
Eric Arnesen’s intellectual project is twofold: to chronicle black workers’ contribution to civil rights activism and to broaden the historiography of black thought, experience, and protest. On both accounts, Arnesen succeeds. Focusing on the “aristocrats of Negro labor,” *Brotherhoods of Color* richly conveys the struggles of brakemen, porters, red caps, and firemen from the early twentieth century through the post-WWII period. Drawing from union documents, black newspapers, court decisions, company records and oral histories, Arnesen engagingly reconstructs black workers’ multifaceted strategies to combat discriminatory employers and exclusionary white unions in a hostile legal environment.

Far from being a retelling of the dynamic leadership of A. Phillip Randolph, Arnesen places Randolph within a diverse group of black labor leaders agitating for social and economic justice. The author effectively counterposes Randolph’s strategy of transforming the labor movement from within against the fiercely independent unionism of black craft workers. Although ideologically distinct and often at odds, both utilized the labor shortages and democratic rhetoric of WWII to undermine the legality of workplace and union discrimination. Black railroaders, however, were also in a race against time. Although some blacks were able to utilize Title VII of the Civil Rights Act to break down racial barriers, the overall decline of the industry muted much of their progress. The author’s recurring theme is that, despite differing philosophies, black workers slowly affected change through assiduous defense of their jobs, persistent legal pressure, and a determined moral and political critique of white racism.

In addition to being of great economic importance to the black community, the railroad was also a conduit of information and experience. According to one Pullman porter, a prime inducement to rail work was the “chance to meet people and see the country.” Presumably, this would allow African Americans to compare what it meant to be “black” in different parts of the country. It is at this level of analysis that Arnesen’s book leaves the reader somewhat wanting. A greater attention to regional racial regimes and their respective opportunity structures would have served the author well. Additionally, the exact relationship between these “labor aristocrats” and the mass of black workers – agricultural, industrial, or otherwise – is nebulous.

Given these reservations, *Brotherhoods of Color* remains a significant achievement. Arnesen’s study enhances our knowledge of black rank-and-file activity, civil rights
activism, and the ideological and economic obstacles to black equality. Moreover, Arnesen reminds us that the black struggle for equality was fought from a multitude of perspectives.
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Continuing the precedent set in the volume she co-edited with Liam Kennedy, Urban Space and Representation (1999), Maria Balshaw here takes on critical foci which seem familiar and considers them in ways which are both refreshing and rigorous. Looking for Harlem is an insightful study of aesthetic realisations of urban space as rehearsed in African American literature, and presents both a coherent survey of the persistent relevance of the city – and Harlem in particular – as a site of cultural reflection and production, and a re-evaluation of black writing in the United States. By identifying the city as the central theme of her study, Balshaw enables a survey that takes in a number of writers often passed over in accounts of the African American tradition, accounts which are frequently more rural- and/or male-dominated. Reflecting the sentiment that black writing should not be evaluated solely on the degree to which it addresses explicitly racial issues, Looking for Harlem therefore considers a range of texts often more clearly dominated by matters of gender, sexuality and urban experience. In so doing, race, in turn, is not sidelined as a crucial element, but nor is it used as a reductive criteria that falsely oversimplifies both the literature and its reception.

There is a perhaps inevitable concentration on writing from the Harlem Renaissance. After a comparative examination of Alain Locke’s The New Negro and the short-lived but influential Fire!! magazine, which nicely establishes some parameters, Balshaw turns to a writer ill-served by scholarship on the Renaissance, Rudolph Fisher. Her readings of short stories by Fisher and of his novel, The Conjure Man Dies (1932) make a good case for his reappraisal and rescue from the critical margins. From Chapter 3 onwards, most of the work covered is by women. Nella Larsen’s Quicksand (1928) and Passing (1929) are read with particular reference to their skilful use and manipulation of visual fields, while Chapter 4 looks at stories by Angelina Weld Grimke and Marita Bonner. Ann Petry’s novel The Street (1946) and Gwendolyn Brooks’s poetry collection, A Street in Bronzeville (1945), are then considered, suggesting, among other things, that the glimmers of hope to be found within these texts (as opposed to the apparently helpless determinism of Wright’s Native Son) should not be used to negate their importance. Finally, Chapter 6 jumps forward to Isaac Julien’s 1989 film, Looking for Langston and Toni Morrison’s Jazz (1992) to examine the continuing resonance of Harlem – and particularly its Renaissance – to contemporary black culture.

Maria Balshaw’s combination of survey and close reading is a generally convincing one: she manages both to reassess movements and to analyse specific texts and passages with considerable sensitivity, and to mutual benefit; and theoretical models,
prominently including those of Paul Gilroy, are used judiciously. If the leaps in time and choices of texts seem a little spurious at points – these are any number of African American texts from the 1950s to the 1980s that might be useful for a study of urban aesthetics, for instance – the overwhelming result of this is that one wishes the book had the space to continue its remit and cover much more. This notwithstanding, what is here is a valuable contribution to scholarship on the city and African American literature, that refuses to essentialise any of its texts or critical bases, and does much-needed work in re-evaluating some unfairly marginalised writing.
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The essays by scholars and activists in Long Time Gone seek to offer fresh historical analysis and explore the meaning of the 1960s today – “the aim is to ... construct both an accurate vision of the past and an understanding of its contemporary influence.”

Julian Bond emphasises the importance of established community institutions and traditions of resistance to 1960s civil rights activists, and suggests that the King-centric view of the movement has hampered contemporary black activism. Karen Miller’s study of black protest at San Francisco State argues that African American students increasingly rejected the assimilationist underpinnings of “integration.”

Wini Breines stresses “disillusionment” as a central experience of sixties student activism, and links this with modern-day cynicism. Appy and Bloom also locate contemporary scepticism in the sixties. They claim that government lies over Vietnam fuelled rising distrust of politicians.

Tom Wells suggests another consequence of Vietnam was the government’s determination to control media coverage of future military action. Tom Wicker, meanwhile, downplays the war’s role in the collapse of the New Deal coalition. He insists that irresponsible rhetoric, sloppy policy, and public identification of the Great Society with blacks, helped shatter LBJ’s consensus and hasten the conservative revival.

Bradford Martin examines the links between culture and politics through the SNCC Freedom Singers and the Living Theater, arguing that performance in public spaces emerged as an important tool for direct action politics during the 1960s. Country Joe and the Fish’s Barry Melton offers a unique insight into the counterculture. Though positive, he does not shy away from the dark side of the “Age of Aquarius.”

Sara Evans’ discussion of feminism emphasises its emergence from the civil rights and student movements, demonstrates its creativity, and stresses its
accomplishments. John D’Emilio shows how the “placing of gay” at the end of the 1960s has imprisoned homosexuality in a narrative of decline, associating it with reaction and backslash. He argues that writing homosexuality into the 1960s enhances our understanding of the period and enriches “our sense of what freedom and social justice might mean.”

The essays by D’Emilio, Martin and Miller are particularly strong, and the book will interest both the scholar and interested observer, yet this collection shares the fault of much sixties scholarship in presenting only the radical side of the story. Missing are the students who supported the Vietnam War, the women who opposed abortion, etc. Only when the 1960s are viewed as divisive rather than radical will we be able to understand their meaning today.

Sociologist Rebecca Klatch believes that “the untold story of the 1960s is about the New Right,” and she seeks to “recast the way people think about the 1960s by viewing the decade as a time of ferment for the right as well as the left.” To do this, Klatch utilises the “life histories” of some 74 former activists – 38 from Young Americans for Freedom (YAF), and 36 from Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). A Generation Divided is neither a history of the 1960s nor an organisational study of SDS and YAF. Rather, its aim is to trace the history of a generation of 1960s activists.

Klatch explains that both SDS and YAF were born out of disillusionment with the perceived failings of America, and both were infused with a sense of mission and historic opportunity. She explores the activists’ backgrounds and demonstrates that, while they came from different social worlds, they typically reflected an extension of parental attitudes. While SDS activists were taught to support civil rights and organised labour, young YAFers learned the values of anti-communism, patriotism and individual freedom at the dinner table.

Klatch shows that conservatives as well as leftists were radicalised by their experiences, and that both organisations were beset by factionalism. In explaining why SDS women perceived sexism while YAF women did not, she suggests the importance of the left’s language of oppression. Klatch’s most significant achievement is demonstrating that, despite their differences, left and right shared much in common. As the 1960s progressed, elements of SDS and YAF coalesced around opposition to the draft, hostility toward the government, and support for the counterculture. The strong libertarian tendency within YAF, and its making common cause with left wing activists, eventually led to traditionalists expelling libertarians from YAF. While Gus DiZerega’s simultaneous leadership of the University of Kansas SDS and YAF chapters was exceptional, it suggests the need for scholars to rethink categories of “left” and “right.”

Klatch has also demonstrated that sixties activists have stayed remarkably loyal to their beliefs. While leftists have tended to live more fractured lives, and have created institutional power bases within the education and social service sector, traditionalists’ journey to adulthood has been smoother, and they now find themselves ensconced in institutions of political power. Indeed, Klatch explains the important role of former YAF activists in the New Right’s success.

The book’s greatest strength is its reliance on oral history, but this is also a weakness. Relatively few archival sources have been used, and the activists’ stories could have been woven more effectively into the wider historical context. Nevertheless,
Klatch’s study is interesting and provoking, and makes essential reading for anyone who wants to try to understand the ‘true’ nature of the 1960s.


Animating Carrie Tirado Bramen’s analysis in *The Uses of Variety* is a critique of recent scholarship on multiculturalism, in which the local and the heterogeneous are often uncritically valorised as conditions resistant to and subversive of the universalising logics of liberalism and international capital. Diversity, she suggests, should not be essentialised as a natural good. The content of local and group identities still matters, for – as in the defence of states rights vis-à-vis slavery and segregation – the protection of diversity may give licence to the inhumane. Moreover, to defend difference for its own sake might be to surrender the potential for individual groups to develop a creative role for themselves in contemporary politics and culture. As Bramen demonstrates in her introduction, it has proven difficult even for some apparently sophisticated multicultural theorists to celebrate diversity in terms any more meaningful than those of the corporate purveyors of cosmopolitan chic. There is a resort in each case to a consumerist appeal, in which the superficial aesthetic characteristics – music, food, clothing – of the ethnic groups in question are valued over the integrity of their ethical systems and the lessons that their histories invoke, rendering their identities more easily assimilated by the processes of pastiche and commodification.

In Bramen’s view, a more progressive conceptual model for the place of the local and the diverse within the national culture and indeed within the wider world was offered in a range of contributions to late Victorian identity debates. She traces through these debates constructions of “variety” that sought to establish relationships between the particular and the larger whole which neither eviscerated the identity and agency of the former nor prioritised it to the point of provincialism and group insularity. Though not always fairmindedly, many of the intellectuals of the late Victorian era were more prepared than contemporary critics to advance judgments about the respective value of different groups; the moderns discriminated where the post-moderns do not.

Bramen establishes her themes through a discussion of William James, whose philosophical writings maintained a dialectical connection between variety and unity which was not to be resolved in the triumph of one or the other, whilst emphasising the ethical and psychological necessity of choice. According to James, the failure to discriminate was the mark of the amoral and the fate of the insane. As Bramen notes, however, James’s pluralistic universe was ultimately intended to be umpired by those who already made most of the choices for everyone else: college-bred gentlemen of “good” culture.

In Bramen’s view, conceptions of variety analogous to that offered by the Jamesian dialectic were articulated in a range of different literary and intellectual texts from
the late Victorian era. Horace Kallen and W. E. B. DuBois, for example, endeavoured to excavate a place for Jewish Americans and African Americans respectively within the modern United States which would not require the abandonment of what made them culturally distinct; DuBois, in particular, sought to replace the white centre of American culture with a transnational core, asserting the benefits for the nation of a variety that was serious about and not evasive of problems of politics and ethics. Bramen explores the regionalist writings of María Amparo Ruiz de Burton, Hamlin Garland and (again) W. E. B. DuBois, which suggested a potential for local characteristics to provide a radical rather than reactionary basis for the reformation of national identity. Narratives of the urban picturesque, meanwhile, resisted the assimilationist discourse of the melting pot, naturalising foreign presences within the American landscape whilst still savouring their exoticism. In the anti-passing fiction of African American women writers, mulattoes appear not as tragic figures torn by conflicting race identifications, but as happily and uncomplicatedly black, capable – as in Frances Harper’s *Iola Leroy* – of devoting their lives to liberal good works and thereby establishing a standard of citizenship to which all Americans might aspire. Finally, Bramen considers the case of the 1893 World’s Parliament of Religions in Chicago, where Asian representatives successfully challenged the universalist pretensions of American Christianity both by advancing rival syncretic claims on behalf of Eastern religions – arguing, for instance, that key Christian teachings derived from those of Hinduism and Buddhism – and by asserting the greater integrity of their own ethical systems.

Whilst issuing a defence of partiality in the afterword to her volume, Bramen recognises that those she examines did not always discriminate well. James accorded cultural precedence to the college-bred elite; Kallen’s pluralism accommodated Jews, but not African Americans, and predicted the decline of class identifications; the ethnic communities depicted in the urban picturesque were generally white, not black; and fin-de-siècle Buddhists were susceptible to a paternalist turn.

Though forceful and rigorous, *The Uses of Variety* does not overstate its case. Bramen is alert to the complexities and contradictions of the texts that she studies. Her discussion of William James structures but does not determine her argument. For the most part, she asserts a rather loose connectivity – sometimes no more than resemblance – between her subjects. DuBois and Kallen were familiar with James, but others were not. The literary and intellectual echoes that she detects across the texts are perhaps more intriguing as a result, whilst the reflections of the late Victorians upon the uses of variety are indeed often revealed as presenting a more radical critique of the society of their time than that offered in the present by multicultural theory.

*University of Southampton*  

*Kendrick Oliver*
The rhetoric of separate spheres has often meant that the lives of women have been seen as without agency in the public sphere, particularly in the political arena. Branson’s book challenges this view and places women firmly on the political stage of early national America.

Branson argues that a rapid rise in literacy promoted a vibrant print culture in this period. Magazines, novels, and non-fiction works such as Wollstonecraft’s *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*, published in 1792, promoted the concept that it was a lack of education, rather than mental faculties, that placed women at a disadvantage in the public sphere. These works challenged traditional ideas about the role of women in marriage and in the wider world. These ideas were further promoted by the French Revolution. Women in America overtly supported the French democratic cause, especially through fashion, and did not simply follow the male lead. Only following the bloody events of 1793 did their enthusiasm wane. However, the more politicized women were, and the more factionalised party differences became, the more women were used as pawns in the political game. Much of eighteenth-century social life was highly politicized, argues Branson. Theaters were spaces in which audiences – very often fickle – expressed popular support, or disdain, for political and moral stereotypes or comments on current events within performances. Furthermore, high society promoted the American political salon in the 1790s, in which women, not men, were the central characters. However, rather than challenging the political system, the salons complimented it, and became highly ritualized networking opportunities. However, the salons did provide a legitimate space in which women could learn about politics and government.

This book highlights many of the ways in which women in eighteenth-century America expressed themselves politically in a man’s world. As is often the case in books about women, it is essentially about the elite – that is the nature of extant sources. Branson sometimes overplays the “publicness” of the spaces that these women inhabited, and the case that these women were listened to, rather than simply tolerated, is not always made. In fact, Branson herself admits that women did not enter the public sphere on the same terms as men. These points made, the book clearly demonstrates how women pro-actively found and promoted a space and voice for themselves, and how this in turn gave them the experience and tools to do much more in the nineteenth century. It also provides us with a view of women as sophisticated cultural and political actors. Branson is correct to argue that their activities in the eighteenth century gave women the foothold they required for greater participation in the nineteenth.
Both Richard Gray in his prefatory endorsement and the editors in their Preface write of a paradigm shift in American Studies. A shift to global and transnational perspectives, and a shift to attending to the voices of indigenous peoples, ethnic others, especially African American slaves, of women, and of regional inhabitants, not just a New England mandarin class. The editors acknowledge the importance of the *Heath Anthology* in pioneering this transformation of the literary canon and also remind us of the crucial keynote speeches of Janice Radway and Mary Kelley in 1998 and 1999 exhorting members of the American Studies Association to re-conceptualize their definitions of “America.” What is so impressive is the rapidity with which the editors have responded and compiled a radically different anthology.

What also impresses me is the lightness of touch in the editorial matter that almost belies the amount of synthesis of scholarly materials involved in producing such informative and eloquent introductions. The result is a genuinely accessible compilation of some familiar, canonical texts and a fascinating range of other literary documents. “America” is implicitly redefined to reflect the territory of colonial discovery, exploration, and settlement from the fifteenth to the late eighteenth century. The authors are not constrained by present political, national borders. Nor are they constrained by cultural or by linguistic difference. The paradigm shifts involved here are not just those of moving to consider gender, ethnicity, and regional matters. The assumed dominance of English is undermined by the number of texts that are presented in translation; and clearly Castillo’s excellent abilities as a linguist and translator were essential to this project. But more subtly still, the editors call into question the definition of “literature.”

This is an anthology of “Literatures,” yet implicitly it assumes that literatures offer accounts of the (new) world. One reads through the anthology as one might read other complex narratives, and realizes that not only national boundaries but also definitional boundaries are being crossed here. The selections are organized so as to suggest a narrative of the New World that is as much testimony as literary text. This is both “literature” and history, and the story is compellingly presented. Students of history and of interdisciplinary American Studies will use and benefit from this anthology as much as students of literature. It is all too easy to find fault with editors of anthologies, but the selection of materials has been so judicious that I found myself reading this volume from cover to cover as if it were a new “grand narrative.” The literary sensibility has been at work in the selection and arrangement of extracts, so that one perceives incidents and issues recurring through the volume, each time from differing perspectives. The consequent pleasures of reading are more comparable to those of reading a good novel or a long poem than is often the case with textbooks.

If I have a niggle it is probably with the students at whom the volume is aimed rather than with the editors. But I did find myself wondering whether a reader who did not know that “distended” meant “bloated” or “famish” meant “starve” for example, would not have been best advised to buy and consult a good dictionary.
On the other hand, I really appreciated some of the more informative footnotes that are scattered through the volume. Thus: “This famous anecdote, a kind of epitome of the West’s fantasy of colonization, was retold by Richard Steele in *The Spectator*, as the story of Inkle (slang or ‘English’) and Yarico.” or “This (i.e. Occom’s method of teaching) anticipates the methods of Friedrich Froebel, famous nineteenth-century German educator and reformer, who founded kindergarten and conducted similar experiments in 1837.” Footnotes such as these contribute to the reader’s ongoing realization of the paradigm shift required for us to reconceptualize an America that is not unitary and exceptional, but astonishing in its complex diversity and imbricated with the rest of the world. It takes energy, courage, and good transatlantic email communication to sustain this insight. Castillo and Schweitzer between them have managed it.

*University of Warwick*

HELEN M. DENNIS

*Journal of American Studies, 37* (2003), 2. DOI: 10.1017/S0021875803277124


In the manner of alchemists searching for the elusive transmutational methodology for turning base metals into gold, Clemens has undertaken the worthy burden of interpreting received historiographical wisdom with a view to divining what the future may hold. Not unlike Paul Kennedy’s *magnum opus* The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers, such scholastic adventures may leave the author open to criticism at some juncture, especially when detractors speak sagely with the benefit of hindsight. Having said that, Clemens has nonetheless approached the task from a position of experience, as the book’s impressive list of his previous works testifies.

The standard approach for texts of this type has been used here; Part One looks back on what is generally accepted as the “American Century,” a warts-and-all view of successes and failures. In attempting to capture twentieth-century zeitgeist, the author walks a well-trodden path but does so without resisting the allure of subjective analysis, a common enough trait for material of this nature. If nothing else, however, he has done so quite admirably and laid solid foundations for the remainder of the book. Of particular note is the chapter on failures of US Foreign Policy over the period in question; this is an interesting section, not just for “setting the scene” for that which follows, but as a timely reminder of the Churchillian aphorism about the dangers of historical amnesia.

In Part Two, Clemens utilizes his expertise to try and negotiate a way through the often-opaque waters of predictive narrative. In such an academic realm not frequently noted for its outstanding triumphs (Nostradamus notwithstanding), the Kennedyesque matter of relative decline is logically alluded to, to the point of citing the above scholar as the section opens. Clemens has, not surprisingly, suggested a number of “alternative” futures. Given the many variables inherent to this type of activity, he can at least be forgiven for obeying the same constraints that we, his fellow mortals are also subject to. What must be said here, appropriately, is that this
author has produced a worthwhile, lucid and considered attempt at a difficult task. Taking the text as a whole, though, this book is well worth a visit.

University of Derby
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These books depict the humanity and courage of former U.S. 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 U.S. governments for delving into the lives of presidents – and everyone else. U.S. conservatives employ government power in ways which 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, 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 mar-
riage, 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 court-
rooms. The political right discovered the courts as a way to advance its agenda.

Feminism and the Christian right, two social movements of these times, rep-
resented 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 im-
peachment 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 un-
cover 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 vilifications, did not return their hatreds,
emerged as a very effective U.S. president, and developed as a populist profile in
personal courage.

Ball State University

JOHN ROUSE

The Law and Literature movement in the United States, as well advanced as it is given its 30 years of development, produces few texts that are clearly interdisciplinary in nature. Most texts focus either primarily on the law, or on the literature. Gregg D. Crane’s monograph is a wonderful exception. His study of nineteenth-century “higher law” debates in relation to key literary and cultural material is provocative, original, and ambitious. His grasp of historical detail is impressive, and his re-reading of figures such as Harriet Beecher Stowe and Ralph Waldo Emerson is persuasive.

Crane’s argument begins by situating debates about cultural production and higher law arguments within the framework of “conscience” and “consent.” Taking as his starting point the Fugitive Slave Law, Crane examines the way in which key political figures developed their political stances in relation to it. His argument that books, poems, and plays about the position of the American slave were fundamental to the shift of public opinion – and thus ultimately the judiciary – is well defended. Particular focus is placed on Stowe and her antislavery fiction. Crane attempts to rectify what he sees as the “striking absence” of debates about her influence on politics and the law. He particularly references Stowe’s partnership with Charles Sumner, though he acknowledges that Stowe’s brand of higher law reasoning was anti-consensual.

Crane next examines the work of Emerson and Frederick Douglass, arguing that their positions are more similar than different, especially in relation to the link both make between aesthetics and ethical judgment. Crane takes issue with critics who dismiss Emerson as either apolitical or racist, arguing that such critics miss Emerson’s vision of higher law. Emerson is not escapist, Crane suggests, but engaging in a necessary distance in order to force innovations in justice. Douglass took a more active stance, it is clear, and became an iconic representative of republican citizenship. Crane explores Douglass’s readings of the Constitution, and his location of justice within that document even as the history of the US appeared to be one of injustice for the African American.

Moving from constructions of higher law to its opposite – positivism – Crane examines the writings and speeches of Oliver Wendell Holmes, Martin Delany, and others. Arguing that a higher law call almost always created a positivist response, Crane explores both fictional texts such as Delany’s Blake and judicial statements, such as Chief Justice Roger Taney’s opinion on Dred Scott; Crane also contrasts Mark Twain’s fiction with Jim Crow laws. In his final chapter, Crane explores the way in which contractual freedom is central to justice and citizenship, focusing on Charles Chesnutt’s fiction and Moorfield Storey’s legal advocacy.

In this complex and conceptually challenging book, Crane displays a wide-ranging understanding of literature’s impact on history, legal processes, and political positions. Truly interdisciplinary, Race, Citizenship, and Law in American Literature more than lives up to its name, and it is a welcome addition to African American Studies, nineteenth-century studies, and studies of American legal history.

University of Central Lancashire

HEIDI SLETTEDAHL MACPHERSON
Paul Downes declares his intention of using literary theory to further understanding of the American Revolution. Any attempt at elucidation of such an important event is to be welcomed. Unfortunately, this book confuses rather than enlightens with jargon to pad out a very thin thesis, viz., that aspects of monarchism persist after the revolution, and that this post-revolutionary mingling of democratic and monarchical tendencies may be discerned in particular works of literature. This interaction is traced through a succession of literary works: Crévecoeur’s *Letters from an American Farmer*, the autobiographies of Franklin and Stephen Burroughs, the stories of Carvin by Charles Brockden Brown, Irving’s *Rip van Winkle* and Cooper’s *The Spy*. To argue that aspects of monarchy persisted in the post-revolutionary world is not new. Further, it is misleading to imply that this contravened the beliefs of the founders. Although several wrote, as Downes shows, that monarchy was to be destroyed in America and all power vested in the people, many came to realise that this united people simply did not exist. There would always be divisions within it, and these would have to be balanced against each other. This is a fundamental dispute in the early republic, but it is one Downes skates over.

The analysis of the texts themselves is problematic. Whenever it seems that a summatory point is going to be made, the author persistently retreats into jargon, loading his sentences with unnecessarily complex terminology. Explaining the transformation wrought in the post revolutionary world from voting *viva voce* to secret ballot, he states: “One of the democratic revolution’s successes, however, was the institutionalisation of a certain secrecy at the site of origin of democratic legitimation.” If “voting by secret ballot” is what is meant then why not say so. By itself, the misuse of English would be bearable if a productive argument was discernible within it, but the analysis of the texts makes this doubtful. Regarding Crévecoeur, Downes appears confused on a fundamental point – the author’s identity. “James” is regarded as completely fictional, and he is equated with Crévecoeur. You ought not to have it both ways. Is Crévecoeur experiencing these things, or is it simply a fictional story about a farmer named “James”? Regarding Irving, Downes ignores what might be thought the paramount engagement of that author with contemporary political questions (*The History of New York*) in order to read *Rip van Winkle* as an allegory on votes for women and the supposed feminisation of politics, which, though interesting of itself, leaves many questions unanswered.

Centrally, the book illustrates the confusion about identities and political positions which characterised post-revolutionary America. But it does so despite itself, for Downes cannot seem to decide whether he simply wants to demonstrate this confusion, or celebrate/condemn particular aspects of it. It is as if the authors involved are being judged on a persistently shifting set of principles. It is possible to examine events and texts through literary theory but to do so in clear prose that may reach beyond the audience of specialists. When crossing disciplines, accessibility to all sides becomes of even greater importance. This book seriously undermines its own worth by creating a reading experience akin to wading through treacle.

*University of Edinburgh*  
FINN POLLARD

The United States’ involvement in overseas conflicts during the twentieth century served to highlight the ambiguous situation of the African American population. The contradiction of fighting for democracy abroad while denied equal citizenship at home was only too obvious to black Americans, even if it was not always so apparent to their white countrymen. Nonetheless, members of the wartime administrations during both World Wars I and II were sufficiently aware of the potential threat posed by the possible alienation of 10 per cent of the population to embark on the surveillance of black opinion. In this detailed, well-written and closely argued study based on meticulous archival research, Mark Ellis provides an examination of federal surveillance during World War I that reveals a great deal about white opinion as well as about black attitudes towards the conflict.

As Ellis points out, for the majority of white Americans, and certainly for those in the Wilson administration, the only legitimate form of black activism was the gradualism espoused by Booker T. Washington. Any expression of opposition or criticism of the war effort on the part of African Americans could only be due to German (or later, Bolshevik) influence. W. E. B. Du Bois’s famous “Close Ranks” editorial in the *Crisis* may well have been what white leaders wanted to hear, but it did not accord with what other members of the black leadership believed and nor with the views of many ordinary members of the African American population. Ellis demonstrates very clearly (in a chapter previously published in the *Journal of American History*) that Du Bois was influenced by Joel Spingarn to write the editorial in the hope of obtaining a military commission. Furthermore, the rejection of the offending editorial by many African Americans reflected an increasingly uncompromising mood. The fact that federal surveillance revealed no evidence of any outside cause of this growing disaffection should have alerted the government to the need for some positive action to assuage black opinion. Other than the appointment of Emmett J. Scott as assistant aide to Secretary of War Newton Baker (the one member of the administration who seemed at all sympathetic to African Americans) and George E. Haynes to the Department of Labor, little was done. It was hardly surprising then that as race relations deteriorated further during the “Red Summer” of 1919, wartime alienation found even greater expression in the many voices of the “New Negro.” This well-documented account provides probably the fullest study to-date of the wartime mood of African Americans in all its diversity.

*University of Glamorgan*  
NEIL A. WYNNE


What do Woody Allen, Richard Belzer, Jack Benny, Gertrude Berg, Milton Berle, Sandra Bernhard, Fanny Brice, Mel Brooks, Lenny Bruce, George Burns, Sid Caesar,
Eddie Cantor, Billy Crystal, Fran Drescher, Judy Holliday, George Jessel, Andy Kaufman, Danny Kaye, Alan King, Bert Lahr, Sam Levenson, Jerry Lewis, Richard Lewis, the Marx Brothers, Jackie Mason, Zero Mostel, Gilda Radner, Joan Rivers, Roseanne, Mort Sahl, Jerry Seinfeld, Phil Silvers, Howard Stern, Barbra Streisand, The Three Stooges, Sophie Tucker and Henny Youngman have in common? Well, they are all Americans, they are all Jewish, and they are all comedians. Fully 80 percent of professional comedians in America are Jewish. Why? This is what Lawrence J. Epstein sets out to answer in *The Haunted Smile: The Story of Jewish Comedians in America*. Epstein covers the years from 1890 until the present, tracing the rise of the Jewish comedian in America. Jewish American comedians, argues Epstein, have fulfilled a special mission in American life, serving as important mediators between Jews and American culture. They acted as symbols of assimilation, survival, acceptance and pride for both Jews and non-Jews alike. Jews were successful as comedians because they expressed the feelings, anxieties and desires of wider America. They had a rich verbal and linguistic tradition, which prized and rewarded quick thinking and a quicker tongue, to draw upon. And, they were lucky, arriving on the American scene at the very point that the mass media (vaudeville, radio, movies and television) was emerging.

Epstein has produced an interesting book on a fascinating topic. The writing is readable and is not scarred by over-theorised academic language. It is punctuated with amusing gags, viz. Eddie Cantor’s apt observation: “A wedding is a funeral where you smell your own flowers”; or Jackie Mason’s quip: “Every Jew loves food. What do you think Jews talk about for breakfast? Where to eat lunch, at lunch, where should we have dinner? Where should we have coffee? You never see a Jew in a bar except if he gets lost looking for a piece of cake.” However, what, no *Mad Magazine*? This is a glaring omission: *Mad’s* mordant satire connected the Borscht Belt of the 1950s with the counter-cultural humour of the 1960s and while *Mad* was not a comedian per se, its place in the rise of Jewish comedy is paramount and hence its absence is unpardonable.

Overall, *The Haunted Smile* is not the sum of its parts. The material is interesting, the style is readable, but somehow it doesn’t all quite mesh and the analysis can appear rather thin on the ground at times. It would, though, make a good bar mitzvah present for an aspiring Jewish comedian.

*University of London*

NATHAN ABRAMS

*Journal of American Studies, 37* (2003), 2. DOI: 10.1017/S0021875803337120


The thesis that cultural values are written on the body is by now very familiar; the study of clothes is part of a growing critical interest in the way in which social customs and appurtenances are markers of hegemonic structures, linked to wider historical developments. *Uplift: the Bra in America* is not the frivolous or titillating read which its title might suggest, but a serious and extensively researched study of that item of women’s clothing which is both most utilitarian and most resonant of
sexual fantasy and gender ideologies. As it points out, changing styles and habits of wear are imbricated with pressures of consumer manipulation, as much as with concerns about health and personal image; women’s choices with regard to the brassiere have been – and still are – statements in which comfort, physical and social freedom, and the expression of sexuality are inextricably bound up with the marketing strategies of “a multibillion dollar industry.” In examining the role of the bra in the history of American women, the book shows how, from the early twentieth century, it became a significant item in the American economy, its fortunes tied up with the rise and fall of manufacturing industries generally. At the same time, it not only liberated women in a physical sense (the development of the sports bra, allowing women to participate in a wider range of activities, is particularly important here), but empowered them as workers and managers in a gender-specific manufacture.

Rigorously factual and well illustrated (it reproduces an excellent range of advertisements), this study will be most useful to social historians, but the general reader also will find some fascinating pieces of information here. Among these are the original creation – and exploitation – of teenagers as a discreet group by brassiere manufacturers and marketeers; the invention in the 1950s of a pump-up bra, inflated by air blown by the wearer through a straw; the techniques of bra-making adapted for a vest-like structure worn by carrier pigeons in World War II; and the early appearance of prosthetic bras. The authors’ concentration on the historical angle, the consequence of their view “that latter-day sociological and psychological analyses of the brassiere already abound in the scholarly literature,” however, means the omission of more speculative or analytical elements. It seems a pity that they did not develop some of the issues introduced by their subject: the relationship between changing bra styles and attitudes towards sexuality and the female body; and the paradox that a garment which symbolises female liberation is also yet another means of exploitation of women-as-sex-objects, for instance. Indeed, the whole question of how and why women have sought to resist cultural manipulation by de-emphasising the breasts – evident among 1870s emancipationists as well as in the radical feminist movements of a hundred years later – is not addressed.

The book is certainly illuminating and shows how closely the developments and fortunes of the bra parallel cultural and economic shifts in America as a whole. Perhaps some opportunities for a slightly lighter touch have been missed; despite the authors’ hope that readers will find “enlightenment and entertainment” in their text, there is more of the former than the latter to be had from it.

University of Sheffield

SHIRLEY FOSTER


Why the Confederacy lost—or why the Union won—the Civil War, are perennial questions of scholars of American history. In this authoritative new work, William
Freehling provides a convincing answer: that the Union's ability to win the loyalty of the Border States and its emancipation activities both debilitated the Confederacy and increased Northern strength to the point that Southern defeat was all but guaranteed. Although this idea and some of the other arguments contained in this book are not entirely original, no one has presented them as clearly, convincingly and as comprehensively as Freehling has done here.

Freehling points to the fact that there were fault-lines in the South, namely its division into the Border, Middle and Lower Souths – the first being the weakest point in the Confederacy's armour. Most inhabitants of the Border States were pro-Union. Federal recruiters, for example, did much better their Confederate counterparts in Kentucky. This was also true both in Maryland (where volunteers chose the Union army by a two to one margin) and Missouri – despite the necessity of occupying Union armies. Indeed, white volunteers from the Border States contributed 200,000 men to the Union's armies in comparison to a mere 90,000 for the Confederacy's – and this last number was further offset by the 100,000 Middle South whites who enlisted in the ranks of the North. This lack of support for secession in the Border South, Freehling demonstrates, made possible the early, crucial, victories of Ulysses S. Grant in the West. Although historians have acknowledged that had all southern states seceded, the War's outcome would probably have been different, Freehling correctly points out that most historians "forget their earlier observations about the Border South when they sum up why the Confederacy lost the war."

It was, however, African American Southerners who were the staunchest anti-Confederates. Freehling skilfully traces Lincoln's long-delayed route to emancipation, and demonstrated how the more the North attacked slavery, the more black Southerners responded enthusiastically to the cause of Union. Freehling rightly declares that the question of who freed the most slaves, the runaways or Lincoln's army, is an "abstruse controversy" which "deflects attention from the essential emancipating power: the indispensable collaboration." This collaboration is comprehensively discussed and again, although the African American contribution to the North's victory has been discussed before, no one has traced its development and demonstrated its importance with the same clarity as Freehling.

Some historians will protest that Freehling has essentially repeated the argument most emphatically expressed by Robert E. Lee, that the North won the war simply because of its greater manpower, but this dismissal would be entirely unfair. The South vs. The South is in no way determinist. Freehling examines how, by pursuing the course it did, Lincoln's government won the Border States and undermined the Confederacy by its emancipation edicts. That the Union gained the necessary overwhelming manpower because of the actions it followed. This is a book that every serious Civil War scholar should read.

University of Wales Swansea

DUNCAN CAMPBELL
In recent years, few issues have dominated the American social scene to quite the extent as those governing the policing of “obscenity.” From rap music, internet pornography, and movie violence, to the Brooklyn Museum’s staging of the Young British Artists exhibit in 2000, the arguments over the nature, meaning, and definition of obscenity have raged backwards and forth. Andrea Friedman’s contribution to this debate is significant, and for no lesser reason than her willingness to explore the historical dimensions of the issue.

Friedman takes her beginnings at the onset of the twentieth century when leisure activities became increasingly reliant on commercial culture. Her intent is to stress the local origins of a now national debate. The study is divided into two sections and concerns three forms of popular media: motion pictures, burlesque shows, and Broadway theatre. The first section “examines the ways in which specific regulatory strategies were fashioned in relation to both the particular representations of sexuality featured within each entertainment form and the audience associated with it.” The second considers “who was involved in these debates and the ways in which these New Yorkers refigured understanding of moral authority and government authority.” It concludes with a description of the debate after the Second World War, emphasizing the problems associated with coupling popular democracy and censorial authority.

The key to the study is the rise of what Friedman terms “democratic moral authority.” Representing a “language of public policy,” the concept encapsulates “the idea that obscenity should be regulated according to the standards of the ‘average person’ and that the mechanisms of regulation should themselves be controlled by the people.” At the heart of this cultural struggle – not to mention Friedman’s study in general – lies the familiar yet always crucial question: what constitutes the “average person”? Friedman’s work here is especially strong. Her ability to delineate how certain key cultural groups – class-based, religious, political, artistic – laid claim to the authority of inherent human morality or “natural law” is persuasive and thought-provoking.

Paradoxically, the book’s strength leads to a minor shortcoming. As signaled by her title, Friedman is interested in gender and sexuality. Yet her work is so uniformly interesting that one wishes she had broadened the study to include notions of violence, substance abuse, religious dissent, and political subversion, all of which have played a significant role in coloring social notions of obscenity. This, however, is to wish for another book altogether. What Friedman presents is important enough. By providing a historical, intellectual and cultural lineage, she is able to clarify contemporary debates about regulation and cultural authority. Equally important, of course, is the study’s relevance to the New York question: how can consensus be achieved in a city with so many competing voices? That Friedman is able to re-examine such a familiar question within new parameters is an achievement in itself.

The United States is a nation dominated by the law and its workings. There are more than one million attorneys in the United States, giving it a ratio of lawyers to population twenty times that of Japan. Yet it is also a nation dominated by those claiming a libertarian ideology that negates in theory the power of government and often places the individual beyond the rule of law. This paradoxical legal culture is a relatively recent construction. In this massive and indispensable book, Lawrence M. Friedman offers a brilliantly written and argued analysis of the many significant changes in the American legal system in the twentieth century that goes a long way toward capturing the peculiar nature of a society that simultaneously respects and derides the law.

Friedman rejects the old formalist myth that holds the law to be an objective science operating in isolation of social forces. The law, as this text amply demonstrates, is a social construct that changes in response to the world in which it functions. As Friedman writes, “law has no firm, tight, visible boundaries,” for “social context, and social meaning, are at the heart of the way it lives, breathes, and moves.” The law, in turn, has become central to American life, affecting every aspect of daily existence.

The twentieth century was a time of rapid, dramatic change in law, as in most other aspects of American society. Beginning with a clear explication of “The Old Order,” the legal structure of the United States prior to 1932, Friedman provides a graphic sense of the myriad of changes brought about by the New Deal. Friedman tracks and most important of those alterations, such as the creation of the welfare-regulatory state, the protection of individual rights, the enhancement of civil liberties, the integration of women into the polity, and the growth of the legal profession. He uncovers a number of surprising nuggets along the way. Two chapters in particular step well beyond the norm of legal history textbooks in examining how technological innovations have affected the law and the impact of American law on other countries.

But are there limitations on the legal impact of social change? The United States retains, for instance, a bizarrely archaic electoral system while traditionalists battle any hint of change in family law. As Friedman observes, the United States government resists becoming involved in the particulars of international law despite globalization; “A superpower does not pay much attention to world opinion.” And America remains a common-law country, granting judges enormous power to shape the law; as was well demonstrated at the century’s end when five judges selected the country’s president. But Friedman remains confident, as ultimately there is the submerged power of the people to transform the law, should they have sufficient motivation to overcome the stultifying force of inertia.

*Independent Scholar*
Gary W. Gallagher brings his encyclopaedic knowledge of primary and secondary sources and typically penetrating insight to assess one of the Civil War’s central figures, Robert E. Lee. Given the existence of a massive academic literature on this subject, as well as a host of hagiographic treatments of Lee who became intimately bound up with Lost Cause mythology, this is not an easy task. Seven of the eight chapters of this book have been published previously, but it stands as that rare exception to most essay collections in forming a focused and comprehensive re-evaluation of the career and reputation of the South’s most important general, without becoming repetitive.

The first section includes four chapters considering the impact of key battles upon Confederate morale, both within the Army and at home, building upon arguments made in a previous work, *The Confederate War* (1997). Refusing to bow to conventional wisdom, Gallagher finds multiple viewpoints in his survey of letter and newspaper responses. Rarely did contemporaries regard outcomes in absolute terms of abject failure or decisive success. Even Confederate defeat at Gettysburg, universally regarded by historians as a critical turning point of the war, was not necessarily seen by Southerners as anything more than a minor setback. Here Gallagher closely follows David Potter’s advice in avoiding the pitfalls of hindsight. The second section provides the centre piece of this book. It refutes criticisms of Lee as ignorant of the exigencies of modern war, suggesting that he was fully aware of the importance of civilian morale and of the need to fight a national, rather than a local, war, by autocratic methods where necessary, restoring Lee’s reputation as the equal of Sherman and Grant. A final chapter, not seen in print before, brings together key themes in establishing the part played by Jubal Early and Douglas Southall Freeman in shaping the public memory of Lee.

Most impressively, this book bridges the gap between Lost Cause propagandists who eulogised Lee, and critics who rejected their interpretations out of hand, including such diverse writers as J. F. C. Fuller, Thomas L. Connelly, and Alan T. Nolan. Each essay carefully evaluates Lee from a variety of viewpoints, taking salient elements from all sides, confirming Gallagher’s reputation as the Confederacy’s most able and prolific historian.

*University College Northampton*  

DAVID BROWN
Events in the South during the post-Reconstruction era have produced a rich and often contentious historiography. Both Goldman’s and Perman’s books add to this body of scholarship by looking specifically at the question of black voting rights and disfranchisement. Perman appropriates an instructive model for the period as being part of a three-act play. The first act, Reconstruction, lasted from 1867 to the early 1870s and was a time of “voter enfranchisement” (of blacks and lower-class whites) by a Republican-dominated federal government through federal statutes, the Fifteenth Amendment and amendments to state constitutions. The second act, Redemption, lasted from the mid-1870s to the mid-1890s and was a time of “vote manipulation” by Democrats to undermine the expanded southern franchise, using state laws, outright election fraud and coercion to do so. The third act, Restoration, lasted from 1890 to 1908, during which time Democrats embarked upon a full-scale campaign of “voter elimination” through changing state constitutions by amendments and state conventions to ensure their continued political power.

Goldman looks at the era of Redemption. However, rather than focusing on southern Democrats, he examines the actions of northern Republicans in this period. In doing so, he refutes the claims of historians who contend that Republicans simply abandoned black Freedmen after Reconstruction and cared nothing for their political rights. Republican Presidents Rutherford B. Hayes, James P. Garfield and Chester B. Arthur all consistently supported black voting rights. These presidential actions were in line with those of other Republican politicians who “continued to believe in the possibility and importance of a viable biracial Republican Party in the South.” A Republican-dominated Congress in the early 1870s therefore enacted laws that allowed for federal supervision of state elections. The Supreme Court continued to defend these laws and upheld the convictions of those who tried to interfere with them. Importantly, the reactions of Freedmen demonstrated that they did not feel abandoned by the federal government. Black politicians, educators and writers continued to speak out in favour of black voting rights until the 1890s.

Although successive Republican Presidents, the Republican Party, Congress and the Supreme Court all provided political support and a legal foundation for black voting rights, it was the Department of Justice and various attorneys general that were charged with actually implementing the law. Goldman points out that between 1877 and 1893 the Justice Department instituted 1,264 cases to uphold black voting rights in all eleven states of the former confederacy and successfully brought convictions in five of those states. Ultimately, the rapidly expanding scope of its activities coupled with insufficient resources began to compromise the work of the Justice Department. The repeal in 1894 of statutes that allowed federal supervision of state elections effectively removed the Justice Department from the equation.
altogether. By then, Goldman observes, “There were simply no more laws for the Department to enforce.” Nevertheless, the fact that there were any attempts to uphold black voting rights at all is significant, Goldman contends. It demonstrates that Republicans did continue to take black rights seriously for almost twenty years after Reconstruction. Only because of various political developments in the 1890s did they finally abandon the idea of creating a biracial democracy in the South.

In part, Goldman’s analysis leads us to Perman’s contention that the 1890s saw a significant change in the way that white Democrats went about the task of black disfranchisement. Focusing on the Restoration of Democratic power in the South, Perman examines the intricacies involved in this process. For the first time, he analyses the campaign for disfranchisement on a state by state basis, thereby exploring the factors involved at that level. Challenging existing accounts of the period that emphasise the uniformity of purpose of white Democrats in seeking to disfranchise the black population, Perman offers a more nuanced and complex version of events. He argues, “The sequence … context [and] configuration of political groups and elements behind the drive for disfranchisement differed from state to state.”

From his analysis of statewide campaigns for disfranchisement, Perman detects some important region-wide trends despite the unique factors that shaped such movements in each state. First, there was a significant shift in the implementation of disfranchisement from Redemption to Restoration. In the earlier period, Democrats used state statutes, fraud and coercion; in the later period, they used the more formal process of constitutional amendment. Second, leading on from this, Restoration represented a different stage of disfranchisement that shifted its focus from “vote manipulation” to a concerted campaign of “voter elimination.” Third, those who campaigned for disfranchisement were not all black belt (planter class) Democrats as many historians have claimed. Such analyses have, according to Perman, “obscure[d] the role of other independent organizations and groups within the Democratic Party, or even outside it.” Fourth, Perman asks, “Was the elimination of white voters as important as the removal of blacks?” Ultimately, the answer is no, but, for black belt Democrats in particular, it was a welcome consequence of the campaign for black disfranchisement. For them, black disfranchisement potentially weakened their political influence since they still controlled many of the votes of their former black slaves. Black disfranchisement might therefore have diminished their own political power and consequently enhanced that of lower-class whites. The fact that many lower-class whites were also disfranchised by the new constitutional amendments (since many could not pass literacy tests or afford poll taxes either) meant that this did not occur.

Both the studies by Goldman and Perman force a reevaluation of the post-Reconstruction era. In line with one of the landmark books examining this period – C. Vann Woodward’s *The Strange Career of Jim Crow* (1955) – they both insist that the resurgence of white Democrats and the subjugation of blacks in this period was not a foregone conclusion and that there are still many “forgotten alternatives” to that outcome yet left to be explored.

*Royal Holloway, University of London*  

**JOHN A. KIRK**
Harry Goulbourne’s use of the term “diaspora” relates the concept squarely to collectively lived experiences which can be examined or documented. The focus is social rather than individual, with a strong emphasis on empirical validation, and a vigorous rejection of the wilder shores of cultural theory. While the phrase “the culturalist persuasion” is not likely to recommend the book to all audiences, Goulbourne’s first chapter should be required reading for anyone planning to use the terms “diaspora” or “transnational” without due care and attention. The case of the Caribbean diaspora is established as particularly complex, involving African, Chinese, Jewish, Irish and Indians in one direction, post-decolonisation English, Dutch and Caribbeans in the other, and additional movements to North America, to boot. Goulbourne dismantles the false mantra of “The West and the Rest,” demolishes misleading claims of innocence or exceptionalism, questions the significance of Gilroy’s emphasis on “double consciousness” as a term in no sense limited to any one group in modernity, and argues forcefully that what distinguishes Africans in the West from other groups is their structural position within the social order (developing M. G. Smith’s concept of “differential incorporation”). While the major emphasis is on the British Caribbean, topics include the dominance of slavery in Caribbean historiography, the reparations debate, the role of British Caribbean publishers in relation to black intellectuals and writers, return migration and postmodernist family structures. Empirical research of this nature offers a valuable model for other investigators of the nature of a diasporic, Atlantic world, as one example will demonstrate. Chapter Five considers Black America in Caribbean public discourse in Britain, examining the “Uncle Tom” epithet in relation to the Frank Bruno–Lennox Lewis case of 1994–95. Lewis had described Bruno as an “Uncle Tom,” and was reported in The Observer. Bruno claimed defamation and sued. Goulbourne originally wrote the chapter as an expert witness statement. The chapter is strong on evidence, offering a comprehensive account of Stowe’s character, literary history, the development of the epithet and its subsequent application in America and Britain, moving from James Baldwin to Spike Lee, Clarence Thomas, the row over the canonisation of Pierre Toussaint and the reaction of Black Voice to a Nigerian complaining about racism encountered at Eton. It would be hard to imagine another image which linked black communities as closely as this one, though Goulbourne does miss one trick. The connection between Uncle Tom, the Caribbean and boxing goes back to the 1890s when Peter Jackson, a West-Indian who became Australian Heavyweight champion, performed the role on stage, interspersing scenes of Christian humility with boxing bouts in the intervals. At this late stage, unfortunately, the meaning of the epithet was too firmly established to be revised, even by Jackson’s famous knock-out punch.
As the title of this book clearly indicates, *Beginning Ethnic American Literatures* is an introduction both to the theory of ethnic literature and to four American ethnic traditions: “Native American fiction,” “African American fiction,” “Asian American Fiction,” and “Chicano/a fiction.” The designation “fiction” is relation to each of these literatures does more than identify the dominant terrain of each of the discussions. As Maria Lauret points out in the introductory essay, ethnic literatures perform important sociopolitical functions. Ethnic writers, she suggests, are almost literally “writing for their lives,” and they write “against history,” contesting the “dominant historical record which has demeaned or vilified their culture and their people” and rendered them either “invisible, or visible only through the eyes of conquerors, slaveholders, Eurocentric rationalists or monolingual anthropologists.” Given these large historical purposes and goals, it is quite natural that ethnic writers should produce works of prose fiction rather than writings in some other less narrative genre.

The four different sections of the book, each written by a different scholar in the field, proceed through essentially the same format. There is an overview, describing the historical and cultural contexts in which the ethnic literature developed; then there is a discussion of recent literary theory as it has both affected and been affected by ethnic canons; following are case studies of three major texts within each of the traditions; and finally some notes for further investigation with an annotated short bibliography.

Each of the ethnic literatures discussed raises different problems in terms of historical accounting and theoretical description, though there are some overlapping themes, such as the importance of oral traditions in Native American and African American writing. Native American literature, Maria Lauret explains, despite the fact that Native Americans are the oldest ethnic population in the United States, is a relatively recent phenomenon, which arrives on the coat-tails of the much more active and visible African American movement of the 1960s and which owes a lot to that ethnic activism. Asian American literature raises considerable difficulty of definition, since it lumps together individuals who take their origins in distinctly different nations (China, Japan, Korea, and so on). The case of Chicano/a literature is different yet. Here the question is no less than at what historical moment the term *Chicano/a* becomes pertinent. Not all Americans of Mexican background are Chicano/a.

This is a very useful volume: clearly written, informative, and intelligent.

*The Hebrew University of Jerusalem*  

EMILY MILLER BUDICK

Sally Hadden provides the first comprehensive assessment of the composition, functions, and significance of slave patrols, covering a long chronological period from the Colonial era up to, and briefly beyond, the Civil War. This is a much needed study, as the subject touches upon a number of different fields: Southern history, slavery, race relations, criminology, and legal history. The slave patrol, as a “community-sponsored” group, is presented as a central component of white supremacy in Southern society.

Hadden corrects a number of myths. In contrast to allegations that the slave patrol was a haphazard and poorly regulated institution, “close linkages between patrols and militia, county courts, town governments, and extralegal groups” ensured that some form of supervision took place in virtually all communities. The patrol’s primary functions were to search slave quarters, break up illicit meetings, and oversee the movement of slaves within the local area. Slave recollections in the WPA Narratives recalled with some bitterness the harsh treatment to which they were subject at the hands of the patrol, confirming the power which it wielded. The common view that poor whites composed the backbone of the slave patrol is convincingly refuted. Two county samples show that more than half chosen for the patrol owned slaves, whilst the vast majority were heads of households. Men of wealth would also serve on the patrol although, by the late antebellum era, such work was regarded as being beneath the status of the wealthy in Virginia and South Carolina.

Skillfully weaving together a variety of sources, *Slave Patrols* is a solid and well-researched monograph. However, it could have done more in developing key points and establishing the wider significance of the patrol to historiographical debates. For example, it is argued that the patrol was an important social institution, breaking down class differences as long nights would often be tempered by a communal drink provided by the patrol captain. At the same time, it is also suggested that slave-owners resented the patrol’s intrusion into the domestic sphere and sometimes colluded with their slaves in avoiding its effects. Whilst difficult to make definitive judgements based on limited evidence and variable local conditions, conclusions such as these are frustratingly ambiguous. Much greater account also needs to be made of distinct regional differences within each of the chosen states (Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina). Nonetheless, this is a valuable book which shows that slave patrols were an integral part of a Southern culture of violence.

*University College Northampton*  

DAVID BROWN
This two volume encyclopedia is one in a series of six encyclopedias published by ABC Clio on topics related to the history of child development and the family in US history. The other five volumes, about parenthood, adolescence, girlhood, boyhood, and infancy, serve as supplements and constraints on what the editors have chosen to emphasize here. Although we live in the golden age of encyclopedia publication, this is the only one available on US family history. Hawes, a professor of history at the University of Memphis, has written books about juvenile delinquency and the children’s rights movement and published several anthologies and research guides about the history of childhood and US family history. The entries in these two volumes are topical, with many short in length. The best entries are the rather lengthy ones written by authors surveying their own recent or forthcoming work—on such subjects as baby-sitting, breast-feeding, childcare, abortion, and adoption. Especially worthy of interest are Kathleen Jones on changing ideals of motherhood and Elizabeth Blair Clark on discipline and punishment and domestic violence.

The editor has exercised his imagination and included topics rarely covered in family history, such as gifted children in the family, the family bed, military families, and the educational achievement of parents. (The family bed refers to the practice of children sharing a bed with others.) Immigrant families receive considerable weight here with six separate entries. The editors have given substantial attention to the medical history of the family, and to major diseases, some of which continue to plague the American family, such as AIDS, and others, which have been largely eradicated, such as polio. There are at least six entries on alternative families, from families in communes to the history of the Oneida experiment in an effort to underscore the desire to escape from the dominant family form. Rites of passage such as weddings and funerals and calendric holidays such as Father’s Day and Mother’s Day are given separate entries. The entry by queer studies scholar Elizabeth Freeman in her entry on weddings argues that wedding ritual has been used as a form of protest as well as the portal to legal marriage. The history of childhood, including children’s education and labor, is covered extensively. Two major themes emerge in many entries and in the foreword by Steven Mintz. The first is that fear of family decline is a long-standing one, appearing especially in periods of rapid social and economic change. The second is that the US has a long history of patchwork and sorely inadequate social policy toward the family and the welfare of children.

The entries are heavily weighted toward the twentieth century, and this is true even in topical entries that span many centuries. All of the “experts” on the family who receive individual mini-biographies are persons who lived in the twentieth century. Deservedly, the entry for Dr. Benjamin Spock is quite lengthy. Despite this chronological bias, many obvious twentieth-century topics are buried within other entries. Thus, discussion of the discourse on “family values” can be found in an entry on the “family as a political theme” and another on “family decline in the twentieth century.” Similarly, important activities of the twentieth-century family,
listening to radio, watching television, and shopping, receive only passing mention. Colonial American history, once the most exciting area of scholarship in the history of the family, receives short shrift. The subject of coverture, for example, is given barely a paragraph in an entry about the history of marriage. Non-historians – social scientists, lawyers, physicians – wrote many of the entries. Without exception, these entries provide limited historical information while giving extensive coverage of the subject in the contemporary period. For example, Peggy Shifflett’s entry on demography of the family is actually about US demography since 1990. Nikki Khanna and Joya Misra’s essay on Asian American families is entirely contemporary, with no references to historical scholarship on this subject. As a result, picture brides are not mentioned in this entry or in the index. That there are so many entries of this kind forces two conclusions: the first is that social scientists remain uninterested and perhaps unaware of the work of family historians, and the second, that many topics of contemporary interest (family medicine, the family vacation) have yet to find their historian.

This encyclopedia will prove valuable to two distinct audiences. Those in the helping professions who are interested in the historical antecedents for contemporary social problems may turn here. Teachers of family history will also find this encyclopedia a useful way to keep abreast of scholarship from the 1990s. The main textbook for undergraduates in family history, Domestic Revolutions by Steven Mintz and Susan Kellogg, was published in 1988 and has not been revised. Thus, this encyclopedia serves as a convenient guide to recent scholarship on many topics. Any serious scholar in US family history will want to own these two volumes and draw the attention of students to them.

University of Illinois

ELIZABETH PLECK
creates a new language and a new set of theoretical parameters suited to her approach. In a telling passage, Hayles recalls asking Robert Coover why he stopped experimenting with hypertext. He explained that what interested him most was “the voice of the writer,” and that he feared technology was killing that voice. *Writing Machines* ought to reassure him: in arguing for the need for a new theory to account for the relationship between technology and literature, Hayles does not announce, or call for, the elimination of subjectivity.

One of the greatest strengths of this book is precisely its implicit humanist perspective; perhaps Hayles’s most significant contribution to literary and cultural debate lies not in her foregrounding of new technologies and the literary possibilities they create, but on her successful demonstration that what is essentially an extension of already much-rehearsed postmodernist anxieties is not also (and does not have to be) the death of the human(ist) subject. Instead, she is suggesting that, by foregrounding their materiality, these texts relocate subjectivity, and that in order to recover it we need to look for it in new places.

Hayles practises what she preaches. Although constrained by the limits of print and linearity, she has collaborated with designer Anne Brudick to produce an unconventional book which is a visual and material analogue to the texts and theories it discusses. Written as a part of series, the book had to conform to a specific format, a fact that might explain some of its weaknesses. Length restrictions may account for Hayles’s failure to engage with the “fabulists,” “metafictionists” and other pioneers and precursors of the authors she studies, while the relegation of footnotes to the MIT Press website is noted with regret by the author herself.

*University of Dundee*  

**ALIKI VARVOGLI**
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It is a truism to say that the 1950s were a decade of consumerism in the USA, but this sumptuous new collection of advertisements from that period gives uniquely accessible confirmation of that fact. Grouped according to products, they reflect the commercial priorities and tensions of the decade. As Jim Heimann points out in his introduction, nuclear energy presented the most complex challenge to the nation in stimulating fear which companies attempted to divert into reassuringly peaceful channels. Paul Boyer’s classic study *By the Bomb’s Early Light* documents such attempts from 1945 onwards and in the present collection a clear tension emerges between legend and image (the navy promoting “power for peace” but showing a precision-guided missile), or between rival images like that for Lukens Steel which showed a group of officers watching a nuclear explosion juxtaposed with a peacetime example of technical equipment. In this period the consumer boom meant that all sales goods were promoted with exaggerated hype or with a none-too-covert appeal to added benefits, the sort of appeal which Vance Packard attacked as commercial brainwashing in *The Hidden Persuaders*. Nothing dates the decade more strikingly than the ads’ repeated appeal to the pattern set by the majority. “Follow
the Crowd,” Schick razors urged; Coca-Cola was promoted as the ultimate accompaniment to any food, possessing a universal social appeal. Or the ads might play on the consumer’s desire to be modern, youthful, family-conscious. The sheer variety of goods motivated such appeals; how else could the customer differentiate between the bewildering variety of goods on offer. Westinghouse offered a range of fridges as broad as a sample card for paint, explicitly appealing to image rather than function. Indeed function was repeatedly displaced by a promotion of electronic gadgetry, like the Servel “Electric Wonderbar” which combined “refrigerette” and bar. Of all the goods on offer, priority went to the car which changed shape startlingly as the decade progressed. Gradually models lost the centre bar in the windshield and expanded in length. But even this was not enough. The development of tail-fins reflected an implied analogy with flight which grew stronger and stronger until models were being sold as the aeroplanes of the road. Heimann’s collection gives us a unique cross-section of the period’s iconography when gender roles were becoming stereotyped (mom in the kitchen, pop doing the barbecue), ethnic variety was suppressed (African American images appear mainly for hair-dressing), and – to appeal to the new class of suburban commuters – domestic values being reinforced. Ads were closely tied to the cinema through the recurrence of film stars to promote goods: Rock Hudson, Phil Silvers and John Wayne for cigarettes; Kim Novak, Elizabeth Taylor and Maureen O’Hara for soaps. As Vance Packard would have argued, the consumer was being offered a vicarious taste of those stars’ glamour. It is difficult to exaggerate the importance of this collection which gives the reader a rich source of primary imagery which sheds invaluable light on the fifties.

University of Liverpool

DAVID SEED
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This two-volume "Reader," 43 items from 28 journals and four books, aims to be a pioneering anthology filling a gap in gender studies. Each volume divides its essays into five parts and has its own introduction and index, but Volume Two’s preface and selected bibliography are the same as Volume One’s. Neither parts nor papers are individually prefaced, nor are the papers sourced except in a list at each volume’s end, a frustration for the serious student and for the browser.

Volume One’s introduction, subtitled “Black Men’s History: Toward a Gendered Perspective”, glosses its 23 articles individually and attempts linkages in a broad historical and quasi-analytical narrative, which unfortunately is often unclear and
confusing. For example: “First, we cannot begin to understand what it means to be black and male in modern America without addressing the fact that, in spite of their status as an oppressed group, the first generations of African men and women arrived on these shores with certain established notions about gender roles and identity. These values and beliefs were the basis for constructing models of manhood that echoed hegemonic masculinities in America but were unique to the experiences of African-Americans.” Perhaps dissatisfied with this, the editors rather perfunctorily introduce Volume Two in only 11 pages, glossing each of the 20 pieces, sometimes explaining its inclusion, and explicating the categories into which the articles are grouped. The preface and introductions mention several works bearing generally on manhood and masculinity, usually giving author, title and date, but the selected bibliography does not include these nor does it offer any analytical division or annotation, such as might be found in a guide to further reading.

Taking both volumes together, only a few articles directly address themes and issues of black manhood and masculinity, e.g. William H. Becker’s “The Black Church: Manhood and Mission” (*Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, 1972), while another few treat relevant cultural or contextual topics – the rape myth; lynching; “John Henry”; “Stack Lee”; Frederick Douglass as representative man. The majority of the essays are relatively narrowly focussed historical studies, all of a high standard of scholarship, from mainstream academic journals, but they are not necessarily apposite to the larger concerns of the editors. For example, William C. Hine’s “Black Politicians in Reconstruction Charleston … a Collective Study” (*Journal of Southern History*, 1983) is a socio-economic profile of 234 men in politics, replete with nine statistical tables and nine appendix pages of raw data. It offers almost nothing directly relevant to understanding the construction of masculine identities, a process not dissimilar perhaps to “taking part in politics,” for which (Hine writes) there “were as many reasons … as there were men in politics, and unraveling those reasons is nearly impossible.”

Categorised by basic subject matter, disregarding the editors’ parts, 12 articles deal with military experience, slave rebellion or conspiracy, while another generalises about violence, protest and identity in relation to black manhood. That selfhood among the oppressed emerges from, as well as generates, protest and freedom-fighting is now a conventional tautology. The relations of African Americans’ struggle to military service, which was brought heroic success and self-confidence as well as severe injustice and humiliation, are well documented and easily accessible in the research annals. Much space given to such material in these volumes is in this sense superfluous. It reduces the room available for unorthodox approaches to gender as a force in black history. However, the number of essays on black military experience would have been unremarkable but for an aspect of presentation that seems to reduce a question of manhood to going for a soldier.

Each volume’s cover (paperback) features a photo of a black man against a background of his “discharge papers”; that of Volume Two is the first editor’s grandfather in uniform, “one of the 40,000 … black soldiers who saw combat in World War I.” Moreover, Volume Two is dedicated to the memory of this grandfather and of the second editor’s father, described as “World War II veteran.” These men lived 90 and 62 years respectively; their lives as soldiers were only temporary,
small fractions of their manhood. Would the editors in ordinary discourse so
reductively define their forefathers’ identities?

Apart from the over-emphasis of military service as a ground for masculinity, a
wide range of subjects is covered, but substance is thinly spread. The editors believe
“that black manhood … is rooted in the slave experience” and we know that most
black men in the 150 years covered in Volume One were slaves and most slave men
were farm labourers. Only a relatively few found other occupations; the many never
became rebels or soldiers, even temporarily. While individual essays in Volume Two
focus on slave ironworkers, skilled blacks, the first African American clockmaker,
and chimney sweeps, and other occupations feature elsewhere in Volume One, no
article addresses everyday slave life, in the fields or the cabins.

The editors write in Volume Two’s introduction that “most blacks ended up in
the sharecropping system by the end of the 1870s … another traumatic system of
inequality.” However, they “examine black men in the labor force in contexts other
than sharecropping,” illuminating “how black and white … interacted and com-
peted for jobs that white men often claimed as theirs only.” This is justified by some
simplistic reasoning, that “emancipation marked black men’s introduction into
the … workplace as paid workers,” as if sharecropping were not wage labour, and
the “family farm, with its independent male head, was beginning its slow, inexorable
decline.” Only one Volume Two item deals with Southern agriculture: Manning
Marable’s short, informative, but somewhat misnamed, “The politics of black land
tenure, 1877–1915” (erroneously Labor History in the sources list, but correctly
Agricultural History, 1979, in the Selected Bibliography), which only tangentially
connects with issues of manhood or masculinity. The remaining occupationally fo-
cussed pieces deal with policemen, cowboys, the railroad brotherhoods, southern
convict coal miners, and (in a later part of the professions) lawyers and physicians.

A Question of Manhood disappoints. Its pedagogical apparatus, indexes apart, is
limited; its contents are mostly in easily accessible original sources and in too many
cases not directly or sufficiently relevant to the main purposes of the Reader. Many
essays would be quite valuable in the general study of African American history,
gendered or not, but this is not reason enough to recommend these volumes for
acquisition.

Lewes, East Sussex

GEORGE REHIN
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Pierrette Hondagneu-Sotelo, Domestica: Immigrant Workers Cleaning and Caring in
the Shadows of Affluence (Berkeley and London: University of California, 2001,

Are suburban homes replacing inner-city factories as sites for the economic incor-
poration of new immigrants in America? A case can be made for such a shift,
especially in Los Angeles, where millions of legal and illegal immigrants from
Mexico and Central America form the bedrock of the expanding, labor-intensive
service sector. The demand for both housekeepers and nannies has skyrocketed in
Los Angeles over the past decade, and Latinas have long since displaced African
American women in supplying that demand. In *Domestica*, a well-written and well-researched study, Hondagneu-Sotelo investigates the varied and informal work relations that exist in the private homes of southern California’s suburbanites.

Based primarily on in-depth interviews with thirty-seven employers and twenty-three employees, the book is part historical narrative, part contemporary sociological study, and part social policy advocacy. It succeeds on all three levels. The author provides a clear, albeit brief analysis of why, despite the predictions of economists as late as the 1970s, paid housework and in-home childcare has expanded even in the face of advances in labor-saving technology. Connecting developments in Los Angeles to global trends, she persuasively argues that the demand for paid housework tends to increase with growing inequalities of wealth. That such jobs are located in private homes and filled by those facing gender and racial discrimination makes it easy to ignore or dismiss these jobs as something less than “real” work.

Unlike most nations, the US incorporates paid domestic service in its labor legislation. There are, for instance, rules governing wages, hours, and taxation. Yet, as revealed in the case of Zoe Baird (Clinton’s would-be Attorney General who failed to report federal withholding tax for her two Peruvian domestics and saw her nomination blocked by the Senate in 1993), employers, employees, and even many judges are unaware of the existence of these laws. Employers are homeowners and parents who consider themselves “consumers” rather than bosses. Therefore the author, a community activist as well as an academic, offers a loud-and-clear plea for a nationwide educational campaign so that existing laws protecting the rights of domestic workers can be enforced.

The true merit of this book lies in the voice it gives to those who toil in the homes of the affluent. As does everyone else, they crave dignity, respect, and a sense that their labor is valuable. Here, the author strikes a restrained note of optimism. White suburbanites do in fact value the contributions of their Latina nannies and housekeepers, although racial and class differences often inhibit them from expressing these thoughts directly, and thus they deny these women the social recognition they crave. *Domestica* is recommended to all those interested in race, class, the gender in contemporary America.

*Craig Phelan*

*University of Wales Swansea*


Horace Greeley, the reformer who urged Americans to “go West, young man” added a qualification: the new territories should be “reserved for the benefit of the white Caucasian race.” Using authors ranging from John Marrant to Toni Morrison, Johnson uncovers a neglected narrative tradition in African American writing – that of the testing of black masculinity within the white-defined myth of the frontier. Central is the renegotiation of the savage/civilised dichotomy established by the myth’s founding documents. For Frederick Jackson Turner and
Theodore Roosevelt, the frontier is a kind of “natural factory” producing a (white) masculinity that balances the instinctive rigour of the male body with its civilising intellectual force – the ideal of the “beast/patrician,” as Turner coins it. If the white man tempers his civilisation with the West’s wildness, the black tenderfoot confronts his culturally imposed identity of the savage. Johnson charts a variety of responses to this conflict, including the relocation of savagery in whiteness, and the adoption of white stereotypes of American Indians.

Johnson’s ambitious project incorporates both a history of the mythologised frontier and of the ideological shift in black identity politics from the prescribed assimilation of Washington to the cultural nationalism of Du Bois. Particularly pertinent to the latter is the chapter comparing *The Life and Adventures of Nat Love*, rife with the influence of the dime novel and the desire to assimilate, and Pauline Hopkins’s *Winona*, which draws the frontier as a space for political agitation and protest. Oscar Micheaux’s 1913 novel *The Conquest* combines a story of Turnerian frontier transformation with one of racial uplift, with the conquered hero of its conclusion suggesting the inauthenticity of both narratives. In his discussion of this, as in all of the lesser-known, less accessible texts, Johnson relies (necessarily, perhaps, but frustratingly) upon recount rather than analysis. His argument gathers speed in its consideration of a Richard Wright story, “The Man Who Was Almost a Man,” in which a black man’s accidental shooting of a white-owned mule in Jim Crow-era Mississippi moves beyond parody of that frontier mythical staple, the ritual hunt, to a deconstruction of the hero’s ability to function within a white-ordained symbolic system. It is on the eventually post-colonial frontier that Johnson is at his best, skilfully illuminating texts such as John A. William’s *The Man Who Cried I Am* with the theoretical insights of, amongst others, Homi Bhabha. William’s novel moves to a frontier of the African continent itself, represented not as escape but as homecoming, a confrontation with sameness.

Female authors are well represented in this study of masculinity, as Johnson considers the critiques of patriarchal ideology and the frontier myth in novels like *Paradise* and Era Bell Thompson’s *American Daughter*. Their analyses of masculinity itself, as an utterly contradictory, deeply unstable construct, however, are the only ones featuring here, beyond a nod to Sedgwick and her insistence upon the importance of homosocial bonding. The hero of Chester Hines’s *If He Hollers Let Him Go* is engaged in a quest to become “a man, defined by Webster as a male human being.” The instability of this reflex essentialist link between masculine and racial identity is left unexamined in this otherwise enlightening book.

*University of Edinburgh*  

ALICE FERREBE
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Many white writers from Wendell Berry in *The Hidden Wound* (1968) to Ellen Douglas in *Truth* (1998) have written about what Berry calls “the psychic wound of
racism” and many African Americans, from Ralph Ellison in *Shadow and Act* (1964) to Toni Morrison in *Playing in the Dark* (1992), have assessed the impact of black history and creativity on shaping imaginative constructions of America. This collection exemplifies the intertextuality of white and black writing in its emphasis on racial crossovers: painful indictments, troubled dialogues and redemptive reconciliations.

With selections ranging from the often-anthologised story by Alice Walker, “Advancing Luna and Ida B. Wells” and “Recitatif,” the only short story Toni Morrison has ever published, to wonderful new finds like Anthony Grooms’s “Food That Pleases, Food To Take Home” and Reginald McKnight’s “Quitting Smoking,” this collection gathers together stories written with vigour and imagination about the complex and strange – and sometimes passionately close – relations between blacks and whites in American society. Jones includes black and white writers we know well alongside neglected voices like William Faulkner’s protégée, Joan Williams, and the powerful Mississippi writer Elizabeth Spencer. She brings to our attention writers whose sparkling and gritty short stories we may have missed in our tendency to reach for novels, like James Alan McPherson and Ekwueme Michael Thelwell.

Organising stories into three sections (Misreadings, Rereadings and New Readings) illuminates the ways in which they function as aesthetic and social commentary on socio-historical trends in the US since the Civil Rights Movement. Some figure as wrenching dispatches from the frontlines of civil rights struggles (“Advancing Luna,” “Spring is Now”); others as meditative ruminations on past times (“The Business Venture”). Still others are contemporary interrogations of interracial relationships in which the sting of racism is in the tale, like the marvellous “Off Season Travel” by Alyce Miller. The experience of reading these stories closely reflects the journey up from civil rights in the American South, and the South is the setting for more than half of the nineteenth stories in this collection.

This collection will entrance the general reader and will serve tutors well when teaching modules on contemporary American fiction, US race relations, the civil rights movement and the American South.

*University of Nottingham*  
SHARON MONTEITH
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These three books under review – by an anthropologist, an environmental historian and a political scientist – deal, respectively, with the last two hundred years, the
entire sweep of human history in North America, and the previous decade. Collectively, they testify to the ever-widening appeal of the study of human relations with nature among scholars of the United States. Reverence for the behaviour of indigenous peoples towards the natural world was a trademark of environmental history in the US when the field took shape in the 1960s. Over the past twenty years, however, environmental historians have been chipping away at the simple dichotomy between the noble Indian “child of nature” and the ruthless Euro-American invader, which revealed more about the feelings of later generations of Euro-Americans (including, not least, a sense of guilt) than actual Indian experiences. Krech tests the powerful myths embodied in the famous “Crying Indian” anti-pollution advertisement of 1971 (I have since learnt that Iron Eyes Cody was in fact a full-blooded Italian) against the best available archaeological and written evidence. In a wider sense, his book is an exemplary discussion of the nature and quality of evidence. A particularly telling point is that Indian spiritual beliefs, far from being conducive to a modern conservationist ethic, were sometimes inimical. *The Ecological Indian*, the first book-length study to present the case against the conventional wisdom, will undoubtedly upset some constituencies (not least many white environmentalists), but Krech’s act of demythologising is far from disempowering. Stripped of the thick layers of mythical veneer with which they have been coated by yet another racial stereotype, Indians emerge as diverse and complex peoples (“real human beings,” to quote a contemporary Choctaw) who were eminently capable of shaping their physical surroundings. As Krech remarks of “Indian Country” today: “For every story about Indians being on the receiving end of environmental racism or taking actions usually associated with conservation or environmentalism is a conflicting story about them exploiting resources or endangering lands.” Level-headed judgments are matched by wonderfully readable prose. Moreover, Krech’s thematic approach is a triumph of common sense. Chapters on the aboriginal role in the megafaunal extinctions during the Pleistocene, the demise of the Hohokam in twelfth-century southern Arizona, the population density debate, and the use of fire as a management tool, are followed by case studies of relations with buffalo, deer and beaver. This tames a potentially unwieldy subject and eliminates the danger of repetition inherent in a tribe-by-tribe approach, but I would have liked to see some more about the credit that early white conservationists gave the Ecological Indian, a much fuller discussion of the fascinating controversy over the authenticity of Chief Seattle’s celebrated speech and a meatier discussion of Indian portrayal in *Pocahontas* and *Dances with Wolves* (both films receiving a single passing mention).

If one of Krech’s essential points is that Euro-Americans have demonstrated no particular genius for environmental disturbance, then the central insight of *Nature and the English Diaspora* is that the environmental history of the United States is best approached as part of a common settler experience in various new worlds (the omission of South Africa is understandable but the great potential here for further comparison should be noted). Dunlap is interested in how “Anglo settlers” have “sought to understand their lands and find their place in them by use of their culture’s organized nature knowledge – science.” His examination of the relationship between a common culture (“Anglo,” he appreciates, is an awkward term, and is meant to incorporate others from the British Isles) and four imperial destinations is fully alert to nuance and variation, but the author stresses the common ground
that emerges from the comparative analysis of topics such as literary accounts of the
natural world, hunting and other forms of outdoor recreation, natural history and its
evolution into scientific ecology and the latter’s popular dissemination through en-
vironmentalism. Settlers shared common goals and technologies as well as a pioneer
ethos, initially seeking to remake strange lands according to a familiar image (refusal
to accept climatic restraints, notably aridity, was by no means unique to the United
States). However, their attitude eventually shifted from an ardour for exotics to
nostalgia for natives, expressed through landscape painting and wildlife protection.
Canada (perhaps inevitably) tends to be overshadowed by its smaller southern
neighbour, with Australia emerging as the strongest and most illuminating point of
comparison, especially for the western USA (the dingo was hounded as ruthlessly as
the wolf). Of the work of the late nineteenth-century Australian counterpart of
Frederic Remington, Tom Roberts, Dunlap comments: “The Breakaway, showing a
rider turning a flock of sheep, is much like American cowboy paintings, and his
Bailed Up, depicting an Australian stagecoach robbery, only needs different trees and
“Wells Fargo” on the coach to pass for American.” Dunlap, who writes with the
same clarity as Krech, is to be applauded for heroic service (reflecting substantial
archival research in four countries) to the cause that seeks to reconnect the conquest
of North America with that of other frontier regions invaded by the British.

Leading US conservationist/environmentalist organisations, such as the National
Wildlife Federation, the Wilderness Society and the Sierra Club, which feature
towards the end of Dunlap’s account, take centre stage in the final book under re-
view. Focusing on the Environmental Defense Fund and (now defunct) Environ-
mental Action as well as the three aforementioned groups, Voices and Echoes for the
Environment examines the implications, especially for relations between leaders
(voices) and rank and file (echoes), of the massive growth in membership and
budgets since the 1960s (especially during the Reaganite early 1980s). This expansion
has transformed the relatively small, simple and often localised groups typical of the
1960s into today’s highly professionalised national public-interest outfits with their
corporate style structures and Beltway headquarters (the majority of members doing
little beyond writing an annual membership renewal cheque). In addition to the
energies they expend trying to save the planet, these environmental groups must
devote time and resources to day-to-day administrative concerns as well as member
recruitment and retention in the highly competitive environment of often overlap-
ning non-profit organisations. Since staying alive has become just as important as
ensuring effective political representation, Shaiko examines recruitment techniques
such as direct mail and recruitment incentives (particularly “non-goal oriented”
one such as attractive magazines), also topics such as leadership style, member
motivation and levels of member input and interaction. His recommendations are
fairly predictable: policy goals must regain priority and links between leaders and
members must become closer. Bristling with tables reporting vital statistics and
illuminating survey data and communicating its findings in the language of the social
sciences, Voices and Echoes for the Environment is obviously less accessible to the un-
initiated than the previous two studies. But Shaiko’s five groups are well chosen,
representing a range of objectives, sizes and structures. And having been a loyal
(if largely inactive) member of one of them (motivated by policy goal-oriented in-
centives, of course) for twenty years, I found it intriguing to compare my own
circumstances and views with the author’s general findings. On the evidence of these three books, the future for scholarship about the human dialogue with the rest of nature in the United States looks an increasingly bright green.

University of Bristol


Churchill’s bust sits on the Oval office desk of George W. Bush, reflecting how Churchill’s post-war cult status is even more potent in the United States than in Britain. As confrontation with Iraq remains more than a distinct possibility and as “hyper-power” America’s War on Terror seems set to become the new Cold War, Klaus Larres has produced a very timely examination of the great man himself. Ironically in the context of the Churchillian posturing of Bush and Blair, Larres forcefully argues that Winston Churchill’s most lasting legacy may well be that reflected in his famous dictum that “to jaw-jaw is always better than to war-war.” Larres reminds us that: “not only Churchill’s activities as a military leader during the Second World War but perhaps even more his political strategy to overcome international conflict situations by negotiation may be his lasting legacy.”

Larres focuses on Churchill’s belief in the power of personal diplomacy, which he sees as the central aspect of his long political career. From his early forays into international politics in 1908, until he retired as a world-renowned statesman in 1955, Churchill was increasingly inclined to personalise international affairs. He became convinced that “individual sentiment and human affection” could positively influence relations between nation states. Larres contends that after 1945 personal diplomacy became Churchill’s credo. And his solution for resolving a Cold War that he feared threatened otherwise to end in the annihilation of all civilisation.

Larres has produced a sorely needed judicious and objective study based on meticulous scholarship that gives careful consideration to the views of other scholars on the many important issues tackled. He thoughtfully weighs the revisionist literature that challenges his central thesis about Churchill’s Cold War summity. He does not deny that some of the factors they stress influenced Churchill’s actions, not least his “arrogance, over-confidence, and imperviousness to argument,” even his “increasing senility and deafness.” But it remains Larres’ contention that Churchill’s personal diplomacy was “an imaginative and perhaps even visionary policy through which he attempted to reverse his country’s declining fortunes and prevent or undo major catastrophes before the First World War, in the course of the Second World War and during the Cold War years.”

Larres presents an outstanding overview of the critical 1945–55 period with astute insights into American presidents Harry Truman and Dwight Eisenhower and the minds and workings of the Foreign Office and the State Department. A significant contribution to Cold War diplomatic History, especially on the post-war position of Germany, it is also noteworthy for its observations on Anglo-American relations.
Well written, notable for its clarity of analysis, this is a book for scholars that the general public will find immensely enjoyable and accessible.

*University of Ulster*

Dianne Kirby
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*American Films of the 70s: Conflicting Visions*, by Peter Lev, examines forty films primarily of the 1970s in relation to the rapidly changing political, cultural and social landscapes of America of the time. Under Lev’s thesis, the book’s well-balanced selection of films gives a wide interpretation to this era of cinema in America while also providing an easily navigable grouping of these films for those interested in individual and thematically related films.

The book’s first four chapters examine the type of future that various films suggest for America, a future that will move towards either a conservative society or a liberal one. Here films are discussed which deal with hippies, cops, conspiracy and the end of the 60s. Some of the most interesting points come in Chapter 3 during Lev’s discussion of the “disaster film” such as *Airport* (1970), directed by George Seaton, which Lev understands to be indicative of the feeling of threat felt by the conservative middle-aged and middle class in the face of the rapidly changing times.

In the second half of the book, more specific issues are examined that Lev sees as playing into the future of America. Here separate chapters deal with art, teen culture, the sexual revolution, African American culture and war. For almost all these themes, Lev provides an insightful and provoking commentary, particularly in his chapter on the easily overlooked teen films, such as *American Graffiti* (1973), directed by George Lucas, *Cooley High* (1975), directed by Michael Schultz, *Animal House* (1978), directed by John Landis, *Diner* (1982), directed by Barry Levinson and *Fast Times at Ridgemount High* (1982), directed by Amy Heckerling. For the conclusion of the book, Lev brings his ideas full circle with a discussion of science-fiction movies, finding in them postulated ideological visions of the future for America.

Perhaps most refreshing is Lev’s approach of using a historical backdrop against which to couch his discussion. This allows for an easy-to-follow analysis of the selected films, while not bogging down in film theory or technical terms. Although at times Lev’s book examines obligatory films of the 1970s such as *Apocalypse Now* (1979), directed by Francis Coppola, it also examines lesser-known films. Ultimately this broad approach of *American Films of the 70s: Conflicting Vision*, under the guidance of Lev’s argument, leaves one with a strong and thorough sense of this era of film.

*University of Essex*

Michael P. Gray
These forty-five weights and measures, essays derived from a July 1997 conference held under Melville Society and local municipal auspices in Volos, Greece, do nothing if not confirm the continuing invitation of Melville’s writing. As America’s prime voyager–author, and for whom Greece itself long drew his interest as Ekaterini Georgoudaki carefully underlines with reference to the 1856–57 *Journal and Clarel* in her “Herman Melville in Thessaloniki,” it hardly surprises that Melville should win this latest round of global scholarship. Who better, given the hugely varied human cast-lists of his fiction and verse, to meet the current multicultural, and transnational, turn? A feat of handsome production – the co-editor A. C. Christodoulou’s stunning cover design and chapter headpieces do immediate good service – the contributions, however inevitably varying their strengths, amount to a flourish.

Each of the six sequences brings together old and new Melville hands. Under the opening rubric of “Among The Nations” Christopher Sten offers a typically sharp reprise of Melville’s cosmopolitanism, *Typee* to *The Confidence-Man*, Polynesia to Native America, the instinctual capacity to enter, and transcend, “otherness” and “see and feel other people, other words, as though they were his own.” Wyn Kelley extends her work on Melville’s city portraiture in a timely study of how Lima haunted him, a spectral city of faith and slavery, and as given voice, principally, in *Moby-Dick*’s “The Whiteness of The Whale” and “The Town-Ho’s Story” and in “Benito Cereno.”

Melville’s Hellenic influences again make a bow in the late Hennig Cohen’s study of the influence of Diogenes as maverick and truth-sayer, especially in *Timoleon*, and in Rachela Permenter’s account of Pythagorean and other pre-Socratic thought on re-incarnation in “Loomings,” “The Try-Works” and other key sequences in *Moby-Dick*. At a different philosophical reach Basem L. Ra’ad, whose work on Melville’s journals has properly earned acclaim, intelligently ponders Lockean “uneasiness” in “Bartleby,” the story’s canny narrative–dialectical clash of “will not,” “prefer not” and “must.”

Under “Thematic Patterns” John Bryant gives a bracing, near Lacanian, airing to issues of sexual reflexivity in *Typee*; Yukiko Oshima offers a well-supported foray into Melville’s use of Native presence in *Moby-Dick*; and Sanford Marovitz revisits the influence of Melville on Shakespeare – *Lear* and the other Tragedies upon *Moby-Dick* and, most engagingly, the implications of *Measure for Measure* as dark comedy upon *Pierre*. “Theoretical Insights” yields Bryan Short on memory as dynamic in *The Confidence-Man*, the use of Guinea’s wonderfully equivocal play of remembrance and its aftermath aboard the *Fidèle*; Zbigniew Bialas on Melville’s use of “Kokovoko” as trope for the interplay of real and imagined cartography in *Moby-Dick*; and Dilek Direnc on multiple and cross-referential gendering in *Pierre*.

Given Melville’s acute powers of visualisation it would have been remiss had that, too, not received attention. It does so with dividends. Not only do the various black-and-white and colour plates confer their own vividness to the collection, they come
accompanied by some genuinely savvy commentary. Elizabeth Schultz so annotates the way Moby-Dick as icon has entered both high and popular visual culture, whether the woodblock illustrations of Rockwell Kent, the children’s graphics of the Canadian Jules Prud’homme, the assemblages of Finnish artist Juhani Harri, the affinities with Melville to be discerned in Lucien Freud, or each restaurant and funfair billboard. Wyn Kelley returns with a consideration of the graphics of William Kienbusch, especially his 1966 figure of Ahab. Robert K. Wallace develops a richly alert account of Frank Stella’s heady, multi-textured prints, reliefs and collages, few more dramatic than his twisting-metal version of “The Town Ho’s Story.” Dorsey Kleitz looks, intriguingly, into Melville’s fondness for the canvases of Elihu Vedder, not least “The Sphinx,” and the nature of their shared orientalist focus.

A last section, “Projection and Reflection,” offers more Melville in, and of, the world, whether the teaching of his work in China (Jincai Yang), Charles Olson’s vexed relationship with some of the founding luminaries of The Melville Society (Ralph Maud), French allusion in Moby-Dick (Dominique Marçais), or Melville studies in Japan (Arimichi Makino). These confirm yet further the book’s plenty, a benchmark, a way-station, in just how, and why, Melville goes on not only seizing, but educating, our attention.

Nihon University, Tokyo

A. ROBERT LEE


The conservative movement in Orange County, California, McGirr suggests, was a prototype for the rise of the modern American right. With a strong regional identity counterposed to the northeast, a significant group of skilled affluent whites, and the powerful presence of the defence industry, Orange County, like such locales as Fort Worth, Scottsdale and Colorado Springs, represented a key focus of conservative growth.

These communities, she contends, were premised not on the rejection of modernity, as influential early studies of American conservatism might suggest, but on its adaptation to encompass older traditions. A convergence of “old timers” (large ranchers, small farmers, merchants) and boom-time entrepreneurs and real-estate speculators created a fertile basis for a conservatism that immigrants partly brought into the area and partly imbibed after their arrival. In this, religion was crucial. The number of Baptist churches in the cities of Orange County grew from 6 in 1950 to 57 in 1960, many of them affiliated to the theologically conservative Southern Baptist Convention. The Assembly of God grew from two congregations to 13 and even within mainline Lutheran churches, of the 35 that existed in 1960, 15 belonged to the conservative Missouri Synod.

It was in this context that Barry Goldwater was to achieve decisive victory in Orange County’s 1964 Republican primaries while in the subsequent presidential election he was to gain the highest plurality in any large metropolitan region outside
the Deep South. If Goldwater was defeated nationally, the area’s conservatives were to be successful in their subsequent support for Ronald Reagan as governor of California. McGirr’s focus is on the sixties, and it is only with hindsight that we can see that decade as formative in American conservatism’s later successes. But she does say a little about later events, and, as the subtitle of her book would suggest, Orange County’s conservatism is seen as of considerable significance in the later rise of both libertarianism and the Christian Right, Reagan’s entry into the White House and the construction of a movement that was instrumental in the Republican capture of the presidency and many other elected positions in the latter part of the twentieth century.

This is a fine study of a milieu in which a movement that barely existed a decade earlier proved able to sink deep roots, but is McGirr persuasive in both her account of Orange County and of its significance for American conservatism as a whole? One aspect that will undoubtedly attract attention is her suggestion that Orange County conservatism was not race-centred. Where other writers, for instance Dan Carter, have emphasised conservatives’ use of coded language to conceal their reliance on white fears and black demonisation, McGirr argues that Californians’ support for Goldwater was lower than (and thus not the same as) the support for racial discrimination. She notes, too, most conservatives’ preference for Nixon over Wallace in 1968. She does not deny that race played a role in Orange County conservatism, and refers, for instance, to Reagan’s linking of welfare, crime and “minority groups.” But race was not central, she contends and, while white backlash was important for conservatism’s success, the movement itself arose earlier and was organised as a more wide-ranging challenge to egalitarianism and forces that were seen as eroding both community and individualism. Such an argument would need more than a review (or a single local study) to substantiate or reject (or, perhaps, to nuance), but it is in the decision, in McGirr’s words, to tell “the story of the making of the national right through the lens of Orange County” that greater problems emerge. In part, we need other studies of the heartlands of early conservatism, but, in addition to questions of representativeness, how we connect the local with the national is also problematic. At times, McGirr makes the links too strongly, noting how conservative Protestantism need not be politically engaged without emphasising the different impacts of religion in the pre-Christian Right 60s and twenty years later. The early anti-abortion movement, largely Catholic in the 60s, is pictured as already having more of the characteristics of the larger and more ecumenical movement of the Reagan years and, while McGirr rightly emphasises that by the 60s American conservatism had moved away from the anti-Catholicism and anti-Semitism of the earlier right, her suggestion that the Orange County of forty years ago can be seen as birthing the right of today emphasises the commonalities at the expense of the differences between the two periods.

McGirr’s study is an impressive achievement. It is a compelling local study which calls out to be replicated, and a valuable contribution to the study of the right as a national force; but we will need more studies of both the local and the national, the early and the recent, before we can fully understand the complex force this study so vividly evokes.

University of Wolverhampton

MARTIN DURHAM
Jonathan Moreno served as a senior staffer for President Clinton’s Advisory Committee on Human Radiation Experiments, chaired by Ruth Faden and established in 1994. The brief of the Committee, which did not cover experiments related to bacteriological or chemical warfare research, was quite narrow. (As Moreno points out, by the early 1950s, the Pentagon’s radiation research had become intertwined with its wider “ABC” – atomic, biological and chemical – programme.) Nevertheless, the Committee’s 1995 report contributed to a new awareness of “secret state” experimentation on uninformed or coerced human subjects. The Clinton Administration responded in 1995 by undertaking to retain all records pertaining to classified human experiments conducted by federal agencies, and to follow the principle of “informed consent.” In 1997 Clinton made his apology to participants in the Tuskegee syphilis study, conducted by the US Public Health Service from 1932 to 1972. In 2000, he announced a compensation plan for workers, at the Paducah, Kentucky, uranium-processing plant, who had unwittingly participated in radiation experiments in the 1950s.

Much of Undue Risk is taken up with descriptions of the radiation experiments investigated by the Faden Committee, but Moreno also peers further afield. He describes well-documented and obscure incidents, including the Fernald School (Massachusetts) radiation experiments, the “Boston Project” (where terminally ill patients were injected with uranium), the CIA’s MKULTRA experiments with hallucinogenic drugs and various “field tests.” (In June 1966, the Army introduced the bacillus globigii into New York City subway tunnels.) Moreno illustrates the difficulty of arriving at a definition of “national security experimentation” – the main concern of the Faden Committee. In Cold War conditions, virtually any quasi-medical “secret state” experiments had possible military or security applications. He documents the reluctance in the Pentagon to adopt (much less to observe) “informed consent” codes relating to human experimentation. Undue Risk also contains discussion of the recruitment of German scientists and of Japanese biological war experts into US military research after World War II. He raises the possibility – discussed in Stephen Endicott and Edward Hagerman’s The United States and Biological Warfare (1998) – that the US used biological agents during the Korean War.

Moreno’s book is not especially well organised. He argues that human experiments are “probably inevitable in the real world of national security.” His main recommendation – for a “recognized international tribunal to interpret and apply ethnical standards in national security experiments” – flies in the face of contemporary American proclivities toward unilateralism in these areas.
This collaborative endeavor, backed by two foundations, augments the literature using material culture to explore the lived religion of ordinary people. The emphasis falls on visual culture, primarily vernacular art, which sends signals about religious worlds of meaning. Some of that meaning comes through public art – murals on buildings, for example, or billboards. Some emerges as social transformation challenges private religious worlds. And some reflects efforts to adapt meaning and identity to technological advance and facets of modernity.

Editors Sally Promey and David Morgan set a theoretical framework amplified in essays by Thomas Tweed and Gretchen Buggeln on public identity. Morgan argues that public art simultaneously reflects socially accepted realities, draws folk into those realities, and subtly perpetuates an ideological perspective. Tweed’s analysis of the Shrine of the Immaculate Conception in Washington, DC, the US capital, demonstrates how one building can signal that Roman Catholicism has an authentically American dimension, despite centuries of Protestant anti-Catholic attitudes, and symbolize spiritual power even for non-Catholics. Buggeln’s study of the rebuilding of a Presbyterian church in Wilmington after a fire shows how architecture and space can capture a sense of mission, mirror a theology, and yet serve as the focus for neighborhood identity.

In the second section, John Davis illustrates how visual depictions of Catholic practice in the nineteenth century showed both Protestant fear of Catholicism as superstition and a fascination based on Catholicism’s appeal to sensory experience; visual expression fosters a sense of the “other” that reinforces one’s own identity. Stewart Hoover shows how television portrayals of clergy and moral qualms some viewers have about the value of soap operas reinforce cultural perceptions that institutional religion and doctrine are irrelevant to daily life, but sustain an undercurrent of personal spirituality. Offerings by Erika Doss, Harvey Markowitz, David Bjelajac, and Claire Farago complete this section.

The impact of modernity and technology receives discussion in Ellen Smith’s analysis of the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century practice among US Jews, particularly recent immigrants, of sending postcards on Rosh Hashanah (New Year’s). The cards’ religious content, often unrelated to the celebration, mattered less than what the cards conveyed about mediating an identity across cultures and adapting religious practice to a new setting. John Giggie portrays how the railroads and their built environment (depots, for example) became symbols of both a demonic racism, because of segregated cars and waiting rooms, and hope for salvation and redemption as railroads mirrored the journey of the soul. Essays by Leigh Schmidt and Paul Gutjahr probe other dimensions of modernity.

This anthology demonstrates how visual culture provides clues about the real dynamic of religion within a culture. It also suggests that traditional ways of telling the story overlook what sustains ordinary folk intent on finding religious meaning and identity.

University of Tennessee at Chattanooga

CHARLES H. LIPPY

The very fact of the revolt of the thirteen continental colonies, and the subsequent construction of the United States continues to blur the fact that contemporaries understood that the American colonies ranged from Canada to the Caribbean. O'Shaugnessy's work goes a long way to redressing this by explaining the important role that the Caribbean played in the economy and politics of this period and demonstrating why the island colonies did not support the mainland revolt. In doing so, he puts the Caribbean firmly back into the historiography of the American Revolution.

O'Shaughnessy argues that there were many social, political and economic ties which prevented the British Caribbean colonists from even imagining independence, let alone thinking that it would be in their economic interest. The white population believed themselves under siege from their own slaves and there was a strong reliance on cultural cues from England: rather than feeling oppressed by the British Army, the Caribbean colonists supported them financially, and the sugar interest was both strong and efficient in defending their interests viz-à-viz the French back in England. However, acquiescence to imperial policies such as the Stamp Act was a precursor to later years. This lack of action was partly due to the preoccupation of the planters with internal politics and in protecting, and in some cases, extending, their privileges locally. Self-interest in economic, rather than political matters, directed the West Indian attack against the British policy towards the mainland colonies. They were far more concerned with the effects of the war on the islands than its causes. The planters complained of low profits, but the islanders were also concerned with protection; both from the enemy, and from a slave population far more rebellious than the white. However, many British merchants in the Caribbean supplied the Americans with weapons and, although there were attempts, even by Governors to join in the military conflict, the motive was more often money than the British empire. The West India interest coincided with that of the metropolis far more than that of the continental colonies, but economics rather than ideology, ruled their actions. This meant that their approach to their own government, and their place within the British Empire, was often ambivalent.

This book is about the politics of the elite of the Caribbean islands in the period of the American Revolution, or rather, how economic interest ruled those politics. Do not expect to find the views of lesser mortals here. Poor whites, and especially coloureds and blacks appear only as a rebellious mass to be controlled by force. The effects of creolisation are also underplayed because, in dealing with politics, O'Shaughnessy is dealing with an elite still closely linked with the metropolis. However, in discussing why the Caribbean colonies did not rebel, he demonstrates that the West India interest was closely identified with that of the empire, and that money rather than morals was the name of the game. O'Shaughnessy succeeds in his goal of placing the Caribbean firmly back in the historiography of the American Revolution, as well as highlighting the role of the Caribbean elite.
Nothing delights a scholar more than access to documents long hidden from academic scrutiny. Recent treasures from Russian and American archives pertaining to the Cold War have offered such an opportunity. Kathryn S. Olmsted has tapped into these sources and her efforts have produced a fine and long overdue biography of Elizabeth Bentley, the Soviet spy turned ex-Communist informer who helped ignite the post-World War II red scare. Olmsted also devotes time to the Soviet spy system in the US, the increasing tension between Moscow and CPUSA, and the gendered culture of the 1950s.

Elizabeth Bentley enjoyed taking risks and breaking rules – she also struggled with personal difficulties, most involving men and alcohol. Bentley joined the Communist party in 1934 and shortly afterward became a Soviet spy. Her controller was Jacob Golos, one of the Soviet Union’s most important spies and the primary arranger of Leon Trotsky’s murder. Through Golos, Bentley learned the trade of spycraft – she also carried on a secret, five-year love affair with the married Golos that lasted until his death in 1943. By 1941, Bentley controlled her own network of agents, the Silvermaster group, “one of the most productive Soviet espionage operations in the United States.”

In 1943, the Soviets began cracking down on their agents, especially Bentley, who they considered to be sloppy and unprofessional. Devastated by Golos’ death and discouraged when the Soviets pulled the Silvermaster group from her control, Bentley launched a campaign to “hurt the Soviets.” Her actions would lead her to the FBI in the fall of 1945. Eventually, Bentley revealed the names of eighty alleged Soviet spies, including two former contacts of Golos, one she knew by the name of Hiss, the other, Julius.

While the FBI worked frantically to verify Bentley’s claims, Bentley made “one of the most fateful choices of her life” and contacted the anticommunist New York World-Telegram. In a clear marketing ploy, the writers characterized Bentley as a “svelte and striking blonde,” a naïve “spy queen” who revealed top secrets pertaining to national security. Anxious to regain some control over her life story, Bentley began to spin her own version of events. She reconstructed herself as “a sort of communist June Cleaver” who was only obeying her man (Golos). Bentley hoped to deflect responsibility for her actions and remain in the public eye, she also survived the best way she knew how in a culture saturated with gender anxieties. The media’s treatment of Bentley after her death in 1963 was also instructive, devoting only a few lines to this “frumpy,” “dowdy,” and “neurotic” woman, a “mistress” to a top spy, but unimportant in her own right. Olmsted sets the record straight.
Not many historians have the status that encourages publishers to collect together their miscellaneous essays into one accessible volume. Nell Painter, Edwards Professor of American History at Princeton, has that status, given her prominence as a leading historian and biographer. She is in the grand tradition of Southern historians concerned about the effect of racial difference in elucidating the American character. She has added an interest in gender, especially the gendered body, culture and sexuality to this customary scholarly focus. Here, she publishes six essays ostensibly about the intersection of these topics. It is a bit of a mixed bag. The best essay is undoubtedly her tour de force on the psychological effects of slavery, "Soul Murder and Slavery." The essay is a significant advance on the 1960s debate that focused on Stanley Elkins’s insistence that slavery was a closed system of repression. The repercussions of the Elkins debate have led scholars to shy away from considering how slavery affected individual psyches, but the subject is very important and Painter’s careful investigation into how contemporary analyses of child and sexual abuse can be incorporated into historical study is well done and innovative. It is a much-read essay already but deserves to be better known still. Her essay on Wilbur Cash’s *Mind of the South* is also important as it treats Cash without the deference usually accorded him and subjects his polemic to a devastating critique informed by feminist theory. Painter makes it impossible to see Cash in the way we did before. She insists that we have to see white supremacy as deeply rooted in particular interpretations of sex that sees sexuality as tied up entirely with the exercise of power. Cash reads differently once we take Painter’s powerful criticisms into account.

Other essays, however, are less convincing and less valuable. I cannot see the point in reproducing in another book two lengthy introductions in already-published books, especially when one of the introductions is to a book on a communist agitator in the mid-twentieth South that Painter herself has written. It feels like padding, and the essay on Hosea Hudson, a not particularly important black communist, does not fit very well within the announced themes of this volume. Her essay on three Southern women as interpreted through the lens of Freudian analysis is similarly unconvincing, though for different reasons. Painter looks at interracial sex as depicted in three texts written by women but as one text is a journal (already treated extensively in the previous chapter), another is a novel and the third is a fictionalised autobiography, she ends up comparing apples with oranges, given that she gives little attention to the question of genre in the works under question.

In sum, this book is a bit of a curate’s egg: excellent in parts but with sections that are not well integrated into Painter’s principal themes. I suppose such lack of cohesiveness is part of the nature of such collections but it does detract from the value of what is presented. It is a shame that more thought had not gone into how the various essays would fit together as the organisation of the volume detracts from many of the excellent things that are contained within it.
For a book on “rough music,” this collection of original essays does not strike a false note. As William Pencak observes, these essays reconcile “scholars who describe crowds as unified community responses that deal with moral or political delinquents, and those who think they reflect class tensions between groups competing for legitimacy.” The poor often claimed the streets as theirs for purposes of protest and play, expressing political positions through riots and rituals.

The editors give pride of place to Steven Stewart, whose unfinished dissertation chronicled a variety of skimmingtons, from angry women beating abusive husbands to anti-inoculation riots. These actions were common enough to arouse government concern and even legislation, but little action. As Michael Zuckerman has written, a rural crowd “was most clearly the ultimate expression of a community consensus, for no mob could have existed for more than a moment in those towns without the toleration of the people.” Local authorities observed but rarely responded to skimmingtons, leaving the victim isolated and without recourse but to give in or move on.

In an elegantly written essay, Brendan McConville traces “The Rise of Rough Music.” Though it had English roots, rough music “developed a new character” in North America. Rough music occurred when officials failed to punish those who violated communal norms; “rough-music gangs emulated, and in a sense even supplanted, the courts.” Rough music, which provincial officials saw as a direct challenge to their authority, contained political potential in its alternate vision of justice. That potential was realized when the crowds turned their rough music onto royal officials in the 1760s; rough music became revolution: “As in so many other aspects of eighteenth-century life, European ideas and traditions became subversive in the American environment.”

Each of these essays is rich in detail and evocative with fresh ideas. Thomas Humphrey demonstrates how “rough music” enforced conformity, while William Pencak examines the elements of play in the early stages of the Revolution. Roger Abrahams explores the origins of the Loyal Sons of St. Tammany in Philadelphia, while Susan Klepp draws our attention to the “one issue [that] crystallized” a host of “fears and uncertainties: women’s hairstyles.” William Piersen looks at the role of an African American “festive style” in crafting an autonomous American culture while Matthew Dennis looks at a little-known event, the tercentenary of Columbus’ voyage and his appropriation as a non-English national hero who justified American expansion. Susan Branson and Simon Newman find women stepping into the public sphere to challenge the Federalist effort to construct a new paternalism. Len Travers closes the book with a fascinating study of South Carolina’s Palmetto Day, a patriotic holiday expropriated by Southern nationalists to attack federal authority. In sum, politics touched on every aspect of life; no social ritual was free of its subversive possibilities. Riot and Revelry is a pleasure to read, and demonstrates, if we need reminding, that the study of American history is still full of surprises.

Independent Scholar

MICHAEL A. BELLESILES
According to cultural historian Clifford Putney, the perceived threat posed by social developments including urbanisation, catholic immigration and neurasthenic decline, constituted a crisis for white male protestant identity in the progressive era. Salvation was to be found in muscular Christianity, defined simply as a Christian concern with health and manliness. Putney chronicles how muscular Christianity overcame evangelical protestant resistance to sport; incorporated physical activity in education; acquainted the world with western athleticism through missionary endeavour; and sought to reclaim the church as a masculine arena. Taking an interdisciplinary approach he focuses primarily on key figures in the development of muscular Christianity (e.g. G. Stanley Hall, Theodore Roosevelt), the ideologies it incorporated (the strenuous life) and institutions it inspired (the YMCA, Men and Religion Forward Movement, Boy Scouts). Accordingly Putney’s is primarily an institutional account and does not consider how individuals reconciled religious belief with sporting endeavour.

Particularly interesting is Putney’s account of how muscular Christians interpreted religious iconography and architecture through a gendered lens. His discussion of sentimental hymn lyrics and effeminate representations of Christ engagingly illuminates the factors discouraging male church attendance. Yet Putney misses the opportunity to critically evaluate the gendered implications of the muscular Christian campaign to defeminise Protestantism through the promotion of a more macho messiah. Given his attempt to understand the movement as a reaction against the progressive concerns of the day it is unfortunate that he does not consider it in relation to the progress towards female emancipation made during this era. This is not to say that women are entirely absent, but that Putney’s approach to his subject is segregated along gender lines so that the attention he does give to women – how muscular Christian ideals influenced the development of female organisations such as the YWCA, the camp fire girls and the Girl Scouts – is contained in a separate chapter.

Putney is adept at synthesising a wealth of sources and perspectives but his own voice is lacking from *Muscular Christianity*. Repeatedly raising critical questions only to answer them by juxtaposing opposing first-hand opinions, Putney does little to guide the reader’s interpretation. Too often he defers to other historians as authorities, especially Ann Douglas and T. J. Jackson Lears, and in doing so fails sufficiently to interrogate how their interpretations impact on his evidence and vice versa. As his stated intention is to provide an “overview” rather than a critique, Putney’s expectation that his sources will speak for themselves is understandable. Nevertheless, the book would benefit from a more concerted authorial position, if only to give the reader a better sense of direction.

*University of Nottingham*

ERICA D. ARTHUR
In seven brief chapters, *Canaan Land* provides a concise and accessible summary of the history of African American religion and its significance in the struggle for black freedom since the colonial period. Designed as an undergraduate textbook, it provides a synopsis of existing research on black religion, rather than new scholarly interpretations. Throughout the book, Raboteau maintains that religion sustained African American communities during the centuries of oppression by providing social networks, avenues for political organizing, and a focus for the quest for freedom. He asserts that in the course of the American experience diverse religious traditions, including Christianity, Caribbean religious expressions, and African practices, were forged into a distinctive African American religious identity.

The book offers a chronological overview of the development of black religion. It spells out how eighteenth-century revivalism led to the conversion of slaves in the colonies and, in conjunction with the American revolution, called into question the legitimacy of slavery. It traces the emergence of black churches, takes a closer look at black spirituality, and discusses the process of the “invisible institution” taking on visible form in the postbellum South. Raboteau rejects the argument that Christianity distracted from the causes of oppression. He argues that religion urged slaves to act upon their own consciences and thus provided a sense of their inner freedom. Black churches, he maintains, were also crucial in managing the transition from country to city at the turn of the century. However, as established churches became more impersonal and bureaucratic, they encountered increasing competition from Pentecostalism and the holiness movement. In the final chapters, Raboteau takes a closer look at the link between religion and the Civil Rights movement, maintaining that the black church was more political and black protest more religious than is commonly recognized. He also comments on recent developments, noting that the class divisions within black communities pose significant challenges to black religion.

Raboteau offers a comprehensive introductory text for undergraduates unfamiliar with African American religious traditions. However, the lack of footnotes and the short bibliography limit its usefulness as a tool for encouraging further independent research. Although the book is very readable and offers good illustrations, it tends to lapse into hagiographic descriptions of religious leadership. A less inspirational understanding of religion would have given the text more analytical depth. However, Raboteau is right in pointing out that religion has been neglected in African American scholarship, and his book is a good starting point for setting the record straight.

*University of Keele*  

AXEL R. SCHÄFER

The connection between women’s writing and quilting has previously been the focus of critics’ attention and there is much that is familiar in Suzanne Shepard’s study. Elaine Showalter, amongst others, has drawn parallels between the two creative processes, identifying the patchwork quilt, alongside images of the hearth, home and kitchen, as a recurrent motif in domestic fictions, recognising the pieced together whole of the quilt as a structuring principal of the texts themselves. What is particular to Shepard’s work is her undertaking of what she terms “a systematic study” of patchwork-quilt fiction inspired by the notion of quilting as a particularly female metaphor for the building of community, counterpointed with the concept of “brotherhood” established in Winthrop’s “city upon a hill.” Seeking not merely to identify and document this trope in a range of women’s novels and short stories, she also traces the development in its use, the changing nature in which domestic metaphors in general are employed by women writers throughout the nineteenth century.

In the home-centred works of early domestic-fiction writers, Susan Warner, Sarah J. Hale and Maria Cummins, Shepard identifies the recurrent use of a log-cabin quilt template in which all pieces emanate from a central square, representative of the home. These writings, she claims, posit family values as the basis for national ones, and subtly expand the parameters of home and the reach of maternal influence into the wider community. Her discussion of mid-century texts focuses particularly on Harriet Beecher Stowe’s more radical adaptation of the patchwork-quilt model for social activism, her politicising of the home, and her abolitionist expansion of the quilt vision to broaden the concept of community. By the end of the nineteenth century, in the writings of Mary Wilkins Freeman, Sarah Orne Jewett and Susan Glaspell, where kitchens are places of isolation and quilts poorly stitched, Shepard reads a critique of the inclusive patchwork model and the failure of any sense of community other than one of women suffering in a male society.

Shepard’s study is accessible, and cogently argued, yet domestic fiction in the nineteenth century remains the preserve of white, middle-class women of the Northeastern states of America. Considering its theme, therefore, it is unfortunate that the scope of the study excludes a multitude of voices, denying itself the status of a truly inclusive patchwork. In an epilogue to the text, however, Shepard acknowledges this limitation, placing later writers such as Alice Walker firmly within the patchwork-quilt tradition of writing and gesturing towards what would be a useful sequel to build on this scholarship and continue the project.

*Manchester Metropolitan University*  

ELIZABETH NOLAN
The focus in *Bachelors, Manhood, and the Novel* is on “bachelor-narrated fiction” and the “paradoxes of the bachelor’s relationship to normative domesticity and normative manhood.” Snyder has plenty of energy for huge, often rather mechanical and reductive, categories, and this corresponds with a proclivity for interweaving long and disparate narrative threads. The “permeable and shifting” boundaries of “domesticity and hegemonic manhood,” she believes, are homologous to those separating “high culture from culture defined as low.” The ultimate destination of this argument is a concluding chapter on *Lord Jim*, *The Good Soldier*, and *The Great Gatsby* where it is suggested that the “disavowed” sentimentality of modernist writers and their New Critical canonizers is as rhetorically ambivalent as, say, Nick Carroway’s “fissured” narrative stance on Jay Gatsby. There, “Gatsby’s mass-cultural telling sounds the call and Nick’s high-cultural gloss provides the response,” “the milk of wonder” failing to flow in both the “maternalized domestic” and “spermatic” economies.

Snyder inspects the narrators, and the “significant others whose stories they tell,” of texts as diverse and far-flung as *Wuthering Heights*, *The Blithedale Romance*, *The Portrait of a Lady*, *The Aspern Papers*, *Under Western Eyes*, and “The Lesson of the Master” and “The Figure in the Carpet,” conceding that her study is predicated on “similarities” between “texts written on different continents and sometimes separated by more than half a century.” There is a respect for specificity; but the problem is that it more than occasionally results in an avaricious clutching at too wide a range of texts and issues; as in the use, for example, of a 1908 *Putnam’s Magazine* article on “The Necessary Melancholy of Bachelors.” Joseph Conrad’s context is very different from that of Henry James’ and his legacy of the (American) feminized space of novel authorship, and Snyder’s principles of selection are flaccid in the extreme. The resort to “similarities” comes close to implying that “bachelorhood” is a transcultural realm that can span decades and that can be defined, incidentally, in total isolation from “spinsterhood.”

Notwithstanding these structural and conceptual weaknesses, there are seminal ideas here, and corresponding critical procedures, at the torrid crossroads of narrative, gender, and the homoerotic. Snyder’s sense of the bachelor as a “liminal” figure occupying a contested site in relation to males and domesticity has a productive corollary in the identification of “bachelor–narrators” who in “both the novel’s story and their discourse constitute alternatives to hegemonic masterplots and hegemonic manhood.” In *The Blithedale Romance* and *The Portrait of a Lady*, invalid bachelors “witness the multiple, overlapping erotic triangles and marriage plots that animate” the novels. The argument has difficulty, however, in avoiding what seem at the same time to be modish yet congested discursive paths: “disavowal” is much overworked; the analysis of Ralph Touchett’s consumption (“emblematizing” the “pathologized culture of consumption”) strains at the leash; and a relentless mode of abstraction results in the odd monstrosity (the “marriage plot” of *The Aspern Papers*, “sets in motion,” we are asked to swallow, “a juggernaut that eventually rolls over the narrator’s comparatively insubstantial strategizing”). More egregiously,
Snyder’s discussion of modernism in relation to the vicissitudes of “high” and “low” culture, Henry James, and the perennial issue of “popularity,” is much weakened by her failure to take into account Richard Salmon’s *Henry James and the Culture of Publicity* (1997), the magisterial argument of Thomas Strychacz’s *Modernism, Mass Culture, and Imperialism* (1993), and (from much earlier) William Veeder’s *Henry James, The Lesson of the Master* (1975).

“Homoeroticism,” especially in its articulations with the “homosocial,” comes more or less undigested from the mantras of Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, and operates in a largely unexamined, catch-all fashion. Here and there, though, readers might feel chastened by the realization that “the danger of male–male intimacy, of course, resides in its association with homoerotic desire,” and by an earlier announcement that “two men sharing secrets in bed” is a “homoerotic primal scene.”

University of the West of England, Bristol

The transatlantic dimension of reform thought and action in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries has been illuminated in recent years by such major works as James T. Kloppenberg’s *Uncertain Victory* (1986) and Daniel T. Rodgers’s *Atlantic Crossings* (1998). In this more narrowly focussed study, Marc Stears combines the approaches of both those scholars in that, like Kloppenberg, he is interested in the relationship of philosophical ideas to political debate and, like Rodgers, he is interested in the effects of national differences in political structure and culture upon both the character and the fate of reform proposals. Stears has identified a transatlantic “debate” that he sees taking place between two particular groups of reform intellectuals in the aftermath of World War I. On the American side the protagonists are the “nationalist progressives” of the *New Republic*, principally Herbert Croly, Walter Lippmann and Walter Weyl; on the British, the “socialist pluralists” G. D. H. Cole, Harold Laski and R. H. Tawney. On the face of it, the two groups were poles apart, with the Americans seeking to enhance state power and the British to dismantle it, but, as Stears shows, they shared many values as well as basic objectives such as “industrial democracy” and the alleviation of poverty and, after the experience of wartime repression made most liberal intellectuals warier of state power, the *New Republic* became interested in the Britons’ Guild Socialism. However, the subsequent closer engagement revealed continuing disagreements which, Stears argues, were rooted in philosophical disagreements, with the British placing a higher value on individual autonomy and self-development than their American friends and critics. He sees the latter as cleaving to an “idealist conception of freedom”, although they themselves more commonly invoked the social ideal of democracy. In the unpromising political climate of the early 1920s, both groups sought in workers’ education a way of promoting social advance. In a particularly interesting chapter, Stears explains how their approaches to this enterprise reflected their distinctive
philosophies, and points out that the ideas of each had to yield to the realities of their respective societies as, ironically, the British WEA became dependent on taxpayer support and the American WEB on labour union money. The story thus illustrates central themes of this acute and original monograph.

St Catharine’s College, Cambridge

JOHN A. THOMPSON

Journal of American Studies, 37 (2003), 2. DOI: 10.1017/S0021875803657129


Perhaps the most exciting thing about the collected essays in John N. Swift and Joseph P. Urgo’s Willa Cather and the American Southwest is the underlying wealth of secondary information on ethnostudies. From a compelling essay on the removal of Native American artefacts to Germany in the late 1800s and early 1900s and the cultural implications, to the examination of the Mark Twain/Willa Cather friendship, one senses a “tip of the iceberg” effect in almost each essay. Throughout the compilation Cather’s conflict with the absence of culture she finds in some of America and the presence of it that she finds in the ancient ruins of the Southwest, continually brush against each other. She is never easily reconciled to the newness of her country and these essays do a fine job of refreshing that clash. The editors, Swift and Urgo, concede that the Southwest was problematic for Cather, lacking the source of high culture with which she liked to infuse her work; but through her visits as a tourist, Cather was able to attribute the qualities of high European culture to Native American and Mexican relics. Her visit to Mesa Verde (1915) marked a significant change in her interpretation of the archaeological remains. Her subsequent writing endowed the area with all the qualities of an ancient classical civilisation and these values were hereditarily transferred to the Native Americans she wrote about.

This collection is the result of a symposium of about 100 that took place at Mesa Verde in October 1999. The group aimed to reinterpret Cather’s relationship with the Southwest through tourism. The essays are divided into three sections: “On Mesa Verde,” “The Professor’s House” and “Death Comes to the Archbishop.” The first three essays highlight her conflict with European culture. They document her transference of relics, mummies and archaeology to a higher form of art, linked in the European tradition that supersedes that of America. Examples in her fiction highlight the inherent right that Cather appropriates to people through history. This theme is loosely continued in the second section, “The Professor’s House.” John J. Murphy in his paper “Holy Cities, Poor Savages, and the Science Culture: Positioning The Professor’s House” addresses the connections Cather makes between the ancient civilisation at Mesa Verde and Christian-Judeo spirituality, and Cather’s deliberate exclusion of American nationality in the model.

The third section, “Death Comes for the Archbishop,” helps to illustrate how Cather’s understanding of individuals moved away from racial interpretations allowing her a broader comment on mankind. Both Manuel Broncano and Joseph
Urgo examine *Death Comes for the Archbishop* along with the seemingly unconnected authors Rudolfo Anaya and William Faulkner respectively. Broncano aligns Cather with Anaya in the realm of magical realism, seeing the landscape of the Southwest as a catalyst for novelists to move beyond plot and form to a closer connection with spiritualism. Urgo examines William Faulkner’s Isaac McCaslin from “Go Down Moses” against the character of Cather’s Jean Latour, the Archbishop, and finds a link in that both characters do not comprehend difference. In Urgo’s model this leads to indifference, and from such indifference springs a greater tolerance of diverse cultures – furthering the way to a more multiracial, multicultural society.

The collection succeeds admirably in both the essays it delivers and the stimuli it provides for further examinations into both Cather as tourist and traveller and the geography that Cather’s writer-self moves through. The essays contained here help both to further discussion and caution scholars in attempting to imply too much upon a text. Although they finish with a last word from David Hassell, who wrote *From Mesa Verde to The Professor’s House* (1992) one senses that on Willa Cather and the American Southwest there will be more to come.

*University of Glasgow*

DEBORAH APPLETON

*Journal of American Studies, 37* (2003), 2. DOI: 10.1017/S0021875803667125


It is a remarkable testimony to the enduring strength of the Southern Lost Cause that Georgia Lee Tatum had to provide a $500 subsidy to the University of North Carolina Press when this book was first published in 1934. Not even an academic press was prepared to take a chance on such a controversial subject as disloyalty to the Confederacy in an era when *Gone With the Wind* effectively captured the collective white Southern memory of the Civil War. Fortunately, Tatum was determined enough to ignore the obstacles, and enjoyed the support of the influential Frank Owsley, who initially directed this work as a PhD dissertation at Vanderbilt University, to complete the first major study of its kind. Whilst well received by most academics, popular responses were rather less complimentary, which perhaps explains why this was Tatum’s only book, despite teaching at Mississippi Delta State Teachers College for thirty years.

*Disloyalty in the Confederacy* effectively identifies and describes the various elements of internal Southern dissent during the war years, although whether it merits a reissued edition is debateable. It very usefully establishes three primary categories of analysis: unionists, who opposed secession from the beginning and often worked alongside the Union Army; the disloyal, whose opposition grew in response to increased hardships, in some places to such an extent that renegade groups were established; and finally the disaffected, who did not support the Confederacy, but who, on the whole, remained within its framework. Virtually exclusively based upon the Official Records of the Confederate Army, this book provides a basic survey particularly suitable for introductory reading. It also contains a valuable opening essay by David Williams, author of *Rich Man’s War: Class, Caste, and Confederate Defeat*
in the Lower Chattahoochee Valley (Athens, 1998), summarising recent developments in the field. On the whole, however, Tatum’s narrative style rarely draws out broader themes and wider arguments and one is left wondering precisely how many Southerners were disloyal, what motivated their actions, and how they contributed to the South’s defeat.

DAVID BROWN

University College Northampton

Journal of American Studies, 37 (2003), 2. DOI: 10.1017/S0021875803677121


Anecdotal evidence long has suggested that the idea of the American “South” holds special fascination for Europeans gazing westward. In her latest book, Helen Taylor does us the service of submitting this phenomenon to sustained attention, thereby contributing to current efforts to expand the field of Southern studies beyond its often provincial purview. Focusing on the particular case of contemporary Britain, Taylor documents eager popular consumption of images of the South over the past twenty-five years in media ranging from literature to television, theater to film, journalism to advertising. Among the more captivating observations in Circling Dixie are Taylor’s account of the British hands in creating sequels to Gone with the Wind; of the marketing of New Orleans as commodity to British consumers; and of the revival of Tennessee Williams’s non-canonical plays on British stages.

In her introduction and epilogue, Taylor hints at the analytic insights to be gleaned from transatlantic views of the South. As both quintessentially American and not American at all, the South has allowed Europeans a post-nationalist, culturally hybrid idea of America in this era when the US has been identified primarily with hegemonic cultural imperialism. While the US “is associated in world consciousness with the present and the future,” the South “has a deep sense of … the burden and authority of the past” more familiar to Europeans. Further, the swift modernization of the southern US in the latter half of the twentieth century has rendered the South “a symbolically resonant site onto which many of the nation’s, and indeed the world’s, most pessimistic and hopeful fantasies [are] projected.” Intimated but not directly stated is the probability that the South as a site of racial oppression, struggle, and integration has become a pertinent model for postimperial Britain’s increasing ethnic diversity.

Although American cultural industries are not located in the southern US, Taylor attributes the images she studies to “Southern cultural industries,” – for instance, identifying Hollywood films such as Gone with the Wind, Mississippi Burning, and Forrest Gump as indigenous Southern products. This occlusion is the weakest point of Circling Dixie, for intranational issues of geography, power, and representation bear significance for Taylor’s transatlantic aims. Southern artists have always consciously performed “Southernness” to and for the specifications of metropolitan audiences; in a sense, Circling Dixie adds London to the roster of New York and Hollywood as another cultural capital captivated by exotic Southern otherness. Even as Taylor’s
attention to the South complicates an essentialist definition of “U.S. culture,” it threatens to replace that definition with an equally essentialist notion of “Southern culture.” Combining an intranational materialist analysis with the transatlantic view Taylor advocates would increase its already demonstrable value.

Columbia University (New York)  
JENNIFER RAE GREESON

Journal of American Studies, 37 (2003), 2. DOI: 10.1017/S0021875803687128


Today 80 per cent of professional basketball players are African Americans and the sport is often seen as a “black” game, dominated by the Michael Jordans, “Magic” Johnsons and Shaquille O’Neals. This was not always so. Although some regional teams had included African American players, and during the war the Chicago Studebaker team in the National Basketball League was two-thirds black, in line with other sports, professional basketball was segregated until 1950. Jackie Robinson’s role in breaking the racial barriers in baseball in 1947 is well known. Here sports-writer Ron Thomas provides an account of the experiences of men such as Earl Lloyd, Charles Cooper, Nat “Sweetwater” Clifton and Hank DeZonie who were the first African Americans to play in mixed teams in the newly created National Basketball Association. The NBA’s decision (by a six to five vote) to allow the inclusion of African Americans was driven by both the changing racial climate and economic necessity – audiences at all-white basketball games were falling in Northern cities with large black populations while the famous Harlem Globetrotters could attract record crowds.

The black players had mixed experiences both on and off the court. White teammates were generally friendly and welcoming. Some of the Boston Celtics team specifically asked to room with Cooper. However, the generally passive Clifton famously knocked out an opponent who used a racial epithet; he also played conservatively because he was aware of his position as a race pioneer. On the road, the players encountered segregation that often required they roomed apart from the rest of the team, or ate alone in their rooms. Don Barksdale, the first black NBA all-Star and first African American to play for the US Olympic team, received death threats when he played in Lexington, Kentucky, in 1948. Hank DeZonie quit after only five games because of the segregation. The first black NBA players were chosen both for their skills and for their deportment off the court and it was only gradually in the late 1950s that more “showy” superstars began to emerge. After dealing with the early developments, Thomas provides brief biographies of players from Maurice Stokes through to Wilt Chamberlain and Oscar Robertson in the 1960s. Another chapter covers the rise of black coaches. The book is illustrated and has a great deal of the statistical information loved by American sports fans.

University of Glamorgan  
NEIL A. WYNN

There can be few places and times that have been subject to such an intense historical gaze as the Puritan communities of seventeenth-century New England. Kenneth Lockridge’s socio-historical exploration of colonial Dedham in *A New England Town* (1970) initiated a generation of studies where Lockridge’s forceful conception of the Puritan village as a closed, corporate, Christian, utopian community has been taken as a yardstick against which other villages would be compared. Of rival studies, perhaps the most influential challenge came from Stephen Innes. His 1983 work, *Labour in the New Land*, presented seventeenth-century Springfield as a community riven by economic instability, wage dependency and social division with the Pynchon family playing the part of overloading squires.

As the title of Roger Thompson’s new study suggests, he finds the inhabitants of seventeenth-century Watertown demonstrated unity and cohesion when confronted with outsiders, be they Native Americans, the wandering poor and unfortunate to be warned out, or the colony’s General Court. Within this façade of unity, however, lay a community typified by conflicts, jealousies and resentments illustrated most telling in a series of nine case studies drawn from court records.

Situated midway between Dedham and Springfield in an historiographic typology of seventeenth-century New England, *Divided We Stand* explores themes familiar within the literature: continuity and change in early settlement, distributions of land and political authority, religious cohesion, economic development, community obligations and exclusion of outsiders, family ties and intergenerational conflicts as resources diminished. Within this approach, there is a tight focus throughout on the town’s outstanding records and a thorough use of related literature, particularly in exploring the predominantly East Anglican, English world the emigrants left and the Native American communities they displaced.

Thompson has added to the literature of seventeenth-century New England, producing an evocative, engaging work that creates a deepened understanding of individual experiences of transatlantic migration and settlement. It is frustrating, however, that the available literature on many comparable New England towns is given only slight attention. At the start of this work, Thompson sets out his aim of writing the first modern study of Watertown, building on earlier genealogical, documentary, memorial and sociological studies. The sociological approach is hidden, unfortunately, within the work. Quantified evidence on landholding, length of service in town offices, relations between age and wealth and other issues where the typicality of Watertown might be addressed are lost within partial footnotes or left altogether unaddressed. Our understanding of the time and place remains fractured and incomplete.

Anthony Mann

University of Keele