps of belief and personnel, and a crucial factor was a fear of overpopulation.

How precisely we are to understand this concern is crucial. A number of writers have claimed that the population lobby was driven by the belief that America’s access to the world’s resources was endangered by increasing numbers in the Third World. Domestically too, those who worked to reduce the birth-rate had a sinister motive – to restrain the growth of particular social groups and particular races. This argument is most associated with feminist scholars, but it has been made by Marxists, by black nationalists and, intriguingly, by anti-abortionists. Critchlow’s enviable access to recently opened material in the Rockefeller Archives enables him to bring new light to bear on these arguments. A profoundly complex picture emerges. If, for the Catholic Church, abortion and birth control were crimes against both God and man, for New York’s United Black Front it was a racist (and Jewish) plot. In 1932, the governor of Puerto
Rico responded to a furore over a Rockefeller Foundation-funded birth-control programme by declaring that the excessive quantity and inferior quality of the island’s birth rate had to be faced. Forty years later, however, John D. Rockefeller III appears to have been genuinely persuaded by his daughters, his niece and his assistant Joan Dunlop that abortion was a matter of women’s rights and not only for relieving population pressure.

Access to archives that reveal more about one side of a debate does not mean that we also better understand its opponents. Critchlow’s discussion of the anti-abortion movement does not reveal much about its inner workings, and leaves much to be done in understanding both the relationship between its often male leadership and its largely female rank and file and that between its stance on abortion, its internal divisions on contraception and its campaign against euthanasia. But, on the development of the movement for population control and its impressively successful efforts to influence government policy, this is a major addition to our knowledge.

University of Walerhampton


Before Jim Crow is a study of the Readjuster Party that flourished briefly in Virginia during the late 1870s and 1880s, uniting black and white voters in opposition to a debt-repayment programme that demanded savage cutbacks in state spending, especially on education. As, in Jane Dailey’s words, “the most successful interracial political alliance in the post-emancipation South,” the Readjuster movement exemplifies the fluidity that characterised Southern politics in the period between Appomattox and the hardening of the Jim Crow system around 1900. This is more than just another local case study of the “Woodward thesis,” however. Dailey is primarily interested in “how Virginians formed ideas about race” and how those ideas functioned within a specific political context.

Historians like James Tice Moore attribute the demise of the Readjuster Party to the baleful influence of “race antagonism.” Yet “race antagonism” did not prevent its formation in the first place. As an ideological project, the Readjusters’ experiment in interracial democracy depended on their ability to demarcate a public sphere in which blacks and whites could “participate in a common discourse of equality” from a private sphere in which white women and children could be isolated from politically active black males. They had to be able to convince white Virginians that the entry of African American males into the public sphere, by voting or holding political office, would not detract from their own ability to control and protect the members of their households. In practice, the boundary between public and private spheres was dangerously permeable. Placing black men in positions of authority, for example on the Richmond school board, gave them power over white males, and, more explosively, over white females. The lack of deference exhibited by black men and women in public
places led to a series of violent altercations, culminating in a race riot in Danville which Democratic publicists attributed to the excitable expectations aroused by black political power. As Dailey explains, the Readjusters’ political practices made white voters more receptive to their opponents’ racist rhetoric “by undermining the customary privileges of whiteness.” Hence white voters began to desert the coalition after 1883 and return to the “white man’s party.”

Dailey’s account can only partially dispel the sense of tragic inevitability associated with the history of interracial political movements in the postbellum South. It does demonstrate that rather than a “timeless and unchanging” feature of Southern life, race relations were perpetually in flux; being repeatedly contested and reconstituted, and continuously interacting with other social relationships. Dailey explores with some success the relationship between racial ideology and notions of male honour, and, in doing so, she goes some way towards introducing gender into our thinking about race. This is, for the most part, a nicely written and sharply observed study, which adds theoretical precision and empirical substance to the growing body of scholarship that treats race as a socially constructed, rather than a “natural,” category of historical analysis.

University of Wales, Aberystwyth

ROBERT HARRISON

Journal of American Studies, 36 (2002), 2. DOI: 10.1017/S0021875802446877


The twenty essays gathered here form, the editor tells us, “a representative cross-section” of the fifty-three papers presented in July 1997 to the 17th International Ezra Pound Conference, held at Castle Brunnenberg in the Italian Tirol, whither Pound had made his way on release from St. Elizabeths Hospital in 1918. The essays are arranged in four loose groupings: Pound and translation; Pound and politics; early influences upon him; and his later influence upon others. Of a consistently high quality across their considerable diversity, together they make for a volume that will be an invaluable tool or guide for Poundian specialist and general reader alike. And, just as Helen M. Dennis, working within publishing constraints, was reluctantly compelled to exclude material that she greatly admired, so here it will not be possible to mention and do justice to all contributors.

The essays that are focussed on translation both investigate Pound’s remaking of poems from Greek, Chinese, Italian and French, and compare his aims, procedures and effects with such predecessors as Rossetti and Swinburne and such followers as Robert Lowell and Paul Blackburn. William Pratt examines his reworking of poems by three poets (Ibycus, Li Po, Henri de Régnier) writing in three different languages across three millennia, to demonstrate how Pound “knew instinctively what was alive in the work of dead poets and could find the precise language to capture it.” In the crisply entitled “Poets and Gaol-Birds,” Milne Holton considers both Pound’s use of Villon as a persona in his two “Villonauds” and Lowell’s “quite clearly Poundian imitations” of the French
poet; whilst Diana Collecott, in a detailed and fascinating account, documents literary warfare around 1912–1914 over matters of ancient Greek, with Pound’s prejudices noisily fluctuating until by the time of Vorticism there would come to seem to be a radical divide between H.D.’s “hellenistic modernism” and his own “modernistic anti-hellenism.”

Leon Surette, Zhang Qian and Michael Flaherty trace Pound’s youthful connections with four elders, all of whom were wistfully recalled long years later in *The Pisan Cantos*. Surette reopens the several “Vagabond” collections co-authored in the 1890s by the archetypal fin-de-siècle poets, Richard Hovey and Bliss Carman, about whom even in 1918, when mostly gripped by quite other obsessions, Pound confessed he could “still get sentimental.” Qian charts the far more substantial influence of the British Museum’s Keeper of Prints and Drawings, the orientalist and laureate, in one immortal stanza, of the First World War’s fallen, Laurence Binyon. And, intrigued by the fleeting passage across the stage in Canto LXXXI of Wilfred Scawen Blunt, Flaherty provides an entertaining sketch of the poet, diplomat, English landowner and Irish nationalist who, Flaherty proposes, became in his old age around 1914 for both Yeats and Pound a memorable type of aristocratic rebel and neo-Renaissance prince.

Turning from inheritances to legacies, Hélène Aji finds Jerome Rothenberg in his numerous anthologies to be working very much in the spirit of Pound in his Cantos, with both anthologist and poet “crossing over the borders of time and space ... and envision[ing] the encyclopaedic mind as actualizing the whole of culture simultaneously.” In “Pound and Postmodern British Poets,” Tony Lopez offers, within the context of contemporary British experience, an illuminating reading of Andrew Crozier’s fine poem, “Free Running Bitch,” and an acute hearing of the Poundian echoes in its closing lines. The editor herself singles out for its “exemplary scholarship” Burton Hatlen’s “Pound’s *Pisan Cantos* and the Origins of Projective Verse,” in which he talks authoritatively of Charles Olson’s detestation of Pound’s politics, dislike of Pound’s personality, but immense admiration for Pound’s poetry. In the shape and movement of *The Pisan Cantos*, with “Pound’s new use of the whole page as a field of composition,” Hatlen discerns the principal model for Olson’s own theory and practice of projective verse.

*Ezra Pound and Poetic Influence* concludes with two pieces that could not exhibit more clearly the polarised political uses to which Pound’s life’s work may be put. Coming from the ecological left, in a rousing diatribe against latter-day Western imperialism, Scott Eastham salutes Pound, both the economic critic and poetic maker, as one who “took his stand against [the] dominant strands of modernity” that issued into being the monolithic regime of the global market. His, of course, has to be very much a selective reading of Pound, one which places a determined emphasis only on that which is good and beautiful in the Cantos, “the stillness outlasting all wars.” Meanwhile over on the far, albeit libertarian, right, William McNaughton, a regular visitor to St. Elizabeths in the 1950s and Sheri Martinelli’s “minder” at that time, enthusiastically celebrates Pound as a precursor of “the men of 1994” (Newt Gingrich et al.). Dennis includes this essay, “even though I disagree with it, since I believe it offers an interpretation of Pound’s economic and poetic thought, which we should engage with.” And,
yes, such a perspective on Pound is necessary for any sort of responsible overview of the disturbed, disturbing and often malign genius whom Lopez nevertheless rightly calls "the most important and influential twentieth-century poet."

University of Essex

R. W. (Herbie) Butterfield

Journal of American Studies, 36 (2002), 2. DOI: 10.1017/S002187580246873


The past decade has seen an increasing interest in the history of the body and the way it has been historically constructed, as well as an expansion in the interest in the economic and social history of sport. These two factors plus the growing field of study of masculinity and its historicisation have led to several recent works on men and their bodies, most notably Michael Budd’s The Sculpture Machine. Muscletown USA is an addition to this genre as it examines the twentieth-century growth of weight-lifting as a leisure activity and as a sport, especially as it revolved around one manufacturer of weights, Bob Hoffman.

Hoffman (1898–1985) was interested in physical strength and prowess from early in life and, after serving in World War I, turned to sales to make his living. Eventually he settled in York, Pennsylvania, where, after a couple of business ventures, he became a partner in a foundry. At first weights for weight-lifting was a sideline, but during the inter-war years Hoffman began to focus on the sport itself. He encouraged his workers to work out, hired men interested in the sport and turned York into a centre for competitions. Over the next forty years, he helped to raise the sport’s profile, coach the Olympic team and create an elite corps of weightlifters in York. Only in the post-war period was he eclipsed when the emphasis began to shift from feats of strength to the creation of a sculpted body.

In one way, Fair’s book is a solid study of an off-beat entrepreneur. Hoffman is comparable to the men who built other American sports in these years, allying increased leisure time with a profitable business. In the post-war years, Hoffman expanded from selling weights to offering health foods and dietary supplements. A teetotaller himself, Hoffman rejected the increasing use of steroids and other drugs to augment nature. It was a fight he lost as the amateurism of weight-lifting shifted to the show business attraction of body-building. Hoffman was also an equal-opportunity sports developer. A majority of the men who practised the sport were recent immigrants who sought to demonstrate their Americanism through weight-lifting. Additionally, Hoffman encouraged African American participation in the sport and rejected the idea that the sport be segregated. This caused problems when he featured John Davis on the cover of his magazine, Strength & Health in 1941. Hoffman rejected complaints and later noted that, were it not for prejudice, Davis might have been the first black Mr. America.

To many, weight-lifting may seem rather marginal in the development of American sport and leisure, but Fair uncovers its development at the crossroads of entrepreneurialism, increasing leisure time and the urge to assimilate.
However, although this book provides an in-depth consideration of Hoffman and his influence, it says little about ideas about masculinity or changing attitudes towards the body. Fair is to be applauded for showing us the mechanics of the growth of a sport, and for not shying away from the fact that Bob Hoffman himself sounds like someone you would rather not meet. A narcissist, womaniser and know-all, Hoffman remains the father of modern weight-lifting.

Middlesex University

KELLY BOYD

*Journal of American Studies, 36* (2002), 2. DOI: 10.1017/S002187530246687X


The reincarnation of the Ku Klux Klan during the inter-war era remains a relatively understudied subject. Glenn Feldman has produced an important state study that adds significantly to our understanding of the order. It is a central thesis of the book that the Klan commanded widespread sympathy and support. According to Feldman, the Klan acted as a conduit for the anger and resentment many ordinary Alabamians felt towards the Black Belt planters and Big Mule industrialists who monopolised state politics. The resurgence of the Klan in 1915 initially met with the tacit approval of the political elite. When the hooded order swept the state elections of 1926, however, the planter–industrialist alliance fought a rearguard action to restore their political hegemony. The pervasiveness of Klan violence threatened not only to deter the flow of Northern capital into the state but to provoke federal intervention. Far from representing the forces of enlightenment, elite opposition was essentially pragmatic and politically reactionary.

By the 1930s the power base of the Klan had been seriously eroded. Although it would never regain its grip on state politics, the order continued to terrorise those who threatened the established social and economic order. With the active complicity of police officers and public officials, Klansmen brutally assaulted labour activists and striking sharecroppers. The racial tensions stirred by the Second World War also acted as a catalyst for renewed Klan activity. Feldman sheds important new light on a period in Klan history largely neglected by historians. The most significant contribution made by the book in this regard is to remind us through one sharply narrated episode after another of the appalling brutalities that the Klan inflicted on both blacks and whites.

Although it is not an explicit theme in the book, there are numerous references to black resistance of the Klan. African American leaders initially towed an accommodationist line, taking issue only with the tactics the Klan used to enforce white supremacy. By the 1930s, however, black sharecroppers openly clashed with Klansmen. The story of Willie Witcher, a strike leader in Lowndes County, underlines this new militancy. Beaten and threatened with death, Witcher retorted to his assailant “You might kill me, but you’ll never scare me.” Episodes such as this contribute to historians’ increasing awareness of the role of black agency during the Jim Crow era.
While it is a pernicious practice among reviewers to assess books on the basis of how they would have written them, it is disappointing that Feldman does not include any detailed discussion of women, either within the ranks of the Klan or its opposition. This omission aside, Feldman has produced an exhaustively researched and authoritatively written work which enhances our understanding of the violent racial prejudices that characterised the Jim Crow South.

University of Sussex

CLIVE WEBB

Journal of American Studies, 36 (2002), 2. DOI: 10.1017/S0021875802476876


American Health Care is one of a series of books on contemporary policy problems published by The Independent Institute of Oakland, California. It makes no pretence to provide a balanced look at American health care, nor is it in any way an introduction for the uninitiated. Instead, it offers 13 densely packed and authoritative chapters written by distinguished authors, primarily economists and lawyers. By and large the chapters are well written and heavily referenced, many containing substantial data and detailed arguments.

The book begins by questioning why the Clinton health reforms of 1993–94 failed, arguing that the American people, simply put, do not trust the government to manage their medical care. Moreover, the authors contend that the scepticism of the public is well founded though not understood by many academics. The book is meant to challenge fundamental assumptions about the benefits of government intervention. It is argued that, no matter how well intentioned, government action more often than not exacerbates the market failures it is designed to correct or creates new problems. Instead, the authors express faith that unfettered private economic activity will promote the public good, while government intervention in health care will fail to serve the public interest. If left to its own devices the private sector is best able to correct those instances where medical care markets fail, and the various authors attempt to demonstrate how this might be accomplished in specific areas.

The book is divided into four parts: health insurance and financing; health care services; drugs and medication; and health care personnel. The chapter on the genesis of Medicare by Ronald Hamowy is an excellent introduction to the subject and raises many questions about American health policy. Likewise, the chapters on medical savings accounts (Gail Jensen) and health consumer contracts (Clark Havighurst) are insightful. Richard Epstein’s discussion of community rating and pre-existing conditions and Patricia Danzon’s discussion of liability reforms and the failure of no-fault systems are also valuable contributions, as are several chapters on regulation of drugs and certification of medical devices.

In summary, the authors find that government intervention, whether in the form of hospital rate regulation, licensing of medical personnel, food and drug
regulation, or malpractice compensation, is counter-productive and makes problems worse. Although this reviewer remains unconvinced and disagrees with the conclusions offered by many of the authors, American Health Care does succeed in challenging the assumptions underlying much health policy. At the very least, it requires a rigorous response from the defenders of regulation and those who would like to believe that government intervention is bound to make things better.

Brunel University

ROBERT H. BLANK

Journal of American Studies, 36 (2002), 2. DOI: 10.1017/S0021875802486872


The second part of Denis Flannery’s title purposively catches an economical paradox where “illusion” is “certain” in that it may be not only particular or even indisputable but also evasively non-specific. Taken from the 1883 essay on Daudet, the phrase is used by James as a measure of the “success” of a work of art in that it presents for the reader a living of “another life” and the possibility of a “miraculous enlargement of experience.” That “miraculous” rather gives the game away in its suggestion of a problematic relation to recognisable experience, expanding James’s point that illusion will, for readerly activity, make it “appear” that “another life” can be lived. Within the next decade, the unnamed artist-narrator of “The Real Thing” will confess to a “perversity” that offers additional force to the strategy of appearance, claiming “an innate preference for the represented subject over the real one: the defect of the real was so apt to be a lack of representation. I liked things that appeared: then one was sure. Whether they were or not was a subordinate and almost always a pointless question.” This is a Wildean moment, certainly, and the focus of a powerful and complex critique in the story itself: but, equally certainly for present purposes, it should, in its dispersal of customary binaries, be recognised as an important tenet within James’s aesthetic of representation. And representation is what Flannery’s fascinating discussion of illusion is most interested in – the complicated business of novelistic trickery that turns out to involve such a strong and unexpected engagement with the immediacy of experience: as Flannery, thinking of The Princess Casamassima observes, rightly: “In the quest to uncover what was beneath the surface what was, in James’s view, of greater importance was the fact of the surface.” To my sense, this lies at the still insufficiently recognised heart of the Jamesian enterprise.

Flannery progresses through a series of chapters on individual texts where the issue of illusion is examined through a set of related preoccupations. The Portrait of a Lady takes on gender; social interaction is explored through a matrix of sincerity and publicity in The Bostonians; the aesthetics of realism are probed in The Princess Casamassima; The Tragic Muse provides a site for the role of passion; the “writerly” stories, “The Aspern Papers,” “The Figure in the Carpet” and “The Velvet Glove” portray the cult of personality; finally, the desire for a future and states of absorption are examined in, respectively, The Wings of the Dove and The
Golden Bowl. Throughout, illusion emerges as performative, both creatively and destructively so: it is, for Flannery’s James, “as world-making as it is world-annihilating” and, above all, “the oscillating and powerful representation of an uncertain and frequently idealised reality.” Flannery’s many-stranded argument bears richly upon that always awkward matter of totality in its various forms, finding in The Bostonians, for example, “a commentary on illusionistic experience through a critique of a naïve aspiration to complete veracity,” and in The Princess Casamissima a reinforcing of “the futility of methods of observation or representation that make claims to absolute finality.” As a consequence, at the more local level, we find a highly acute account of the maleability of gender in The Portrait of a Lady, and in The Wings of the Dove a particularly insightful encounter with one of the temporal staples of nineteenth-century fiction (duration, continuation and revelation in time) where Milly Theale is shown to move from “represented time” to “representing time” as she attains a status akin to that of the narrator. For illusion to be successful, it depends a great deal on its capacity for absorbing its audience. Indeed, for Flannery, the two “can be said to have an almost inevitable interdependence.” But this is not at all a matter of audience surrender to beguiling writing: in effect, reading becomes paradoxically engaged – its distance elided through the intensity of absorption yet simultaneously restored problematically and in altered shape by a resistance to that elision, a resistance which, through its own potency, galvanises reading into the “enlargement” proclaimed by James in 1883.

If Flannery’s text is sometimes over-written (and, on occasion, clumsily so), it is also a first-rate close reading not only of James’s fiction but also of the strategies explored by that fiction: our sense of both is enlarged indeed.

University of Keele

IAN F. A. BELL


Two years ago Woody Haut’s admirable Neon Noir appeared, the contemporary equivalent of Pulp Fiction and the Cold War, his earlier work on crime novels. In that tradition, Erin Smith produced in Hard Boiled (2000) a fine study of pulp magazines and their working-class readers, examining hard-boiled tales as models of class mobility and lessons in modern self-presentation. Despite the reference in the sub-title to the crime novel, Greg Forter’s Murdering Masculinities also takes pulp fiction for its subject, although the approach is radically different from that of Smith and Haut. Forter concedes that his contribution is no conventional genre study. He selects as key texts not the fast-moving tales behind the lurid magazine covers, but the transgressive works of particular American writers which, he maintains express those desires unspoken elsewhere in crime fiction.

Forter’s texts, usually analysed in a relentlessly psychoanalytical mode, are: Hammett’s The Glass Key, Cain’s Serenade, Thompson’s Pop 1280, Himes’s Blind Man with a Pistol and Faulkner’s Sanctuary. For his investigation he prefers to rely
on the works of Freud rather than, say, Christine Buci-Glucksmann’s relevant study of modernism, masculine identity and the commodification of idealised feminity. Already in 1951 Sanctuary was being described as “a book of disgorgement” so that Forter’s focus on vomit is less than shocking. Freud and his successors made it possible to think of the human individual and his/her development in social and historical terms, but do not look here for reactions to Faulkner’s narrative as a fable of life in the Deep South.

The author of Murdering Masculinities admits to focussing on the negative moment of psychic dissolution at the expense of reconstitution, and to ignoring contemporary developments in crime writing. It is indeed bizarre to find a book on masculine crisis and crime fiction that fails even to mention the pungent, startling chronicles of James Ellroy. Forter endeavours to answer these self-generated objections by citing the affecting vision of wise masculinity in K. C. Constantine’s Cranks and Shadows (1993) and by giving voice to the registers of proletarian speech that the novelist creates. But it is like reading the start of a new monograph, and the base for Forter’s various assertions is dangerously small. The ending might have been engineered for these sombre post-September 11 days; echoing Constantine’s chief of police and seeking to sustain a personal note, Forter urges us to get up and dance … .

University of Hull

RALPH WILLETT

According to a 1993 poll, approximately two thirds of Americans believe that US POWs are “still being held in Southeast Asia.” The pervasiveness of this belief in the absence of any credible evidence – not to mention its contravention of diplomatic common sense – suggests to H. Bruce Franklin, the John Cotton Dana Professor of English and American Studies at Rutgers University, that fantasies about the Vietnam War have replaced the conflict’s reality and its aftermath in American memory.

In Vietnam and Other American Fantasies, Franklin builds on his important M.I.A. or Mythmaking in America (1993) by confronting more broadly the “fantasies that made the war possible as well as those myths, celluloid images, and other delusory fictions about ‘Vietnam’ that in the subsequent decades have come to replace historical and experiential reality.” His examination is wide-ranging, tackling among other subjects the history of war images and their manipulation by government planners, the origins of the contemporary culture wars in “the protracted culture shock” spawned by the Vietnam conflict, and Star Trek’s shifting responses to United States militarism.

While Franklin is highly critical of numerous myths circulating in American mass consciousness, he does not believe all fantasies to be “delusory.” Recognizing a value in fantasies that “put us in touch, not out of touch, with reality,” the author believes that the body of imaginative literature arising from
the war—much of it written by veterans—is one of the “two great Vietnam War achievements in which Americans can legitimately take pride.” Franklin analyzes the creative work of W. D. Ehrhart, Tim O’Brien, and others, as well as the war’s mixed representations in American science fiction, which, he maintains, has frequently employed “nonrealistic conventions to portray a reality deemed too atrocious for realism.”

The second great American achievement alluded to above, according to the author, was the popular mobilization against United States imperialism in Indochina, a movement in which Franklin played a prominent part; the book contains, for instance, a first-person account of the struggle to halt napalm’s manufacture by United Technology Center (which was subcontracted by Dow Chemical) in the San Francisco Bay Area during the mid-1960s. Franklin argues that after 1975 the antiwar movement—like the Vietnamese with whom countless Americans empathized during their long struggle for independence—has been subjected to widespread demonization, one result of which has been collective amnesia about its size, composition, and nature in public discourse—“almost total” with respect to the “crucial role” played by many combat veterans in attempting to stop the war. Franklin, himself a former Air Force navigator and intelligence officer, shows how both active soldiers and veterans posed a unique problem for war planners in their persistent opposition to the armed forces’ collaboration in French and American imperialism, as they sabotaged naval vessels, “fragged” their superiors, and assumed leading roles in the broader peace movement.

In its scope, its cogency, and its accessibility, *Vietnam and Other American Fantasies* provides an invaluable corrective to the many delusions about the Indochina wars pervading contemporary US popular culture, while at the same time providing an excellent model for the crafting of politically engaged cultural historical scholarship.

*University of Minnesota*  

SCOTT LADERMAN

*Journal of American Studies*, 36 (2002), 2. DOI: 10.1017/S002187510221687X


W. S. Merwin has continued to produce volumes of competent, occasionally interesting, poetry over the last forty years or so. Jane Frazier’s preoccupation is with Merwin as an ecologist, and with his shift from the “fixed forms” and rather “straightforward free verse” of the 1950s and 1960s. This routine poetry of alienation gives way, for Frazier, to the “broken syntax and stanzas” of *The Moving Target* (1963). “As a result and as a reason for this move to free form,” although it is far from clear why an ecological agenda requires such a medium, “Merwin has discovered a poetic place for himself—the wandering, alienated poet of the modern age has found a ‘home’ within the ecosystem.” This project is marred by hints of serendipity and opportunism that Frazier’s account does little to dispel.
Frazier’s chapter organisation is topical: “Origin,” “Division,” “The Disembodied Narrator,” “Silence,” “Language and Nature,” “New World Conquerors, the Environmental Crisis,” and “The Vanishing Planet.” In Merwin’s earlier poetry the belief is that a “search for origin may bring a sense of personal harmony with the earth” and “initiate ecocentric thinking,” but registered later is the threat to this “goal of biocentric existence”: senses of origin weaken, and are even extinguished, as the “earth continues to be depleted and contaminated on a daily basis.” (For some, of course, origin myths are interpellating chicaneries whose absence can only be welcomed.) One problem is that Frazier seeks the comfort of a narrative direction for Merwin, yet *The Lice* (1967) is, in some respects, more of an ecological polemic than *The Rain in the Trees*, published twenty-one years later. Chapters find themselves returning to poems as alternative themes seem relevant to them; this leads to a good deal of repetition and a fractured sense of the poetry.

Frazier exaggerates this poetry’s debt to a Thoreau whose function becomes that of validating, or canonising, Merwin. The book as a whole is woefully under-theorised and would have profited from some notion of the discourses of Transcendentalism, ecology and environmentalism, and from an awareness of the discursive constituency of these categories. Thoreau’s “intimate observations of the living world” are unconvincingly contorted into evidence of his prescient eco-consciousness; and, as the printer who ran out of the letter “I” when setting *Walden* might have testified, “humility” in the face of nature, let alone some kind of disembodied narration, was not one of Thoreau’s attributes. Frazier appears to believe that nature exists independently of a discourse which she sees, in any event, in sterile, anachronistic, terms. Whitman, in particular, is a casualty of these limitations: Merwin and Whitman “perceive the biosphere in different ways” not least because the word “biosphere” entered the language as late as 1899.

Oddly for a book on poetry, the issue of language is obtusely negotiated throughout. The first chapter, “Origin,” arraigns language as that which detaches and isolates humans from the natural world, whereas the fifth, “Language and Nature,” concerns the recovery of a language that binds us to nature. For sure, the issue is now the retrieval of “native” words, somehow more authentically related to the natural world, but this smudge compounds rather than mitigates the difficulties. Omitted is any discussion of Emerson on words and their natural correspondences in “Nature,” and Thoreau’s etymological excavations of the concrete origins of words however abstract. The destructive paradoxes of dealing with perceived disjunctions between language and the world in a form, poetry, whose medium is language, and of articulating silence in language, are avoided rather than confronted here, especially in “Silence.” Fudged are those discriminations made by Pierre Macherey between what is not said and cannot be said, or between factitious, deliberate and unwitting silence.

The challenge of using language to say how debased language has become, or how unavailable it is for utterance, is familiar enough (wearisomely so), and Merwin’s poetry palls in the extreme when, on Frazier’s account, it reaches for the “truly referential [*sic*] names for things” in the Hawaiian context of *The Rain in the Trees* (1988). Supermarkets and airports may be ecologically hostile places
and “paradigms of the modern situation,” as Merwin contends in “Glasses” and “Airport,” but the modish consigning of these semiotic paradises to the realm of insignificance is wanton captiousness.

University of the West of England


Aaron Friedberg’s book is not so much a corrective to Michael Sherry’s *In The Shadow of War* (1995), as the depiction of a parallel universe. For Friedberg, American anti-statism, not militarisation, defined the Cold War institutions and practices of the United States. The power of the federal government, the “uneasy state,” was and is constrained by institutional decentralisation, the ideology of limited government, business mobilisation and public resistance to high taxes. American military planners, even if they had so wanted, were unable to construct a “garrison state.” What was remarkable about American Cold War defence budgets, according to Friedberg, was the fact that they were not bigger. Despite the Vietnam War draft, voluntarism in military manpower provision was extraordinarily resilient. Military support industries, arms production and research and technological development all failed to succumb to centralised incorporation. America’s Cold War strategy, which settled down after 1960 into the doctrine of “flexible response,” was a compromise which reflected anti-statism. By contrast, the Soviet “strategic synthesis,” though relatively stable for long periods, was achieved only “at a much higher level of societal exertion” and economic damage. Anti-statism and moderate militarisation thus won the Cold War for America and for liberal democracy.

*In The Shadow of the Garrison State* is a rare creature: a brilliant polemic, which is both conscientiously researched and subtly argued. Two major avenues of criticism, however, occur to this reviewer. Firstly, is Friedberg really arguing anything which is very novel or startling? The yardsticks he uses for judging American “garrisonism” – the USSR and dystopian forecasts from the 1940s – are not particularly appropriate. Of course, the USA never attained the same degree of centralised militarisation as did the Soviet Union, a country which, after all, developed full-scale Stalinism in the 1930s. Nor did the USA descend into the kind of garrisonised polity envisioned by George Orwell, Harold Lasswell or Lewis Mumford. Is Friedberg really arguing much more than that America’s pluralistic Cold War bottle was half-full rather than half-empty? Secondly, Friedberg fails to discuss many of the characteristics often ascribed to America’s “national security state.” The Central Intelligence Agency, domestic anti-communism, Presidential law-breaking, doctrines of “preponderant power”: none of these are examined in any depth. Friedberg does write at length about private defence contractors and military support industries. He fails, however, to address adequately issues of the unaccountability of private power.
The section on Reagan’s military buildup, during the course of which major defence contractors made massive profits (an average 25 per cent return on equity in 1984), is unconvincing. The full range of explanations for the end of the Cold War is not explored. Do not throw away your copies of Sherry.

Keele University

John Dumbrell
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Of all the traditionally marginalised social groups to come under the historian’s gaze, the most neglected is the disabled. This volume is the first of its kind to explicitly examine the past experiences of disabled veterans – a seemingly strange situation given professional and popular history’s fascination with war. In this sense, therefore, Disabled Veterans in History is a ground-breaking collection. Consisting of thirteen essays and an introduction by the editor, its topics range from disability in classical antiquity to the treatment of disabled veterans in post-Soviet Russia. Despite this broad sweep, the book tends to concentrate on western societies, particularly North America, and the twentieth century. Biological impairment as a result of war, however, can be found in all societies and time periods. This relatively narrow focus reflects the infant nature of disability history as an academic field and can be excused. As it grows, so too, hopefully, will its scope of inquiry. The collection is also representative of the current state of disability history in that the quality of its scholarship is highly varied. Of the better contributions, Marten’s essay on alcoholism and Union Civil War veterans, and Hudson’s piece on disabled veterans in early modern England stand out in particular. They are models of what can be done when the techniques of academic history are used to explore the phenomenon of disability. Unfortunately several of the remaining essays do not display the same commitment to rigorous historical research, and are impressionistic and cursory. The volume’s use to readers new to this subject would also have benefited from the inclusion of a unified bibliography and index.

Disabled Veterans in History undoubtedly “provide[s] a beginning to a project that ... has been deferred much too long,” and for this it should be commended. But it is a beginning that is not entirely satisfactory. If disability history is to gain the same kind of academic acceptance as such historical “sub-fields” as women’s history – and I hope it does – it is essential that it should not only draw on this book’s strengths, but come up with answers to the questions posed by its conspicuous weaknesses.

University of Helsinki

Daniel Blackie
It is ironic to note that never before has the United States enjoyed today’s feeling of well-being and prosperity on the state of the American union at the same time as alarming questions are raised about the health of the American democracy and its political system. In the series Dilemmas in American Politics, Gierzynski’s book, Money Rules: Financing Elections in America, is an insightful and highly readable contribution to the current debate on the nation’s campaign finance system and its faults. This book will be very useful in political science courses to teach undergraduates the workings of the American political system.

Gierzynski identifies the problem of the campaign finance system as a conflict between political freedom and political equality. He argues that it is not so much money or the power of money which is at the root of the problem, but that the fault of campaign finance is inherent in the pluralistic political system of the United States. During the past decades the situation has deteriorated, the author notes, because the political process has tilted too far in favor of political freedom at the expense of political equality.

The author makes a convincing case in countering the oversimplification in the media of the campaign finance issue. This study does a very good job in defining the issue to its proper proportions by thoroughly discussing its historical context, the impact of contributors, the unequal distribution of money, and the existing campaign finance rules. Though beyond the scope of the book, it would have gained more weight by comparing the pluralistic system of democracy in the United States to parliamentary systems in Western European countries, where the ability to compete and communicate with the voters does not depend on the amount of money available.

This highly accessible book illuminates very clearly the fundamental faults of the current campaign finance system in the United States, but the implementation of Gierzynski’s theory may not be a feasible way to reform the system in practice. There is simply too much at stake for incumbent politicians inside the beltway. Also, alternatives would require an overturning of the Supreme Court’s decision that political contributions are the equivalent of free speech. If the conflict between political freedom and political equality is inherent in the political system of the United States, as the author states, reforms such as the public financing of elections, or limits set on contributions and expenditures will turn out to be mere political band-aids.

Leiden University

ERIK VAN DEN BERG
Reviews

American slaves. In recent years other historians of the antebellum South, including Steven Hahn, J. William Harris and Stephanie McCurry, have apparently shared her aim, highlighting the position and role of poor and non-slaveowning whites, who were, after all, the most numerous demographic group in Southern slave society. Whilst yeomen farmers have received the lion's share of recent scholarly attention, Free Labor in an Unfree World focuses on white male artisans: a smaller, yet significant and hitherto relatively neglected, group.

Gillespie contends that there was space for white artisans in Georgia throughout the period between the American Revolution and the Civil War, but that opportunities to amass wealth and social status varied over time, and by location. Gillespie's thesis revolves around the assertion that the slave system precluded class formation among Georgia's craftsmen because it was able to offer some, if not all, distinct advantages of mastery and upward social mobility. Gillespie argues that, although opportunities for successful artisans to join the ranks of the planter class had faded by the late antebellum period, white male artisans usually had something to gain from slave society. However, at the eve of the Civil War, the slave system could not always offer the same benefits to journeymen and apprentice artisans as it did to the artisanal elite, and social tension developed between master craftsmen and journeymen artisans.

Gillespie also shows how the cotton boom and slavery's subsequent westward expansion led to new opportunities for artisans, although the boom–bust economy, engendered by a constantly rolling frontier, could lead to uncertainty, encouraging mobility and migratory searches for work. The responses of Georgian artisans to the appearance of manufactures originating in the industrialising North on the Southern market are also given thorough consideration, as are the ambiguous responses and relationships occasioned by the presence of African American artisans, slave and free, in the antebellum Deep South. Her arguments are clearly stated, well illustrated and convincing.

Free Labor in an Unfree World is an exciting achievement. Using diffuse sources, from artisan's journals and account books to newspaper, census and court records, Gillespie presents a detailed and compelling analysis of craftsmen in antebellum Georgia, and their interaction with the region's complex web of class and racial tensions. She has made a notable contribution to the rich and expanding scholarship on the slaveholding Deep South and to our picture of the Old South more generally.

University of Warwick

CHRISTER PETLEY
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Historical studies often attempt to advance or undermine an established argument, and Mexicanos: A History of Mexicans in the United States is no exception to this rule. Rather than follow what he identifies as the dominant “anti-
imperialist” consensus in the work of Chicano scholars of the sixties and seventies, Gonzales claims early in the book that he is an historian who is “objective” in his approach. The pitfalls of this perspective are well documented and it has to be said that, while seeming to advance objectivity, his challenge to earlier arguments does have a distinctly political nature. The emphasis placed on “accommodation” rather than the generally accepted “Chicano-Anglo dichotomy” towards issues such as immigration, class cultural conflict and race relations in the twentieth century reflects his political bias and self-confessed “conservatism” most overtly, though arguably it is the decision to move beyond the earlier more radical historiography trends that provides some of the major strengths of the book. One such is Gonzales’s ability to pose some stimulating questions particularly in relation to areas of scholarly enquiry that have been under-represented.

By and large the prior concentration on the twentieth century and on creating paradigms for understanding imperial oppression established parameters within which the study of Mexican American history was determined. Gonzales’s work on “Pre-History,” “The Spanish Frontier” and “The Mexican Far North” which explore relations between Spanish and Native Americans provides a less inhibiting historical interpretation, as do the geographically defined sections on vigilantes, rural history and racial and social hierarchies in the nineteenth century. An apparent equation between female “emancipation” and the development of racial mixing on the United States–Mexico border nevertheless would benefit from further clarification. Perhaps an added chapter would have given due weight to critical developments in these areas as would greater attention to women’s history in general. The sections on “Mexican Women and the Labour Movement,” “The Chicana Movement” and “Feministas: The Second Generation” are still relatively brief reminders that, despite their marginal status, Mexican American women have also been active participants in their histories.

Using a wide range of sources Gonzales does none the less integrate a complex series of interrelating economic and political events into a condensed account of over five-hundred years of Mexican American history. Aimed at a wide readership in content and approach, Mexicanos: A History of Mexicans in the United States provides a very useful framework for understanding its development.

University of Wales, Aberystwyth

EIZABETH JACOBS
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*En Aquel Entonces* is a riveting and essential read for anyone interested in the history of Mexicans in the United States. This anthology, bringing together thirty-one of the most innovative journal articles published during the past four decades, provides a scholarly overview of Mexicanos in the United States while
at the same time introducing them to Chican/o,-a historiography. The editors
careful consultation with each author have made this text highly accessible to
students and general readers.

The text is divided into five parts: Genesis of A People (1598–1846); Gringos
Versus Greasers (1846–1900); The Great Migration (1900–1940); The Rise of
the Middle Class (1940–1965); and Chicanismo and Its Aftermath (1965–2000). Most
of the pieces are written by historians, but several other disciplines are
represented among chosen authors. This multidisciplinary commitment has
characterized Chicano and Chicana scholars since the advent of Chicano Studies
in the 1960s, yet its merit has never been greater than today—at a time when each
discipline has become too specialized to perceive a broader context and too
theory-centered to cross over other fields.

Another merit is that these pieces are drawn from a variety of journals that are
not readily available to students and general readers, especially those residing
outside the United States. While the need for strengthening American Studies is
felt in many countries, a good resource book on Mexican Americans has been
very difficult to obtain. This is rather disheartening when we consider the vital
importance of this population in reshaping the social, economic, political, and
cultural map of the United States in years to come as well as in reflecting upon
the meanings of pluralism and democracy in this contemporary age. One
consequence is that we, here in Japan, have a couple of new books on ethnic
dynamics and multiculturalism in the US that still remain virtually silent (or
negligent) about Chican/o,-a experiences. The field of American Studies would
be significantly enriched by incorporating perspectives from overseas. En Aquel
Entonces is valuable in informing and stimulating such a dialogue and is certainly
worth translating.

On a final note, I wish that Gonzales and Gonzales would publish a second
book to illuminate the representation of Mexican American by authors of “non-
Latino” background, i.e. those not incorporated into this volume, so that we can
have another dimension of the construction of Chican/o,-a identity and
historiography.

Keio University (Japan) 
Yasushi Watanabe
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Jack P. Greene and J. R. Pole (eds.), A Companion to the American Revolution
0 631 21058 X.

This volume is one of the first pair out of ten books to be published that will
comprise a set of Companions to American history, published by Blackwell. Most
of these volumes have been commissioned from scratch, but this particular one
work has proved to be an authoritative guide to the ongoing historiography of
the American Revolution. Students needing to write essays on the background
to American independence and its manifold consequences, as well as hard-pressed
lecturers delivering survey courses, have had reason to be grateful for the deft summaries of scholarship found therein. Anyone who still has that *Encyclopedia* will want to know whether the new *Companion* is sufficiently different and updated. By my estimation, around three-quarters of the text remains essentially the same. Material already published before has, for the most part, been only lightly revised to take account of the latest research findings. Many maps and illustrations that were included in the *Encyclopedia* have been cut, along with the hundred pages of potted biographies of personalities associated with the American revolutionary era. The six main sections of the *Encyclopedia* have been retained. Two deal with themes and events; two cover internal and external developments of the Revolution; another deals with contextual matters. A final section, perhaps the most useful for students, analyses broad concepts such as liberty, freedom and virtue that informed the discourse of revolutionary Americans. The new material has been smoothly integrated into the existing pattern of the book. One oddity, however, is a solid essay on the Townshend duties crisis that appends seventy footnotes, as if it were intended for publication in a scholarly journal. The *Companion* can nevertheless be recommended as the best available vade mecum dealing with all facets of the American revolutionary struggle: most essays are crisply written, factual accuracy is high, and helpful references to more detailed scholarship are provided. Some of the new material will interest specialists considerably; an example would be the tabular data provided on commercial industries and their workforce in the mid-Atlantic region. Individuals and libraries that already have the *Encyclopedia* will have to decide, however, whether to purchase an expensive volume only a quarter of which is new.

*Brunel University*  
**KENNETH MORGAN**
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If the subtitle of Miriam Gogol’s 1995 collection of Dreiser criticism, *Beyond Naturalism*, signalled a deliberate break with a narrowly defined literary framework, the present collection offers a generalised notion of American culture as a provisional relocation for Dreiser studies. Hakutani’s title does not signify a programmatic assault on the status of the “literary.” Rather, the “cultural” is conceived loosely enough to accommodate critical approaches informed by feminism, psychoanalysis and new historicism alongside the more traditional frameworks of close reading and comparative literary history. The result is a multi-vocal anthology in which Dreiser’s literary status is broadened and, at times, fractured.

In terms of coverage, the collection strikes a fine balance. Short works are not ignored, while the pre-eminent status of *Sister Carrie* is cemented. Jennie Gerhardt figures more prominently than *An American Tragedy*, which receives roughly equal attention with the trilogy of desire. Dreiser’s depiction of American cities,
a familiar topic, receives welcome development in essays by Thomas P. Riggio, Hakutani and Robert Butler, who make tellingly direct comparisons with Fitzgerald, Wright and Farrell. Expressed cogently and in terms accessible to undergraduates on traditional literature courses, the spatial taxonomies outlined here should also prove suggestive for emergent discourses of comparative urbanism.

This volume makes a major contribution to discussion of the topics of gender, sexuality and class in Dreiser. Essays by Marsha S. Moyer, Laura Hapke, Kathy Frederickson, Stephen C. Brennan, Miriam Gogol and others constitute a culmination of a steadily growing body of Dreiser criticism that focuses on gender and sexuality in ways that are theoretically informed and politically astute. Brennan’s use of Freud, Lacan and Irigaray to delineate the depiction of masculinity and patriarchy in Jennie Gerhardt is a model of clarity. Perhaps more unexpectedly (and unsignalled, except in the title of Hapke’s essay), the articulation of gender to issues of social and economic class serves as a touchstone for many insights, some of them brilliant. Thus Hapke shows how Dreiser’s depictions of working-class labour in Sister Carrie and Jennie Gerhardt are bifurcated by gender, while Frederickson highlights the differentiation by class of notions of social mobility and individualism in a previously neglected sketch from Twelve Men. In addition, Kiyohiko Murayama makes a significant intervention in the ongoing debate over the political valency of Sister Carrie, highlighting a Bakhtinian dialogism whose political dynamism has been under-appreciated.

There are some awkward shifts in register, due in part to the collection’s twin aims of orientating undergraduate readers and intervening in debates over Dreiser’s significance, and due in part also to the diversity of critical approaches deployed. Recognition of the operative status of gender, for example, varies hugely between essays. Overall though this is a fascinating collection, not least because it juxtaposes critical projects which seem as antithetical as they are inextricable: the continued development of theorised understandings of Dreiserian ambivalences over capitalism, genre and the individual/social, alongside other tendencies to resolve them into stable dualisms.

King Alfred’s College, Winchester

J U D E D A V I E S
Women’s leaders, according to Harvey, decided that the only way that they could achieve policy concessions for women was by gaining the suffrage. They therefore concentrated exclusively on the pursuit of the suffrage. But, as a consequence, the National American Woman Suffrage Association (NAWSA) was not organisationally well suited to the tasks it faced upon women’s enfranchisement. The time it took for NAWSA (now the National League of Women Voters, NLWV) to adapt to a broader policy agenda, allowed the established political parties to mobilise their own forces. Thus, both the Republican and Democratic parties developed their own women’s organisations, believing that women were a distinct group that could not be mobilised by the male party elite, and they were able to attract a large following among newly enfranchised women. While in the early 1920s the NLWV still appeared to threaten the independent mobilisation of women in electoral contests, party elites were willing to offer legislative concessions to attract women voters. The absence of clear mobilisation activity by the NLWV convinced the party elites by the late 1920s that they were not an independent electoral threat. The parties’ ability to control their own women’s organisations, meant that they were able to ignore any threats emanating from that quarter and they concluded that the “women’s vote” could be mobilised without offering policy concessions. It was not until the 1970s that with the weakening of parties’ control over the electorate, and a reinvigorated women’s movement, women’s groups were able to gain policy concessions.

Theoretical models are central to this book, and for this reason the non-specialist might find it rather inaccessible, but Harvey does draw substantially on archival materials and develops an historical narrative alongside the theory. Her argument is persuasive and does much to explain why women’s organisations were unable to win policy concessions from the political parties, despite the importance of the women’s vote. It is, however, a rather narrow interpretation that focuses only on electoral politics, and says little about the diversity among women’s organisations or about women’s turnout at elections, thus missing some of the wider picture.

University of Leicester

ELIZABETH J. CLAPP
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Authenticating the arduous adventure of crossing the American middle and further West, these diary and journal entries of six women offer a range of insights into the mundane details of such mid-nineteenth-century journeys. Primarily documents of a family or of local interest, they are collected here as key revelations of a nation in transition, more important, it seems, for what they have left out or held no knowledge of, rather than for what they include. This, at least, is the opinion offered in Sherry L. Smith’s introduction, which cites the absence of any extended considerations of the wider impact of such migrations, or of the
politics of manifest destiny, or more particularly of the Civil War, not as a weakness in these “communal documents” but as supportive proof of their “compelling individuality.”

For those cultural historians concerned with the minutiae of such journeys, what is contained here with regard to what food is eaten, what hardships are suffered, and what deaths and births occur along the way, may well prove to be essential reading, though, those familiar with any of the previous eight volumes may find old ground once again being revisited. Moreover, it is intriguing how the absences in these texts are glossed in this volume: whether examples of a gendered or individual myopia with regard to wider contemporary American issues, or testaments of a specific white and domestically oriented group, these diaries’ disconnection from critical American contexts surely requires a more rigorous level of investigation than that provided by either Holmes or Smith. Indeed, the mini introductions to some of the journals, informing the reader of how the editors discovered particular materials, add a further layer of evasive academic inquiry, sentimentalising journeys of an American generation which was rewriting the political, racial and geographic landscapes of a nation. The diaries of Ruth Shackleford and Harriet Bunyard in particular provide interludes of cultural importance: indeed, the latter’s continuous suspicion of “Negroe soldiers” and of Mexicans, let alone a shared distrust among the writers of Native Americans, marks these texts as examples of a particularly white and Protestant interpretation of the developing United States. What we are left with is a resounding sense of alienation on the part of the diarists, and on overpowering resistance by the editors either to question the racial assumptions or interrogate the cultural suppositions on which these journeys were based.

Goldsmiths College, London


History has not been kind to the American Whig Party, even if historians have been kinder to certain individual members such as Henry Clay. The Party, which lasted some twenty-two years, has too often been seen by historians as equivocal on the subject of slavery and probably best remembered as a mere precursor to the Republican Party – many of whose members began their political career as Whigs, including one Abraham Lincoln. Michael F. Holt’s magisterial study of the Whig Party is thus a necessary corrective, and should give cause for historians to rethink this easy dismissal.

This book is a comprehensive study of the rise and fall of the Party, from its origins to its demise. The amount of research is impressive – Holt appears to be familiar with the papers of every major Whig and many more minor ones. Equally impressive is the sheer volume of knowledge at Holt’s command, as the Party’s activities are examined at both the state and national level. Discussion of the odd assortment of individuals who made up the Whig Party is equally well
Reviews

handled, and not just the luminaries such as Daniel Webster and Henry Clay. Millard Fillmore, most famous for being one of the least-known of the presidents, emerges as an interesting and complex individual in this work. What is most impressive of all in Holt’s study is his skillful placing of the Whig Party clearly within the context of its time. In other words, this is not only a study of a party, but American politics as a whole from the 1830s to the 1850s.

This detailed and comprehensive study deserves far more praise than criticism, but there is, none the less, a contradiction at its heart. Holt’s main argument, that the collapse of the Whig Party helped pave the way for the Civil War is virtually abandoned by the work’s end. Indeed, in his conclusion, Holt appears to argue that the differences between the North and South were such that the conflict was inevitable — that it was circumstances, rather than anything the Whigs themselves did that doomed the Party. Unfortunately, this contradicts the book’s main thrust, that the Party’s members’ actions determined its fate. As it happens, his earlier argument, which underpins this book, is ultimately the more credible one. This quibble aside, this is a great work of political history, which should do much to restore the reputation of the much-maligned Whigs.

University of Wales Swansea
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Journal of American Studies, 36 (2002), 2. DOI: 10.1017/S0021875802636874


Forced Founders recreates the predicament of colonial Virginia’s “gentlemen revolutionaries” at the eve of American independence, a set of men whom Holton terms “the most paradoxical” figures of the nation’s founding era. Holton sets out to illustrate that the power-struggle that ensued between Virginia gentry and British politicians during the last decade of the colonial period was powerfully influenced by other significant groups whose decisive roles in the outcome of the colonies’ conflict with the mother country have until now lacked definition. Despite the focus on rights and liberties in their much-analysed public writings and speeches, Virginia elites also felt significantly challenged in other, more material ways which were frequently closer to home: by Native Americans whose “coalition-building” after 1763 pressured the British government into obstructing further land speculation in the west; by enslaved workers, whose growing numbers steadily escalated the threat of insurrection; by small planters, whose economic interests did not necessarily coincide with those of their wealthier counterparts; and by British merchants, who used their influence in London to maintain their control of Virginia’s trade. Like the Virginia gentry, each of these groups had something to gain or to lose in the burgeoning conflict with the metropolis. In the power vacuum which followed the collapse of royal government in 1775, new instabilities and opportunities arose which galvanised these protagonists in different ways. Enslaved Virginians saw an opportunity to gain their freedom by supporting the Royal cause. Native Americans, always alert
to the advantages of a war which divided Europeans, were ready to harry the frontier on behalf of the Crown. Smallholders were swiftly exposed to the hardships of a war which was intended to be a short prelude to a reconciliation between Virginia gentry and British politicians. The process of protest which was their response led them to a growing recognition that independence would mean a more popular form of government in Virginia. Although independence was not a serious item on the elite agenda in 1774, by 1776 it seemed the only way for Virginia’s gentry to maintain their increasingly precarious leadership in their native province. Independence promised to establish a new, legitimated regime which would leave elites firmly in control. It would end internal conflict by conceding to smallholders and poor whites the republican government many of them now demanded, and it would undermine the capacity of enslaved Virginians and Native Americans to appeal to the British Government as an ally. In the denouement of Holton’s narrative, small planters gained their objective of a more inclusive political regime. British merchants maintained their leading role in managing Virginia’s trade. But the real winners were the elite planters who, although initially reluctant to support independence, thereby consolidated their positions as political and social leaders in the new state of Virginia. Although Holton agrees with the Progressive dictum that the American Revolution was not only about the question of home rule, but also about who shall rule at home, Forced Founders is not history from below. It is an alternative narrative of well-known events which, by being inclusive, explores causation, and in so doing gives clearer, more empowered roles to groups such as enslaved Virginians and Native Americans. These are ultimately the losers; yet, as Holton shows, their influence on the march of events was significant. Virginia elites did not become revolutionaries as a result of a Whiggish power-struggle with metropolitan officials; instead, Holton uncovers a more complex and ambiguous path to independence, as large planters dealt with a myriad of conflicting pressures in their attempts to maintain power in their native province. Forced Founders is a challenging reconstruction of the trajectory which carried Virginia’s gentlemen revolutionaries from resistance to independence. It will be appreciated by serious scholars of Virginia’s revolutionary period; its lively style and wealth of anecdotes will make it an enjoyable read for anyone.

Dundee University
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Through the testimonies of African American labour organisers in Memphis, Michael Honey explores the history of race and industry in the city from the 1930s to the present. Honey, a Memphis-based activist in the 1970s, offers the rich memories of dogged union men and women who faced the hostility of employers, fellow white workers, local government, the police and the FBI. The recollections of these leaders illustrate the entire spectrum of segregation from outright
violence to psychological attrition. For many years, black workers had to “take it” (i.e. endure Jim Crow), barred from negotiations conducted in segregated hotels or referred to as “nigger” at such meetings. They remained alert to the sabotaging of machinery or their cars, particularly those given the “Jackie Robinson” task of integrating areas of production previously off-limits to blacks. Honey wishes to demonstrate that the black freedom struggle was conducted in factories and union halls prior to and alongside the efforts of students and preachers in the televised period of the Movement. This he undoubtedly achieves, yet his own notes and references indicate that black labour history is by no means a new area of inquiry. Robin Kelley and Tera Hunter, for instance, have recently written about the African American working class, and we have acknowledged unionists like Hosea Hudson, A. Philip Randolph and Nate Shaw for some time.

Black Workers Remember appropriately highlights such issues as police brutality and female organising. Its chapter on the sanitation workers’ strike of 1968 – elevated by the assassination of Martin Luther King and the appearance of stark placards stating “I Am a Man” – is a moving account of the fight for recognition by Local 1733. Yet the book is too long. The author might have limited his own comments which occasionally steal the thunder from his eloquent interviewees. Their accounts, meanwhile, might have benefited from closer editing, since fewer descriptions would have been adequate to convey the range of problems confronting black workers. Moreover, a critical perspective on these black activists is largely absent. The efforts of those black men and women who managed to organise in Boss Crump’s Memphis are remarkable indeed, but, equally, the genuine streak of black anti-unionism is neglected. This study would have been stronger for the inclusion of African Americans unsympathetic to Honey’s heroes.

University of Newcastle

ANDREW M. KAYE


America Divided is a first-rate work of synthesis that seamlessly integrates social, cultural and political history. Their backgrounds as 1960s college radicals and their current leftist politics have not prevented Maurice Isserman and Michael Kazin from writing a balanced study of liberalism, conservatism and the New Left which treats all concerned with empathy and criticism. While the book provides good accounts of the civil rights, black power, antiwar, Hispanic, countercultural, feminist, gay and environmentalist movements, it neglects neither their opponents nor the aspirations and frustrations of middle America. Evangelicalism, Catholicism and Judaism also receive as much attention as Eastern and New Age religions and beliefs.

The authors rightly contend that the 1960s were marked as much by conservative revival as by liberal triumph. The decade witnessed a clash over cultural politics, encompassing the functions of the federal government, race
relations, the roles of the sexes, lifestyle choices and personal morality, that is still being played out today. By the late 1970s, conservatives had won the political argument and began to dominate elections and policymaking. The widely perceived failure of Lyndon Johnson’s Great Society to alleviate poverty and successfully manage the economy, together with the belief that liberals now championed vociferous “special interest” groups and the undeserving poor at the expense of the hardworking majority, fuelled conservative resurgence. By the 1980s, “liberal” had become a term of political abuse.

Although conservatives now set the economic and social agenda, they could not reverse the entire legacy of the 1960s. Even as they echoed conservative complaints about big government, many Americans supported initiatives, such as Medicare and the Environmental Protection Agency, originally championed by Liberal Democrats. Women, particularly from the middle class, enjoyed a greater degree of equality. Americans became increasingly tolerant of diversity in lifestyle choice and sexuality. Indeed members of the counterculture and the dominant culture had shared similar desires, however differently expressed, for self-fulfilment, community and meaning.

The authors’ attempt to characterise the divisions of the 1960s as comparable to those of the Civil War is unnecessary, forced and unconvincing. There are some puzzling exclusions. Native Americans are absent. The important desegregation crisis at the University of Mississippi is treated parenthetically. Occasional inaccuracies intrude. Elvis Presley was not a Southern Baptist. “Love Me Do” was not the Beatles’ first British number one. The contention that cohabiting American men and women share housework and child rearing is questionable.

University of Derby
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Limerick’s The Legacy of Conquest (1987) has become a landmark text of “New Western History,” urging readers to revise the mythic visions of the Old West and the dominance of Frederick Jackson Turner’s “frontier,” in favour of a more complex, relational approach to the subject. Something in the Soil: Legacies and Reckonings in the New West, a new collection of previously published pieces, continues and develops these ideas by working its way through “heaps of memory,” as Limerick terms it, to uncover new ways of seeing the West and its history as “an ideal … a dream” and as “actual, material, and substantial.” There is a particular emphasis upon identity throughout the essays, drawing, as always in her work, upon her own experience of growing up in Banning, California. Her
work continues to assert that the personal is most definitely political. However, in this collection of essays, which could have been more sharply edited, some of these personal reminiscences are recalled more than once and begin to suggest an unhealthy obsession with her “roots” and with a kind of authentic identity that much of her best writing seeks to problematise. Likewise, she continually refers to the notoriety of The Legacy of Conquest and the position it placed her in as an academic continually being asked to speak on behalf of a non-existent new “school” of Western history. The essays vary in quality, but cover a range of topics: Asian perceptions of the Western landscape, Turner, Mormon history and the Californian Gold Rush. Limerick’s style deals as always with ideas, concepts and provocative revisions rather than with the minute documentation of archival history, but her work retains the ability to provoke and to stir the reader to further study. It is a shame that some of her recent pieces on representation, such as her collaboration with and essay on photographer Mark Klett, are not included here, for they seem to me to cover new territory for Limerick in which the older arguments are being applied more specifically to new materials.

Johnson’s book, Roaring Camp: The Social World of the California Gold Rush, is a post-Limerick study benefiting from the revisionist thinking of New Western History whilst at the same time extending many of its approaches and concerns through an awareness of the impact of cultural studies. Johnson, for example, writes of California’s Southern mines as “sites of contestation” in which “class formation” and ethnic and gender relations struggle for dominance and for meaning. She has no desire to synthesise history, but “to take issue with the received wisdom about the Gold Rush by encouraging the proliferation of alternative plot lines, stories not customarily nourished by the dominant culture, broadly defined, or even by most historical scholarship.” In this, she is truly “New Western.” Just as Turner had obscured the multiple histories of the West for Limerick by telling a meta-narrative of the frontier, Johnson works against the dominant story of the Californian mines to tell different stories of ethnicity, gender and class relations. This is a West where Joaquin Murrieta becomes an emblematic figure of ethnic and mythic status, where Natives, Chileans, Mexicans, Chinese and Anglos struggle over their different and related visions of future and a past which often become blurred between history and memory. Johnson reconstructs many, often fragmented, voices of the Gold Rush, from forgotten documents that tell complex stories of contact, collision and negotiation, to revealing narratives of ethnic struggle and gender battles, of racial panics and boom and bust, of sexual commerce and domestic arrangements, and of people who all “had to renegotiate their usual modes of representation” in the strange, new world of California.

At times Johnson’s material can seem almost too marginal, too small-scale, and yet she manages, in most cases, to integrate it into her larger framework of ideas, her “thick lens of historical context,” turning “backgrounds into foregrounds, portraits of individuals into crowds.” Ultimately, Johnson’s purpose in revising the Gold Rush is political, for, as she says: “If we can remember it differently, perhaps we can use that memory to different ends.” In this she shares much with the New Western History of Limerick and others whose work may vary in approach but has a similar goal of challenging the dominant narratives of the American West through its forgotten voices. Johnson’s careful mix of details and
concepts makes her study an important and unusual contribution to the field of western studies.

University of Derby


This book challenges, in Kimeldorf’s phrase, theories of proletarian conservatism. Selig Perlman believed that the American Federation of Labor’s (AFL) dominance of working class organisation was proof that US workers were job conscious rather than class conscious. That workers rejected the revolutionary industrial syndicalism of the alternative Industrial Workers of the World (IWW) was taken as further proof of this alleged conservatism. Kimeldorf believes that, in challenging this incorrect assessment of working-class consciousness, some labour historians tended to over-exaggerate the role of the IWW. Others blamed false consciousness for the attachment to the business unionism of the AFL. For Kimeldorf there has been a psychological reductionist approach to US workers’ consciousness. He asks, what evidence is there that the actions that workers took were determined by ideological motives of the left or right?

Kimeldorf argues that there is a distinct radicalism of US labour based on a form of syndicalism that was neither based entirely on the IWW, nor exclusive to it. He demonstrates that an industrial syndicalist current also existed in the AFL. That, in itself, is not new. Studies of the AFL (in particular David Montgomery) have outlined this before, but what is fascinating about Kimeldorf’s book is that he goes on to argue that this industrial syndicalism was, for the most part pragmatic not ideological. He illustrates this with two case studies of workers that left the AFL for the IWW in 1913. In the case of the Philadelphia longshoremen the alliance with the IWW would last over a decade, whilst the New York City culinary workers it was only a matter of weeks. Both groups would eventually return to the AFL, but the kind of AFL, they returned to was one that, to an extent, gave them leeway to pursue industrial organisation and militancy. Concerned not with pro- or anti-capitalist ideologies of union leaders, but with the most effective way of protecting their jobs, workers switched between the AFL and IWW, and thus pursued industrial syndicalism.

Kimeldorf believes that the different responses of workers in Philadelphia and New York to the IWW can only be explained in the historical context of the options available “under pressure.” For in this account, workers pursuing immediate union objectives did not believe the views of IWW or AFL leaders were central. The AFL had the final victory, in that it became the home of these syndicalist workers, but only after it embraced the practices of the defunct syndicalist unions.

It is impossible to do justice to the evidence that Kimeldorf presents in a review as brief as this. There is no room to detail the relationship between IWW and AFL militants, or the opposition from the state and employers, and problems
of race, ethnicity and gender that are interwoven into this compelling account. Kimeldorf provides a powerful case that the absence of a labour party, or mass industrial unionism, is not evidence that the US working class is conservative. He prefers to analyse what workers actually did to “organise themselves in opposition to employers and the state,” rather than use abstract and unproven models of false consciousness or exceptionalism.


Jane Landers’ stimulating monograph resurrects the Tannenbaum thesis within the historiography of Atlantic slavery. Published in 1946, Frank Tannenbaum’s *Slave and Citizen* excited a generation of historical debate by arguing that Iberian slavery proved milder than the monochrome racism of Anglo-America. In contrast to the conspicuous racial hierarchies of the British Caribbean and mainland, Roman law and Spanish imperial rule established legal protection for slaves and Catholicism acknowledged the African’s humanity. The color line that segregated North American consciousness proved remarkably permeable in the Spanish Caribbean where stark ethnographic divisions gave way to a broader and more complex structure of racial and social categorization. Tannenbaum’s thesis did not stand the test of historical scrutiny, but, in Spanish Florida, Landers contends that the peculiar combination of colonial competition, labor shortage, military necessity, and political ferment enabled freed and enslaved Africans to further their rights, power, and autonomy along the Anglo-Hispanic borderland.

Landers establishes that black Floridians manipulated the exigencies of Castilian law, custom, and faith to acquire social and economic opportunities that distinguished them from those living in Georgia and the Carolinas. Invaluable as laborers and militiamen on Spain’s tense and relatively unpopulated northern border, free blacks vigorously defended the Iberian regime when Anglos attacked. In an era, Peter Wood reminds us in his foreword, “replete with black historical agency,” Afro-Floridians shrewdly manipulated colonial administrators and the “emancipatory potential” of Castilian jurisprudence to advance working conditions, secure manumission, and obtain property rights, citizenship, and freedom. Fully politicized by the racial geo-politics and revolutionary ideology of the late eighteenth-century, black Floridians adeptly exercised the instability of colonial competition to advance and protect their economic and legal independence under Spanish administration. Astute to events unfolding throughout the Atlantic world, Landers’ Afro-Floridians operated upon an international stage, sharing ideology and political rhetoric within a vibrant multi-ethnic and linguistic community. Although somewhat narrow for generalization, the black community of St. Augustine formed part of the “Atlantic proletariat”, a class defined, Marcus Rediker and Peter Linebaugh contend, by a transatlantic discourse of freedom and equality.
Floridian maroons, black soldiers, and African American entrepreneurs represented, Landers argues, a significant threat to Anglo-Americans under colonial and post-colonial rule. Anxious to stem the flow of fugitive slaves escaping south and eradicate this dangerous example of racial collaboration on their southern border, the US waged diplomatic, military, and racial war on Spanish Florida until its acquisition ensured conversion to “antebellum” racial patterns. Despite the colony’s final capitulation to racism, Landers presents a convincing account of black activism within the midst of imperial rule. By accommodating the Spanish regime, however, slave agency carried a hollow ring as Afro-Floridians exchanged short-term gains of immediate autonomy for their long-term class interests. Why enslaved and freed Africans pursued this path after large-scale capitalistic agriculture eroded the legal and religious protection of Spanish slavery in the 1780s remains unclear, for, once commercial expropriation advanced in Cuba, priests and administrators swiftly shelved morality in the interests of the state. Landers overwhelming contribution deserves signal attention, for, by utilizing a diverse and rich array of primary sources, Black Society in Spanish Florida adds significantly to the works of late Kimberly Hanger, Gwendolyn Midlo Hall, and Daniel Usner in delineating the intersection of colonial and racial politics in the eighteenth-century circum-Caribbean.

University of Sussex  


Historians of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries have recognised cities and the processes of urban design and planning that create them as important forms of both cultural and political expression. In their new study, Urban Design Downtown, Anastasia Loukaitou-Sideris and Tridib Banerjee, consider how these expressions are constructed and what they subsequently represent in the United States of the present day. Focusing on downtown sites in California, and more specifically in San Francisco, Los Angeles and San Diego, the authors are particularly interested in the interplay between private investment and the public realm. Loukaitou-Sideris and Banerjee see power over the process of contemporary urban development situated in the hands of corporations, rather than municipalities. With this shift in investment has come a move away from traditional public spaces, such as broad avenues or central squares, as the focal points of urban planning.

Following a historical overview of the creation of American downtowns, Loukaitou-Sideris and Banerjee present case studies of projects that epitomise this corporate influence on contemporary cities. They look first at the political processes that allow for property accumulation and development and then at the design process that influences the final form of the projects. Particularly this latter section is informed by “behind-the-scenes stories,” based on copious interviews with key players in any given project. This very detailed approach based on
individuals’ opinions is a good counterbalance to a story that might otherwise seem too driven by anonymous corporate forces.

Despite the authors’ grounding in the past history of urban form, there does seem a danger that, in drawing the distinctions between public and private too firmly, they interpret their case studies as a wholly new phenomenon, rather than allowing for some historical continuity. For example, many of the urban development projects and zoning plans implemented in the early part of the twentieth century under the auspices of municipal governments were directly influenced by the business, or corporate, community of a given city, and even by very specific enterprises or interests. In seeking to illustrate “the shifting roles of the corporate, philanthropic, and public sectors in shaping the appearance and design of the downtown,” Loukaitou-Sideris and Banerjee could have done more to show that these sectors often overlap or are at least difficult to distinguish. Nonetheless, Urban Design Downtown does give its reader a means of evaluating corporate influence on the build environment, through its excellent depictions of the processes of contemporary development.

University of Glasgow  

MARINA MOSKOWITZ

Journal of American Studies, 36 (2002), 2. DOI: 10.1017/S0021875802706877


Utilizing some of the best scholarship of recent years from luminaries including, but not limited to, James Merrell, Alfred Crosby, Theda Perdue, James Axtell, and Rebecca Kugel, the editors of this book have offered a wide range of scholars access to a wonderful resource. The resulting book will appeal as a fine resource for the breadth demanded by undergraduate courses, yet also offers the depth of scholarship and expertise that will make it a valuable asset to any graduate student interested in the field. While a short review such as this is unable to detail all the works held within, a brief listing of the section headings will give some idea of the comprehensiveness of subject area covered. An introductory prologue section deals with the concept of cultural change through the idea of Old and New Worlds, for the native not the European. In section two we are led through areas as diverse as Demography and Disease, Ideology and Spirituality, Economy and Exchange, and Diplomacy and Warfare, and in the final section, From Revolution to Removal and Beyond, we are offered a final wide array of articles dealing with the early national period. One example chosen from the book shows the inventive and ingenious manner in which records have been re-examined and shown to reveal more than a first glance would indicate. In “Of Missionaries and their Cattle” Professor Rebecca Kugel has returned to the journal of nineteenth-century missionary to the Ojibwa, Edmund Ely. Reading the journal “coupled with ethnographic insight into Ojibwa Culture” Kugel has revealed strands of a story previously hidden. What appears at first sight to be nothing more than a brief record of one of many medical cases to which Reverend Ely turned his limited skills, is in fact a complex tale of competing cultures and attempts by the
Ojibwa, and specifically one individual Makwawaian, to understand Europeans and European material culture. One item that was to hold great fascination for the Ojibwa was European livestock. The Ojibwa developed an understanding of the cow as spiritual being. The cow’s ability to consume several herbs unpalatable to its American cousin, the buffalo, coupled with the potentially malevolent spiritual role assigned to the pastor himself, led Makwawaian, to interpret what Ely saw as an accident as a deliberate act of witchcraft by Ely using the cow as a weapon. This newly revealed interpretation is simply one example of the many fine works held within the covers of this book.

University of California, Riverside


Moore bases her book, *Leading the Race*, on the notion that black elites in Washington, DC intimately bound their fate with that of the black masses, thus becoming true representational leaders. In making this assertion, Moore challenges earlier scholarship that branded these elites as merely self-interested. The book contains interesting and useful detail about the local metropolitan area, with fascinating vignettes of the lives of her selected upper-class families. She narrates the lives of W. E. B. Du Bois’ Talented Tenth in established social institutions: the family, culture, leisure, church, education, occupation and social organisations. Moore uses her sources well; the papers of the elite archived in the area and black newspapers and periodicals unfold a story of pride, the emergence of the politics of respectability and an endangered elite in transformation in the age of Jim Crow to protect their social status.

Herein lies the contradiction. While the elites did bind their fate with the lower classes, this represented a reactionary strategy of self-protection, self-preservation and ultimately of self-interest. The transformation of elite priorities to highlight racial consciousness reflects their new dependence on black working classes for patronage as segregation intensified and once white clients became scarce. The book does shed light on the complexities and politics within the elite class. The shift from noble family ties to the rise of the importance of trained professionals mirrors the same social and economic shifts happening in white America, with the rise of the service sector industries and managerial classes at the turn of the century. That is not to discount the extensive philanthropic, church-related and social deeds men and women of the relatively tiny upper class performed, but it is to put it in perspective.

All this considered, *Leading the Race* is a fine addition to the histories of black elites at the turn of the century. As the text lacks the voices from the black masses with their feelings about their self-appointed leaders, I would recommend reading it in conjunction with Elizabeth Clark-Lewis, *Living In, Living Out: African American Domestics In Washington DC, 1910–1940* (1994). This book deals with
poor black female domestics who migrated to the capital. The time period overlaps nicely to produce a more complete picture of DC, showing the sites where the different classes in the African American community worked (or failed to work) together to combat their common experiences of racism and prejudice around them.

Yale University
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In this book Michael P. Morris, details the interaction between the various Native American nations of the Southeast and the incoming colonials. He uses trade to detail the complex and interwoven relationship that existed not only between two disparate cultures, but also between and within the colonial nations. Yet, this reviewer is left wondering what new information comes from this discussion. Chapters 5, 6 and 7 are detailed discussions of colonial trade policies and the manner in which they were affected by the actions of the region's native population both as customers and active agents within the dialogue. However, his claim that "historians have traditionally underestimated the deleterious effects of abusive traders" is a little surprising, for in 1929 Verner Crane was writing that "interior tribes" of the Southeast possessed a "resentment of the traders of the Charles Town." More recently this idea is also found in Braund's Deerskins and Duffels: Creek Indian Trade with Anglo-America, 1685–1811, a book that surprisingly does not figure at all in Morris' discussion.

The earlier chapters, which aim to set the stage for this drama, are lacking in originality and occasionally confused and misleading. In Chapter One, Morris gives a short introduction to Euro-American–Native American trade. In discussing the factors that motivated the local native population to enter into the seemingly self-destructive over-hunting of local wildlife for trade, particularly of the white-tailed deer, Morris puts forward a thesis suggested by Calvin Martin. Formed to explain the actions of the Micmac of the Northeast, Martin suggested that the virgin soil epidemics that struck the native population were treated as an unprovoked attack from the animals, thereby allowing a retaliatory strike when the native population began literally making war on the deer. The validity of this thesis has come under attack from several scholars, most notably for the Southeast by Charles Hudson in his article "Why the South-eastern Indians Slaughtered Deer." Morris also appears to confuse native thought with European description, informing us that the Muskhoogees, when referring to a clan grouping, "called such a group an Owachira." However, a glance at Morris' source informs us that rather than being a self-referential word, this is actually a Mohawk word first used by ethnologist J. N. B. Hewitt in 1906. In conclusion this work is limited in its appeal or usefulness for further study in the field.

University of California, Riverside

IAN CHAMBERS

This is the first comprehensive history of the best-known musical conservatoire in the United States. Based on thorough research, many interviews and first-hand experience of teaching at Juilliard, Andrea Olmstead traces the shifting artistic policies, student experience and faculty membership of the various institutions that metamorphosed over the years into The Juilliard School of today. The reader will find a lucid dovetailing, therefore, of the histories of the Institute of Musical Arts, the Juilliard Musical Foundation and the Juilliard School. The contextual backdrop to the book is provided by consideration of the changing social history of twentieth-century Manhattan; and the financial support for the institution is covered in depth without becoming tedious. It is helpful to be reminded that the $13 million provided by the textile merchant and founder Augustus D. Juilliard was the largest bequest to music in the United States before 1927. The move to Lincoln Center in the 1960s attracts attention, as does the integration of dance and drama into the curriculum. A major theme that emerges is the idiosyncrasy and power of various presidents of the School and the vulnerable position of most of the distinguished faculty. One president, Eugene Noble, a former Methodist minister, blocked the admission of Catholic, Jewish and non-American students, and was guilty of serious, financial mismanagement. More recently, the presidential styles of William Schuman and Peter Mennin have contrasted sharply. Schuman totally revised Juilliard’s history and theory programmes and pursued an aggressive management style, while Mennin remained aloof from students and instructors and was often an invisible leader. The faculty, on the other hand, including some of the most celebrated soloists and pedagogues available, have never enjoyed tenure and have been hired and fired according to changing presidential policies. Olmstead’s book is particularly good at highlighting these ongoing tensions: she has had unrestricted access to the Juilliard Archives, which were only made public in 1985. Few other studies exist of America’s musical conservatories, so this book could serve as a model for histories of schools such as the Curtis Institute of Music, Philadelphia, or the Eastman School of Music, Rochester. The book is handsomely printed except that the matte photos lack definition and too many proofreading slips occur – William Bachaus, William Kappel, “War I” and “Otto Niccolai” for, respectively, Wilhelm Backhaus, William Kapell, World War I and Otto Nicolai, are only a few.

*Brunel University*

KENNETH MORGAN


Historian William Riches’ *The Civil Rights Movement* offers a useful introduction to the struggle for African American rights, primarily since the Second World
Reviews

War. Elegantly and at times movingly written, perhaps what distinguishes this book from the many other surveys of the Movement currently available is its special attention to the connections between the African American campaign for voting and civil rights, and those of other marginalised and oppressed groups in America. The galvanising impact of the freedom struggle on drives for equal rights among women, gays, native Americans and the disabled is fully noted, and Riches’ relatively brief book actually does a better job of contextualising the Movement than many much longer works. He even manages a 14-page canter through African American history between 1619 and 1945 in order to set his main story in a broader perspective.

Although it is clear where his sympathies lie – and he is especially damning of the reactionary new conservatism of the post-Nixon years – Riches refuses to romanticise any of the progressive movements which he describes, seeing them all as flawed, often highly factionalised, and occasionally deeply intolerant endeavours, if undoubtedly worthy, heroic and necessary ones. This even-handedness can also been seen in his sympathetic treatment of white liberals who have been routinely castigated for their refusal to support increasingly radical black demands after the legislative successes of the mid-1960s. Riches suggests that the hostility of recent attacks on liberals and the achievements of the 1960s to which they were party (Voting Rights Act, Affirmative Action) actually indicates how successful they were in securing an agenda which was always reformist, not revolutionary.

There are many other engaging features of the book, not least the telling pen pictures of figures like Al Gore and Frank Johnson, whose careers were inextricably caught up in the ebb and flow of racial change in the South, but who rarely get much attention in these sorts of overviews. Occasionally, however, the inevitable compression of detail takes its toll on the complexity of the argument, and there are a few factual inaccuracies which could have been avoided (the Supreme Court struck down the Grandfather clause in 1915 as a violation of the 15th, not the 14th Amendment; the Boynton decision was in 1960, not 1958; the Sixteenth Street Baptist Church bombing in Birmingham was in 1963, not during the Selma campaign of 1965). Also there is not much here on the cultural aspects of the Movement – and when there is, poor LeRoi Jones (Imamu Amiri Baraka) has his name mispelled in both its pre- and post-Islamic variants. These quibbles aside, the book remains a useful starting point for anyone wishing to understand the contemporary history of race relations in America.

University of Newcastle

BRIAN WARD
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While the Nazi Holocaust has become so integral to American culture that museums are devoted to it, few have paused to ask how the culture has come to know and remember the event in such a way that it paradigmatically defines how Americans consider and respond to other global horrors (Cambodia, Rwanda,
Jeffrey Shandler attempts to address that historical process in his book, *While America Watches: Televising the Holocaust*, by focusing on the role television has played in the American understanding of the Holocaust. As he suggests, the history of television in the United States is almost exactly contemporaneous with the study of Holocaust history; the two, he argues persuasively, are inextricably linked in the medium’s role in creating and developing a “memory culture” of the event.

The first of the three sections through which Shandler traces that connection is the most interesting and least effective, as the author runs through a “Shandler’s list” of 1950s television treatments of the Holocaust. Like many media historians, Shandler gets so caught up in his descriptions of individual shows that their relevance to the point he wants to make gets obscured. His discussion of the 1961 televised trial of Adolf Eichmann, however, is well detailed and nuanced in its treatment of both the production and the reception of the “show.” Though Shandler’s analysis of the 1978 miniseries *Holocaust*, which concludes the book’s second section, is less thorough, it successfully opens up into the public debate over the meaning of the Holocaust and television’s much-criticized place in establishing that meaning. The final section of the book hurriedly traces that debate through more recent televised representations of the Holocaust and the use of television in Holocaust museums in Washington, DC, and Los Angeles. Cable television, particularly the World War II and Holocaust coverage that earned both the A&E network and The History Channel the nickname “The Hitler Channels,” is paid short shrift here, while the museum discussions uncomfortably shift the focus on analysis from what is seen to how it is seen.

For its shortcomings, however, Shandler’s book is convincing in presenting an almost inchoate connection between television and the Holocaust in America, and in outlining the role that connection has played in creating the central trope of the Holocaust in American morality. Shandler also refuses to take the elite route of blindly writing off the medium for distorting the “real” meaning of the Holocaust; rather, he says, the admittedly false simplicity and intimacy for which television is damned have in fact created spaces for discussion, understanding, and knowledge of the Holocaust that have made it an indelible part of American memory. As his book opens up a rich area for media scholars to explore further, so does Shandler’s own openness toward his object of study provide a worthy model for those scholars to emulate.

*Augustana College (South Dakota)*

JEFFREY S. MILLER


If a New Critic had fellow traveled, *The Power of Political Art* is the book he would have written. Emphasizing context as no New Critic would, Shulman nevertheless comes off as a kind of Cleanth Brooks for Communism. More *Well*
Wrought Anvil than Well Wrought Urn, Shulman’s book claims that the work of the 1930s literary left repays the sort of “detailed, in-depth” reading that Brooks lavished on Keats. If close reading reveals that the 1930s left produced aesthetic sophisticates rather than party hacks, then, or so Shulman implies, these writers may get the “classroom exposure” they have previously been denied.

In his introduction and first chapter, Shulman convincingly points out that many on the 1930s left belonged to “a nonmodernist avant-garde tradition we have lost sight of as avant-garde.” Like a number of recent critics, Shulman also contends that 1930s writers were “animated,” rather than hindered, by their engagement with Communist Party positions and debates. Thus, in his chapter on Richard Wright, for example, he goes against the critical grain and argues that Wright’s engagement with communism “strengthens” Native Son. While he challenges the common critical view of Native Son, he also wishes readers to view Langston Hughes from a 1930s left, as well as a 1920s Harlem, angle. Examining the “neglected” political poetry Hughes wrote in the 1930s, Shulman shows how, as it calls for community and rebellion, it blends African American vernacular and musical traditions with the political concerns of the left.

If Shulman wants Wright and Hughes read differently, he simply wants Herbst, Le Sueur, and Rukeyser read. An acute and attentive reader, Shulman ably demonstrates that each of these writers has much to offer contemporary readers. His chapter on Herbst is at its strongest when he examines the Trexler trilogy’s “fusion of the personal and public, of family history and national history.” In writing of Le Sueur, Shulman illustrates her distinctly Midwestern, as well as Marxist, feminist, and ethnically inflected investigation of a “people’s culture.” With Rukeyser, Shulman’s focus is a modernist documentary poem, “The Book of the Dead,” about the thousands of West Virginia Union Carbide workers poisoned by silicosis contracted on the job. A formally innovative attack on corporate capitalism, “The Book of the Dead” may, Shulman contends, be profitably read alongside the 1930s collaborations of Agee and Evans, Bourke-White, and Caldwell.

Like a number of recent critics, Shulman does valuable work in emphasizing the range and vitality of the 1930s literary left. If his emphasis on close reading is his book’s novelty, it is also his attempt to preach left literary virtues to the unconverted. I am less convinced than Shulman, however, that his critical methodology will bring new readers to the literary left. I am also unsure that the writers he examines are always as complex and innovative as he claims them to be. Finally, I am far from certain that they need to be complex and innovative to deserve a larger readership. That said, and recent upsurge in critical interest notwithstanding, books about 1930s left writers remain in relatively short supply. While it is not as compelling as Maxwell’s New Negro, Old Left, or as readable as Browder’s Rousing the Nation, The Power of Political Art is still a useful addition to critical efforts to re-evaluate the writings of the red decade.

As a political figure, George Lincoln Rockwell was, in Frederick Simonelli’s words, “notorious but essentially powerless.” About 50 American Nazis attended Rockwell’s 1967 funeral, following his murder at the hands of a fellow right-wing extremist. Following Rockwell’s 1965 decision to concentrate publicly on “white power,” rather than anti-Semitism, the American Nazi Party (ANP) did achieve considerable publicity. Rockwell attracted around 6,500 votes in the 1965 Virginia gubernatorial election. Various theatrical stunts, a 1996 interview with Alex Haley in *Playboy* magazine, the “shadowing” of Martin Luther King and Rockwell’s arrest in Chicago all attracted public notice. Yet Rockwell was a very marginal figure, an extremist’s extremist. Always in severe financial straits, the American Nazi Party could not even attract money from major far-right benefactors like H. L. Hunt.

Simonelli has expended a great deal of scholarly energy in telling Rockwell’s story of failure. This is a painstaking study: the first serious Rockwell biography, and the first to be written by a non-sympathiser. Simonelli argues that Rockwell’s story does have historical significance: that the Nazi leader stood between older “hatemongering demagogues” like Gerald L. K. Smith and later figures like Lyndon Larouche and David Duke. Rockwell “brokered the marriage between racism and anti-Semitism and theology that provided a spiritual haven within the Christian Identity movement for those seeking justification from God for the hate that drives them.” Rockwell was the first American rightist to see the demagogic potential of Holocaust denial. He also developed, against the grain of Hitlerism, a “pan-white” definition of “white power,” designed to appeal particularly to working-class Americans of Southern European origins.

Unsurprisingly, Simonelli cannot really account for Rockwell’s wildness. Rockwell’s father was a vaudeville comedian, whose friends included George Burns and Groucho Marx. George Lincoln Rockwell was educated at Brown University and served his country as a navy pilot. His conversion, in 1951–52, to doctrines of race war and genocide was sudden and extraordinary Rockwell’s brother, Bobby, offered to pay for psychiatric help. Simonelli’s book is worthy rather than enjoyable. Certain chapters are nevertheless fascinating. The American Jewish Committee’s “quarantine” policy (designed to minimise confrontation with, and publicity for, Nazis) is discussed with sensitivity and intelligence. To a British reader, Rockwell’s European links are also interesting. (The 1962 meeting to form Rockwell’s World Union of National Socialists took place in Gloucestershire. Its plans for global genocide were known as the “Cotswold Agreements”). *American Fuehrer* is a careful and sensible study of the far, far shores of political unreason.

*Keele University*

John Dumbrell
For Werner Sollors, “recurrences” of all kinds supply “interracial literature” with its “special quality.” Interracial literature is defined as “works in all genres that represent love and family relations involving black-white couples, biracial individuals, their descendents, and their larger kin.” The focus, in part, is on a number of thematic occurrences, motifs and topoi in an encyclopaedic range of novels, plays and poetry (in works by no means confined to an American context), many of which Sollors here identifies and moves into prominence for the first time, and the details of which he includes in an exhaustive appendix. Sollors’ analytical enthusiasm is for intertexts, rather than texts: the corollary is not only a revealing preoccupation with “recurrence” as a “systemic quality,” but with some of its “historical unfoldings and transformations” as “represented in a few selected moments of revision, change, and rupture.” This book is both a seminal critical study of interracial literature and, as its subtitle implies, an intervention in the theory, or discourse, of thematics. Menachem Brinker, on whose work the argument partly draws, contends that themes inhabit the “intertextual space created by the partial overlapping of artistic fictional texts,” and that the search for the theme of a text cannot be confined to the specifics of one text: the theme is precisely that which may unite different texts. Sollors locates synergies between this approach, predicated as it is on overlapping and miscegenation, and the texts he excavates.

The first three chapters survey notions of the “origins” of racial difference, fictional representations of the births of children whose colour differs from their parents, and the racialisation of the biblical “curse of Ham” as it has been appropriated to account for the emergence of “blackness.” A fourth chapter, “The Calculus of Color,” traces a “double legacy of the Enlightenment interest in the calculus of color”: the “scientific excesses of eugenicism and fascism as well as the scientific knowledge that helped to dismantle segregation and apartheid.” Elsewhere, in a pattern that becomes familiar as the book proceeds, Sollors makes evident the extent to which a belief in the bluish tinge of fingernails, for example, as a sign of “negro blood,” is “yet another ideological element that helped to fix racial categories against ‘appearance.’”

Two chapters stand out in a book that is, nonetheless, erudite, informative and utterly convincing throughout: “Retellings: Mercenaries and Abolitionists,” and “Incest and Miscegenation.” Scrupulously mapped in the former is the position of Lydia Maria Child’s “Joanna” (1834) in relation to eighteenth-century precursors (such as John Gabriel Stedman’s Narrative of a Five Years Expedition Against the Revolted Negroes of Surinam, 1796) and the thirty years or so of “thematic production” that it engendered. “Incest and Miscegenation” revisits, and even regenerates, a text that inherits the cumulative theoretical and empirical abundance of the book as a whole: Absalom, Absalom! Sollors has little difficulty in demonstrating both that the “obsession with incest seems intimately connected with the fear of miscegenation,” and that “racial fantasies … reveal a deep and necessary yearning for incest.” Werner Sollors has produced a book,
then, which is at once a telling intervention in thematics, a unique history of interracial literature, and a simply indispensable critical study.

University of the West of England
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Historians of the American antislavery movement have made much of the internecine struggles between William Lloyd Garrison and his followers, whose brand of perfectionism required that they withdraw from the established institutions of church and state, and the main body of abolitionists, who sought to achieve their ends through electoral politics. The Garrisonians, it is said, maintained their ideological purity at the cost of alienating practically everyone, while the anti-Garrisonians only managed to advance their cause by forming alliances with groups whose motives were distinctly self-interested.

These accounts, according to Douglas M. Strong, oversimplify the situation. For a start, they are based on what the leaders of the opposing factions said rather than on what the great mass of the movement’s supporters believed. They also fail to take account of the underlying perfectionist theology out of which Strong, as a professor of Christian history, sees abolitionist thinking as having evolved. Looked at from a theological viewpoint, it emerges that rather than there being two distinct groupings, each with its own brand of abolitionism, there existed a broad spectrum of beliefs ranging from anarchistic perfectionism at one extreme to moral pragmatism at the other. In the “burned over” district of up-state New York, so-called on account of the successive revivalist movements that swept through it, abolitionists generally attempted to steer a middle course. Most were millenarians of one kind or another, believing that the time in which they lived belonged to the thousand-year period that would end with Christ’s Second Coming. In preparation for that event they saw it as incumbent on individuals to strive for moral perfection. As slavery was a notorious breeding ground for all the worst human vices, it followed that they should seek its overthrow. That, however, did not require that they go to the Garrisonian extreme of withdrawing from existing institutions on the grounds that they were corrupt. Sanctified individuals needed sanctified institutions to achieve their ends. In the first instance, therefore, they should strive to purify institutions from the inside, although when that proved impossible they might find it necessary to establish new ones. This was a doctrine that gave rise to much ecclesiastical disruption and the founding of many new churches. In up-state New York, the Liberty Party derived most of its support from a network of some 300 abolition churches, some long established, others newly founded.

By drawing attention to the close correlation between perfectionist beliefs, church membership and political abolitionism in upper New York State Strong helps fill out the picture given by Gilbert H. Barnes, Dwight L. Dumond and others of the way the religious revivalism of the 1820s turned into the antislavery activism of the 1830s and 1840s. Religiously motivated Christian action groups
remains a feature of American political life. Despite the arrival of the new millennium, however, the disappointments of the past century make it difficult for them to summon up quite the same degree of optimism and millennial fervour as that manifested by their early nineteenth-century predecessors.


This makes a noteworthy contribution to the literature on early nineteenth-century religion and labour. Baltimore’s growth from the late colonial period onward made it a significant centre of artisan manufacture. By the 1820s and 1830s many tradesmen were facing the competitive and organisational pressures of an emergent industrial capitalism. Baltimore was also a strong centre of urban evangelicalism, especially of Methodism; by 1830 a quarter of its churchgoers were Methodists and a decade later there were twenty-eight Methodist congregations in the city. Noting the parallels between these economic and religious transformations, William R. Sutton examines the interconnections between artisan status and evangelicalism.

His argument is designed to rebut the old bugbears of religious and labour history: that evangelicalism was an instrument of social control, and that it made working people docile in the face of capitalist transformation. Artisans who embraced evangelicalism did so at their own behest, not their employers’, and their religious and political beliefs shaped a pattern of resistance to the economic and ethical changes that industrial capitalism brought. Imbued with the ideology of small producers who believed in the sanctity of labour and economic restraint, many artisans found an evangelicalism that complemented these ideals. “Evangelical producerism,” as Sutton calls it, upheld equality and a moral economy against liberalism and the power of the wealthy, and would help sustain Baltimore’s labour movement when protest spread across the city’s trades between 1833 and 1836. Advocates of harmony between social classes, artisan evangelicals condemned the greed and power that pitted masters against journeymen, and they struggled to uphold the producerist vision of an artisans’ republic.

For its account of Baltimore’s labour movements of the 1830s alone, this book would be valuable. But Sutton also uses the interplay between producerism and evangelicalism to shed light on other aspects of Jacksonian-era social change. He argues that Baltimore trade unions were already weakened by divisions and loss of public sympathy before the 1837 panic swept them away. He traces the ways in which evangelical workers did, by the 1840s, embrace aspects of liberal individualism, though he also shows that the legacy of a producerist ideology continued. Above all, he notes the degree to which artisans conducted their religious affairs on their own terms.
Like other good, nuanced accounts, Sutton’s leaves us wondering about further aspects of the story. Though it is about Baltimore, the book tells us most about the kinds of encounters between labour and religion played out in the North during the Jacksonian period. While not ignoring it, Sutton has little room to explore the implications of slavery. As elsewhere, Baltimore’s Methodists broke apart in the 1840s over that issue. It would be useful to consider how this intersected with the ideas of artisan-evangelicals (many of whom, as Sutton shows, were anti-slavery) and the confrontations between producerism and capitalism.

University of Warwick

Christopher Clark
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Taves’ book is to be welcomed. This work contains 361 pages of substantive sustained main text supported by 71 pages of accurate, up-to-date helpful footnotes which are succinct where need be, whilst thoughtfully discursive at other points. Taves uses various frameworks of analysis and presentation. Her underpinning theme is religious experience, but in a double sense of “the interplay between experiencing religion and explaining experience.” In considering “religious experience” she broadens the picture. A chronological treatment from 1740–1910 is interwoven with a triple thematic progression. Part One on “Formalism, Enthusiasm, and True Religion” considers the periodic waves of evangelical Christian renewal, including African American movements, from 1740–1820. Taves’ treatment is clear, effective and sensitive in this relatively well-trodden academic area. Her profile of the “Shouting Methodists” and their camp meetings is particularly graphic. This indicates some of the extra value in her book, as she brings the academic subject to life for the reader through skilful use of varied rich primary textual sources. Taves goes still further in Part Two, on “Popular Psychology and Popular Religion,” which focuses on the various spiritualist strands (clairvoyants, visionaries, trances, etc.) that flourished c. 1820–1890. Although far removed from evangelic Christian theology, Taves unites these previous disparate elements of the American setting through her underpinning concern with tracking religious experience. Useful visual material from the times enriches this ongoing analysis. Last, but not least, is a further widening of horizons in Part Three, which deals with “Religion and the Subconscious.” This pays particular attention to the contributions of William James, whose field spanned the worlds of physiology, psychology, philosophy and comparative religion at Harvard. James is a fitting conclusion to Taves’ own work which has this distinctive and successful cross-disciplinary thrust to it as it also ranges across varied manifestations of “religious experience” inside and outside Christianity, and indeed outside Religious Studies. University libraries could place this book with value in their Religious Studies, History, American
Reviews

Studies, and Psychology sections. Academics, students and the interested general reader will benefit from reading this book. In short, one is spoiled for choice amidst this rich panorama from Taves of American cultural developments 1740-1910, which expands the horizons in considering the American religious experience.

Brunel University  DAVID A. SCOTT
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This book asks us to reappraise American dance between 1890 and 1920. It is particularly informative in a number of areas: it discusses how social and theatrical dance burgeoned at this time, saying this was so because dancing bodies provided good models for working out issues of autonomy, dependence and gender roles. It reveals how famous female dancers like Loe Fuller, Ruth St. Denis and Isadora Duncan were supported by what the author calls “women’s cultural practices.” It sheds light upon the Settlement House movement in which community dance programmes were used to remedy physical, moral and even spiritual problems resulting from deep changes in industry, immigration and demography. It speaks of how the Girls’ Branch of the Public Schools Athletic League in New York City, through dance in park fetes, dealt with questions about gender and particularly with what it meant to be female during the period considered.

However, it is difficult to accept all that the book says or implies. The author seems to oppose dance featuring what she calls “communal participation by the many” with dance that emerges out of “the modernist myth of dancing as a rarefied realm … accessible only to a few.” What she calls “myth” and a “rarefied realm” appears to be the position of performance artists, like those mentioned above, who make dance as high art or performance dance at what is usually thought of as the professional level. At least sometimes in this book it is as though a conflict is being imagined between such dance and non-professional community dance (whether performance based or not). The author says these two kinds of dance represent “competing views of human creativity.”

Need this be so? We presently have dance practised and produced by the performer who is especially skilled and perhaps especially gifted while we also have the surely valuable dance which is pursued through the “communal participation by the many” in the sense that the many dance. It seems unfair and an over-simplification for the author to say, for example, that “[Doris] Humphrey’s modernist practice positioned creativity as the purview of the few.” Perhaps it is better to think of dance artists like Humphrey as specialists who, through dedicating their lives to their speciality, gave to the many of society a special and hard-earned gift. Humphrey probably realised she was concerned with one kind of dance creativity that existed among others.

Rambert School, Brunel University  ROSS MCKIM
Historiography occupies one of the more unfashionable wings of the disciplinary house, but present-minded students have much to learn from retreading the dusty corridors of past scholarship. Hugh Tulloch sets out his own stall in his introduction: the central cause and consequence of the Civil War, he writes, was “a recognition of, and attempt to adjust, the racial question in America to conform to the principle of the Declaration of Independence that ‘all men are created equal.’” After a useful discussion of the American historical profession, the author scrutinises the major participants in debates over slavery, abolitionism, the war’s origins, the war itself and post-war reconstruction as they struggled to free themselves from the conflict’s long shadow. Tulloch’s judgments, especially in the early chapters, are sharply etched, and we are rarely left in doubt as to which scholarly pillars he believes deserve our continuing respect and which do not. He is at his most persuasive when morally engaged, as in the chapters on slavery and abolition; by contrast, the discussion of the war itself is less successful, turning that infinitely ambiguous conflict into a prosaic litany of military and political success and failure.

Hugh Tulloch writes so engagingly and with such perspicacity about the pastmasters of Civil War-era historiography that one can only regret that his study is so neglectful of the recent past, and thus subversive of the book’s professed aim to demonstrate that historiography, “far from being otiose and irrelevant, is highly pertinent and central to our sense of how we interpret the world around us.” Important recent works by James M. McPherson and Gary Gallagher are discussed, but these are the exception, and the book’s failure to acknowledge, let alone examine in detail, the vibrant and multi-faceted scholarship of the past two decades is a serious failing. Space constraints preclude listing all the main victims. Suffice to say that today’s students will search in vain for many of the leading historians on their course reading lists, including Michael Tadman (whose 1989 study of the internal slave trade fundamental challenges the work of Eugene Genovese that Tulloch reveres) and Deborah Gray White on slavery, Drew Gilpin Faust and George Rable on Confederate political culture, and virtually everybody on the rich historiography of secession, which Tulloch inexplicably ignores. The issue is not about individual historians, however, but about subject and approach. From the evidence displayed here, at least, the author seems out of sympathy with modern social and cultural history, and his discussion of the war years in particular betrays a yearning for scholarly battle-lines that most of today’s combatants are ill-inclined to join. It may seem too fashionable a complaint, but a study of the “debate” on the Civil War period that fails to mention the impact of women’s history – on slavery, on abolition, on the domestic war, for example – and incidentally also fails to note the work of any female historian writing after 1979, is bound to invite controversy. But perhaps that was the author’s intent.

Keele University

Martin Crawford
This is a useful, thorough book by a venerable and respected historian of Native America, but, in significant ways, it disappoints. Wallace dubs Jefferson an “enigma with charisma,” but never expands adequately on the intricacies of this ungainly phrase. To be sure, Jefferson has invoked the classic problems of democracy for successive generations, but, as Wallace’s own book demonstrates, there was nothing particularly enigmatic in his self-serving and apocalyptic conception of Native Americans. A certain ambivalence is clearly detectable in Jefferson’s words and actions concerning Indians, but his main focus was always the survival and expansion of the United States as a republic governed by Anglo-Saxons. He was, variously and simultaneously, a lawyer, a landowner, a geopolitical, a public relations man, a slave-owner and an Indian-lover, but his actions and rhetoric always advanced the settlers’ cause. He helped the republic obtain Indian land at any cost, short of expensive and wholly unprovoked wars of conquest. The “apostle of liberty,” as Wallace points out, was a man with “a deeply controlling temperament.” His relentless moralism allowed him to trample on civil liberties and use force to achieve national goals. In Indian affairs, as perhaps in foreign policy, he clothed his actions in a rhetoric of benevolence and virtue.

Many working with Native American studies are tired of the key words in Wallace’s subtitle. We have heard enough of tragedy, rather than survival, of fate rather than historical adaptation, even if this is Jefferson’s view as opposed to Wallace’s. It seems this book was written for a non-Indian audience – Jefferson is described as “our version of the universal Trickster” and also as “shape-shifter” in inappropriate co-option of Indian culture. He was none of these things. As Wallace himself puts it, he was an ethnic cleanser, one who favoured a “final solution” for the Indians and blacks who refused to assimilate. And if only it were true, as Wallace claims, that Indian cultures were “decimated” – Indian populations were eroded by much more than a tenth. This is a book for, I presume, the “Second Americans.” I fear that, as far as “First Americans” are concerned (whoever they might be), it simply does not say enough forcefully enough.

Anglia Polytechnic University, Cambridge

JOY PORTER

Any study of the development of the birth-control pill will be centrally concerned with the expansion of women’s reproductive choices. But, as this book so clearly
demonstrates, it involves other questions too. In part, it is about the risks that come with the ingestion of oral contraception. It is about the relationship between women and doctors, between women and their partners and between science, medicine and the media. Not least, it is about how women have responded differently to this intervention into their bodies.

Underpinned by some excellent archival material, interviews with key individuals and an extensive use of the newspapers, magazines and medical journals of the time, this study is particularly strong in its discussion of concerns over the safety of the Pill. The appearance in the late sixties of a book on the dangers of oral contraception by veteran women's health journalist Barbara Seaman came in the wake of Rachel Carson's critique of pesticides and Ralph Nader's indictment of the automobile industry. Her work was to influence Senate hearings on the pharmaceutical industry, on the last day of which the Food and Drug Administration announced its decision to require manufacturers to include material on health risks in every package of birth-control pills. The Senate hearings found the nascent Women's Liberation Movement, which not only believed that the Pill was dangerous but also demanded that women should be asked to give testimony, on the opposite side of the argument not only from the as yet little known Senator for Kansas, Bob Dole, but also from many of those who would later be prominent in the campaign for the legalisation of abortion. In important ways, organisations such as Planned Parenthood and what became the National Women's Health Network had much in common, by the two groups disputed the issue of whether the Pill represented a vital step forward for women or a threat to their lives.

This is not the only area of interest within this valuable book. Anyone concerned with the debate over scientific “advance” and medical authority will find this a highly stimulating study, and, while we may doubt Watkins' contention that eugenics had little to do with the birth-control movement, she has constructed a carefully thought out alternative perspective to those who have seen the development of oral contraception as male experimentation upon women's bodies. For her, the Pill brought the possibility of voluntary pregnancy, and feminist (and other) critics of its medical effects and social repercussions will need to engage carefully with her arguments if this important debate is to be taken to a new level.

University of Wolverhampton

MARTIN DURHAM
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Websdale’s exploration of the relationship between intimacy and killing focuses on a sample of 319 domestic homicides or intimate killings in Florida in one particular year; 1994, and stems originally from a Florida study of domestic-violence deaths that was funded by a Governor’s Task Force on Domestic and Sexual Violence. By drawing together material from the case files of several state
and police agencies, Websdale is able to piece together the details of individual cases of child murder, domestic abuse and spousal killing, some of which are highlighted in the individual chapters. Much of this makes grim reading as many, but not all, of the personal histories embody narratives of social deprivation, physical and mental cruelty, depression and alcohol and drug abuse. Websdale draws on existing research on all forms of domestic homicide, much of it based on studies of other US states, to try and provide a context for the individual Florida case histories. The use of material gathered for an official report then subjected to wider socio-cultural analysis is always problematic as the official and academic outcomes are not always mutually compatible. Further, a snapshot of domestic homicide in Florida in one single year actually raises numerous questions about continuities and changes, while the homicide trajectories of different ethnic groups cannot be effectively addressed.

Nevertheless, several conclusions follow from the material presented. Domestic homicide is socially and culturally patterned: men kill more often than women do, and African Americans kill more often than whites or Latinos (Asian Americans and Native Americans are rarely discussed or not at all). In fact, African Americans commit a disproportionately high number of domestic homicides and are disproportionately the victims of domestic homicides. This stems in part from a historical legacy of police passivity, the belief that violence is a normative feature of black life, and an external and internal under-valuation of black life. However, the impact of community policing on black neighborhoods over the past 20 years has resulted in a massive increase in African American incarceration rates, and declining numbers of black intimate-partner killings. In fact, the overall decline in intimate murder during the past two decades has been most marked in the African American population. Much of the research cited in this context reveals more about the race and gender biases of Florida police and some sociologists than the individual motivations of those committing domestic murder. Further, intimate-partner homicide is “a profoundly gendered affair”; men commit the majority of offences, but, while they typically kill as part of an ongoing pattern of physical and emotional abuse directed at women, women are more likely to kill in self-defence. Intimate-partner homicide also varies by “culture”: black women are more likely to kill their male partners than are white or Latino women. It is the “functional dominance of males” and “the traditional cultural ascendancy of men, accompanied by a strong norm toward respecting them as heads of households, that provides the most likely key to understanding why very few Latino women kill men, compared with the number of Latino men who kill women.” Websdale uses patriarchy as his ordering concept: socially marginalised men unable to reap the benefits of capitalism (economic success, political influence, social status, personal esteem) demonstrate an exaggerated sense of personal honour, in which they seek to exercise property rights over their female partners. As a result, “those men at the margins of capitalist production are more likely to engage in coercive acts of control in their interpersonal relationships.” Men usually kill their wives or girlfriends after violently abusing them for long periods, thus, “killing is but one way that many men keep many women in their place as socially subordinate subjects in a patriarchal order.” Websdale recognises nonetheless the limits of this theoretical framework in
exploring all domestic homicides, particularly those that involved women killing their children. In sum, while the study is interesting, even enlightening in places, it underlines our limited understanding of domestic homicide.

_Middlesex University_