Weighing in at over 450 pages and containing essays by some of the most famous names in nineteenth-century American literary studies – scholars such as Lawrence Buell, Nina Baym, William Andrews, and Jean Fagan Yellin – *In Search of Hannah Crafts* is, by any accounting, a substantial work. The title is apt, for its twenty three essays and four republished reviews chart efforts to place *The Bondwoman’s Narrative* by Hannah Crafts a Fugitive Slave Recently Escaped from North Carolina and its author artistically and historically. Like *The Bondwoman’s Narrative* itself, this collection is edited by Henry Louis Gates, Jr. It was Gates who purchased the manuscript of this nineteenth-century novel, had it authenticated and dated, searched the historical record for evidence of the identity of Hannah Crafts, analysed the textual evidence that would suggest the gender, race, and class of the author, and finally published the novel, as he explained in an informative and entertaining introduction, “to restore Hannah Crafts to her rightful place as the author of the first novel written by a female fugitive slave” (lxxii). Gates proclaimed the work a literary landmark in another respect as well: “to be able to study a manuscript written by a black woman or man, unedited, unafected, unglossed, unaided by even the most well-intentioned or unobtrusive editorial hand, would help a new generation of scholars to gain access to the mind of a slave in an unmediated fashion heretofore not possible” (xxxiii).

If the manuscript of Hannah Crafts’s novel was unmediated, it is unmediated no longer, for Gates has framed Crafts’s *Narrative* using many of the techniques employed by nineteenth-century editors of slave narratives (a whole battery of witnesses paraded before the reader to prove the authenticity of the text and author, portraits, illustrations, testimonials, etc.) and for much the same reason. Where abolitionist editors sought a full hearing for the fugitive slave within the public debate over slavery, Gates seeks a hearing for Crafts within the scholarly dialogues that help to write literary history. *In Search of Hannah Crafts* must be viewed as part of this agenda. “These scholars take it as a more or less settled matter that the author was a woman of African descent who wrote this text after attaining freedom in the North,” Gates and his co-editor, Hollis Robbins, state in their introduction. “Just as importantly, all of these scholars accept Hannah Crafts’s narrative as a serious and important piece of writing that has dramatically changed how we view the ante-bellum literary landscape” (xi). This is canon formation on fast forward, and I find deeply worrying the frequency with which hypotheses and unsubstantiated
observations are transformed into certainties or established facts within many of the essays.

Nonetheless, taken as a whole, the collection does help to identify Hannah Crafts’s debts to a host of literary sources, including mid-nineteenth-century texts such as Brontë’s Jane Eyre, Dicken’s Bleak House, Stowe’s Uncle Tom’s Cabin, Hawthorne’s The Scarlet Letter, William Wells Brown’s The Escape, or, A Leap for Freedom, and Douglass’s Narrative of the Life of an American Slave, and to explore the creative use that Crafts made of such borrowings. The generic blending that occurs within The Bondwoman’s Narrative is also discussed convincingly and at length, particularly with regard to elements from the slave narrative, the sentimental/domestic novel, the gothic, historical fiction, fairy tale and the genealogical novel. Interestingly, while there is general agreement that Crafts’s use of multiple generic conventions plays an important role in the textual dynamics of the novel, there is no systematic exploration of the interaction and intersection of these diverse generic borrowings or of the tensions that result.

Also in the collection are useful essays that place the novel in relation to the historical record. Thomas C. Parramore provides detailed information on the life and view of John Hill Wheeler, information that casts doubts on the alleged factual accuracy of details within Crafts’s novel. While the literary merit of the novel is unaffected by any inaccuracies found, the affirmations of factual accuracy within this volume of essays are themselves more problematic; such assertions provide examples of the way unsubstantiated claims about the The Bondwoman’s Narrative are made and echoed, taking on a spurious authority in the process. Katherine E. Flynn presents the fascinating results of her genealogical researches into Jane Johnson’s life in Boston, though I am not convinced by her intriguing suggestion that crafts might be Johnson. Bryan Sinche’s essay neatly positions The Bondwoman’s Narrative in relation to sentimental and humanistic appeals to the spirit rather than the letter of the law, made by anti-slavery advocates, in opposition to the more legalistic positions often taken by pro-slavery advocates in nineteenth-century debates over slavery.

This volume also contains some insightful and impressive essays that interpret Crafts’s text from a range of theoretical perspectives and in relation to some surprising contexts. Catherine Keyser’s “Jane Eyre, Bondwoman: Hannah Crafts’s [sic] Rethinking of Charlotte Brontë” notes similarities between the plots, stylistic devices, thematic concerns and generic blends in Jane Eyre and The Bondwoman’s Narrative. Keyser uses postcolonial literary theory to demonstrate the way that Crafts offers a rereading and reworking of Brontë’s novel that responds to its racial themes, but from the point of view of the black subject, the “racial other.” In “‘I Dwell Now in a Near Little Cottage’: Architecture, Race, and Desire in The Bondwoman’s Narrative,” William Gleason suggests ways in which the nineteenth-century vision of the ideal home, promoted in the pervasively popular works of American landscape architect Andrew Jackson Downing, and the philosophy behind this ideal, permeate Crafts’s novel. Christopher Castiglia provides a psycho-analytical reading of the text, arguing that the absence of the heroine’s mother compels the central character to look for a reflection of her parent – and herself – through a succession of potential maternal figures, all of whom “abandon” her in one way or another and towards whom, as a result, she harbours both desire and rage. It is only after the protagonist has been reunited with her biological mother that she is able to move beyond an
extended and socially conceived “mirror” stage of development towards wholeness, Castiglia argues, freeing her to embrace marriage. Because Crafts’s heroine is of mixed race, her search, both for mother and for self, necessarily has a racial dimension that involves placing herself in relation to women who are nominally or by skin tone both “black” and “white.” Robert S. Levine’s “Trappe(d): Race and Genealogical Haunting in The Bondwoman’s Narrative” also notes the need to acknowledge the interracial dynamics of identity in the novel. He places Crafts’s novel within the tradition of the American romance and the genealogical novel, with particular reference to Hawthorne, suggesting – quite rightly, I think – that the novel is as much about race as it is about slavery, and that the complex dynamics of American racial identities and genealogies can haunt those who identify themselves as “black” as well as those who align themselves with “whiteness.”

With luck, this volume will not only fuel a wider debate over the significance of Hannah Crafts’s novel, but will also encourage discussion of the equally important matter of the reception of that novel in the twenty-first century. It is important that these discussions are not foreclosed, and that the echoing of established “facts” is not allowed to go unchallenged (see Parramore’s refutation, 364–67, especially). Admittedly, it would be deeply perverse to deny the nineteenth-century provenance of the manuscript Gates published; the material and textual evidence for such dating appears to be overwhelming. The evidence for female authorship also appears conclusive. Otherwise, the authorship of the manuscript remains as open question. The evidence that the manuscript was written after the public furor over the escape of Jane Johnson in 1855 is convincing, but the arguments for a pre-1861 date are less definitive, particularly given the generic and thematic links that the text shares with Harriet Jacob’s Incidents in the Life of a Slave Girl and the link made in the novel between slavery and the dynamics of racial prejudice. Admittedly this is a theme that echoed through the antebellum debates over slavery and its impact on the free black population of the North, but it was also an issue that remained within the national arena during the Civil War and Reconstruction, and it was an issue that did not necessarily require direct reference to the Civil War. Similarly, much is made of the fact that the manuscript was never published, though this presumably means that it was never published in book form. We may yet find that Crafts’s novel was serialized in one of the many obscure nineteenth-century periodicals. The supposition that the book was by an escaped slave is also questionable; indeed, there are a number of scholars – Nina Baym and William Andrews to name but two – who call this conclusion into question. The supposition that the book was written by an African American also remains as open question, though there is more evidence for this. Nonetheless, the preponderance of very light-skinned characters with whom readers are encouraged to identify or to whom they are asked to extend sympathetic regard would, in another text, elicit more suspicion.

This does not mean that Gate’s claims are false, or that his claims are likely to be false, but there are important points at issue. No equivalent pressure for immediate recognition was exerted when Gates did scholars an inestimable service in bringing a host of obscure African American texts to a wider public as general editor of The Schomburg Library of Nineteenth-Century Black Women Writers. When he documented conclusively the historical identity of Harriet E. Wilson, author of Our Nig (1859), the text was allowed to find its own way into the scholarly debate. There
is no doubt that Gate’s publishing career has been instrumental in furthering our understanding of and theorizing about nineteenth-century American literature. His work has helped to promote a wider search for and re-evaluation of a host of texts that have transformed our understanding of African American contributions to the development of American literature, culture and intellectual history. As a result we have renewed interest in the writings of Frank J. Webb, Martin R. Delany, William Wells Brown, David Walker, Maria M. Stewart and Hosea Easton to name but a few. Given this, one might ask why so much editorial effort, intellectual capital and public relations machinery is being expended on securing Hannah Crafts an immediate place in the pantheon of literary firsts.

Related to this, of course, is the question of why it matters so very much that Hannah Crafts is “properly” identified as an African American and a slave. This question does not go unasked within the volume itself. Commenting on the central villain of Crafts’s novel in “Gothic Liberties and Fugitive Novels: The Bondwoman’s Narrative and the Fiction of Race,” Karen Sanchez-Eppler notes, “Trappe’s villainy makes evident the reductive and destructive implications of the role of race detective and raises questions about the stakes of interest and desire within Gates’s or my own eagerness to determine the race of Hannah Crafts” (267). Exactly. The question is raised again by Robert Levine in his insightful essay:

What are the differences, then, between reading the novel as the first novel written by a formerly enslaved African American woman (which it likely is) and reading it as a novel by, say, a white abolitionist woman with extensive knowledge of the life histories of formerly enslaved African American woman [sic]? The differences would seem to be profound. But are they? For one of the truly brilliant aspects of The Bondwoman’s Narrative – brilliant insofar as Crafts seems to have anticipated the dilemma of racial identity politics with such prescience – is the way that it can trap its bookish, Trappe-like readers who insist on working with essentialized racial categories in order to establish “authentic” identities. (293)

Precisely.

In Search of Hannah Crafts should be read for the good essays it contains. But it should also be assigned and examined, along with Gates’s text of The Bondwoman’s Narrative, as a case study in the literary politics of canon formation. In this respect alone, it is an important book.

Rothermere American Institute, University of Oxford

CYNTHIA S. HAMILTON


One one level this concise book is an authoritative introduction to Edith Wharton’s career. On another – and perhaps more significant – level this book is a concise reassessment of the full range of Wharton’s literary contributions. In less than a hundred pages, Janet Beer provides an overview of Wharton’s travel writing, her
major novels, and her short fiction as well as contemporary developments in Wharton scholarship.

In her introduction, Beer reveals how recent insights into Wharton’s travel writing, autobiographical writing, and once less-acclaimed novels have both complicated and enriched psychoanalytic and feminist interpretations of Wharton’s career. Although Beer treats these facets of Wharton’s writings in separate chapters, she adds to our understanding of Wharton’s contribution by consistently linking thematic and aesthetic concerns across genres and through periods of Wharton’s career.

Chapter 1 suggests Wharton’s travel writing is a key to understanding her distinguished career. Beer believes that Wharton’s life and work can be understood through her two great passions: a profound aesthetic sense nurtured by frequent travel, and the outsider’s ability to comprehend – in Wharton’s case, brilliantly – “something of the substance that humanizes a landscape, something of the interconnectedness of people and a place that gives meaning to the individual and the collective life of a culture” (7).

Wharton’s works of nonfiction range from travel accounts such as A Motor-Flight Through France (1908) to the autobiographical A Backward Glance (1934), so making generalizations about this body of work is difficult. Beer, however, identifies in Wharton’s nonfiction an impulse to explain aesthetic effect – whether it is located in culture, in landscape, or in an artist’s work. This impulse is not limited to Wharton’s nonfiction but radiates from it through her fiction. Wharton is best understood, Beer suggests, as a writer whose aesthetic was formulated by desires to integrate into, and interpenetrate with, the world she sought to understand.

Three chapters in Edith Wharton focus on her fictional settings. Beer believes that Wharton’s fiction warily patrols borderlines between cultures and ages. Beer’s treatments of lesser-known books such as The Valley of Decision and The Reef in these chapters are particularly valuable. They will help many people approach these intriguing and often unexamined texts and lead to fuller understandings of Wharton’s flagship novels.

Beer’s chapter on Wharton’s short fiction focusses how she employed it as a form to work out problems with genre, style, setting, and themes. Beer observes that novellas such as Ethan Fromme (1911) and Summer (1917) explore how landscape influences the lives of its inhabitants. Short fiction provided her with a medium in which to explore the intersections between form and content. Short ghost stories yielded to Wharton a common medium between herself and her readers.

Edith Wharton concludes with a brief chapter about Wharton’s library, restored recently by George Ramsden. Beer believes Wharton’s response to these books provides evidence of how her everyday existence and literary career intersected. Beer’s discussion of Wharton’s response to Leaves of Grass is illuminating. Rather than forgetting the lives of real people, Wharton, like Whitman, passionately sought to render the inherent through the particular.

Janet Beer’s Edith Wharton may be the best short introductory treatment of Wharton’s life and work. Written with impressive clarity and never bogged down with biographical detail or jargon, Edith Wharton should be in every university’s collection and on every scholar’s bookshelf.

Beloit College

SHAWN GILLEN
In continuing the trend of literature-minded academics offering collections of Ambrose Bierce’s *Tales of Soldiers and Civilians*, Donald T. Blume has merely added another reconstituted volume to the already strained shelf of the Bierce scholar. The continued interest in Bierce is certainly not unwelcome. However, Blume’s offering fails to challenge any conventions. His introduction to the collection is common fare and offers little to distinguish itself from its antecedents, and any serious Bierce researcher will possess the tales collected between these covers elsewhere. Nevertheless, this edition does offer some minor benefits to those willing to persevere. The textual emendations Blume proposes apropos of the various published versions of the tales, and the depth of knowledge that he brings to the footnoted material present interesting – if perhaps overly academic – nourishment for readers.

The benefits of these considerations wither in the shade when compared to the companion volume Blume has produced. *Ambrose Bierce’s Civilians and Soldiers in Context: A Critical Study* places Bierce’s *Tales of Soldiers and Civilians* atop the surgeon’s table and surrenders them to the violence of the autopsy. Within *Bierce’s Civilians and Soldiers in Context* Blume submits each of the original nineteen texts to close readings and extensive contextualization. This is a worthy enterprise. Not since Cathy N. Davidson’s *Experimental Fictions of Ambrose Bierce* (1984) has there been any real attempt to analyse Bierce’s writings textually. By examining the differences between the original newspaper editions of the *Tales* and the originally collected versions, Blume has performed a valuable service. Indeed, his study goes some way in laying to rest the obstacle first noted by Mary E. Grenander in her *Ambrose Bierce* (1971) concerning the difference between the various editions of Bierce’s tales. Furthermore, Blume’s heavy referencing of sections of Bierce’s journalistic material not readily available merits praise. This is not only a practice that Bierce scholars should be thankful for due to its biographical implications, it should also be welcomed as an additional means of proliferating Bierce’s acid consideration. Moreover, as an exercise designed not simply to offend Derridan sensibilities, Blume’s contextualizations provide the means to examine Bierce’s *Tales* as a single combined work built for the reader’s edification. This is problematic. Although Bierce was no minor pedagogue, the suggestion that the *Tales* operated across a number of years as a unified construct to educate Bierce’s reading public risks marginalizing the thematic contents of the tales and slides perilously close to hagiography. Furthermore, Blume’s heavy contextualization occasionally has the effect of atomizing Bierce’s texts, often producing a number of tautologies that result in a sometimes arduous read. For all that we must praise, Blume has unfortunately managed to suck all the vitality and energy from Bierce’s *Tales*, reducing them to grim lifeless curios atop the surgeon’s table.
Donald Blume’s study is an intriguing piece of detective work applied to a “critically neglected literary masterpiece” (360), Ambrose Bierce’s collection of nineteen stories published under the title Tales of Soldiers and Civilians. Some of these stories, such as the Civil War tale “An Occurrence at Owl Creek Bridge,” are frequently anthologized, introducing students to such of Bierce’s preoccupations as the transition from life to death and the ironies of heroism and cowardice. Blume’s approach is to situate these stories in the context of Bierce’s development as a literary man, which means not only his newspaper journalism but also his editorial work. The relevant stories were first collected in 1892 and subsequently revised under different titles in 1898 and 1909; however, the majority of them first appeared as newspaper stories in a variety of San Francisco-based publications with which Bierce was connected as both columnist and editor: the News Letter and California Advertiser, the Argonaut, the Wasp and William Randolph Hearst’s Examiner. Blume’s stated aim is “to reconnect the stories _with their original host publications and related materials_” (xiv), thus illuminating not only the stories themselves but also the expectations of their original readers and Bierce’s own assumptions of how his stories should be presented to later readers of the collections. Blume succeeds admirably through a painstaking process of comparison and cross-reference, relying in part upon on fortunately available source, the “typesetting paste-up copytext bearing Bierce’s inked-in corrections and emendations” for the 1892 collection (xxii). By connecting the later collections with Bierce’s notations, along with the original newspaper publications and associated writings such as Bierce’s “Prattle” and “Town Crier” columns, Blume establishes the contexts of the stories’ composition and revision, often resulting in alternative interpretations to those commonly argued in Bierce criticism.

Many of Blume’s discoveries are startling, revealing what are often inadvertent damages ultimately inflicted by Bierce upon his earlier tales in the process of revision and collection. Blume notes, for instance, Bierce’s frequent destruction of the “parted-clues” for which he is critically celebrated — “whereby a clue is divided into two or more parts that are then carefully distributed in the text” — with Bierce unaware, apparently, “of how his localized later revisions affected the artfully achieved integrity of specific tales” (27). Moreover, Blume’s careful investigations
enable him to identify critical misreadings by other Bierce scholars. In one instance, Blume discovers, Carey McWilliam’s 1929 biography of Bierce only partially reproduced original material from the “Prattle” column in his discussion of the story “A Son of the Gods,” which led Mary Grenander to assume in her 1971 Twayne’s study that the story is based on Bierce’s own combat experience at Shiloh – not, as Blume concludes, upon a topic of editorial discussion in the Wasp. Overall, Blume’s study is consistently detailed, if reliant upon minutiae that can at times overpower all but the most committed students and lovers of Bierce’s writing.

University of Central Lancashire

Will Kaufman

Journal of American Studies, 39 (2005), 2. doi:10.1017/S0021875805250211


Scott Brown’s “untold story” of the activist–scholar Maulana Ron Karenga and his cultural nationalist organization called US is both sympathetic and judicious. Yet his deliberate even-handedness is not always convincing: did the US doctrine of polygamy and gender stratification actually aid “latter-day quests for full gender equality”? Can the elaborate internal structure of US really vindicate Karenga’s autocratic and violent leadership style? Can we absolve US of responsibility for the spiral of sectarian violence that derailed the Black Power movement in the early 1970s?

Brown begins by connecting Karenga’s cultural nationalist discourse to numerous intellectual traditions. We learn that Karenga remains indebted to Jomo Kenyatta and Julius Nyerere, among other heads of state in postcolonial Africa. He drew inspiration from early twentieth-century black nationalists and met the political demands of post-Watts rebellion Los Angeles by echoing Malcolm X’s call for a “cultural revolution to unbrainwash an entire people.” Brown places so much emphasis on Karenga’s intellectual antecedents that his doctrine emerges as a poor imitation of more sophisticated ideas.

Defending US’s strict gender roles and stratification is Brown’s toughest task, which he ascribes to the gender politics of the day and Karenga’s study of African societies. US did relax its policy of male supremacy during its violent feud with the Black Panther Party, but only because it was expedient to allow women to join its security units as the police regularly searched and harassed male advocates.

Kwanzaa, the public holiday created by Karenga, has “over 20 million celebrants” worldwide today and even features on a commemorative US postal stamp. But what really interests Brown is Karenga’s activism and his continuous search for a cultural revolution of alternatives that might defy “American institutional racism and the persistent defamation of African history and culture ….” Brown argues that this cultural ideal not only informed the Black Power movement and the recent Afrocentric movement but will continue to challenge the anti-African bias of Western cultural hegemony.
Besides Karenga’s ongoing activist scholarship (he authored the mission statement for the 1995 Million Man March), Brown applauds his commitment to operational unity and cooperative activism during the era of Black Power. From his participation in the Black Congress and the emerging Modern Black Convention movement to his advisory role in Amiri Baraka’s Committee for a United Newark (CFUN), Karenga helped to revive Malcolm X’s goal of united-front politics. Nevertheless, while Brown laments the sectarian violence and government repression that eventually destabilized the Black Power movement, Karenga’s desire to impress his own personality and unique philosophy on black alliances remains the real untold story.

Nicholas PatSides

Journal of American Studies, 39 (2005), 2. doi:10.1017/S0021875305260218


In the United States there are two places you can expect to see large numbers of senior citizens: Las Vegas, and the polling place. In her book How Policies Make Citizens, Andrea Louise Campbell explains why. First, as Dr. Campbell explains in Chapter 3, while seniors have less income than do younger people, as a group they are quite affluent. This is the case because they pay fewer taxes, hold less debt, and spend considerably less than younger people. Second, as Dr. Campbell demonstrates in Chapters 3–5, elderly Americans participate in politics at much higher rates than younger Americans. On practically every measure of participation elderly Americans “max out.”

Social Security – the massive and expensive social program that provides income to seniors – enhances both the income and the participation rates of elderly Americans. Few people are surprised that Social Security augments income. After all, its purpose is to improve the economic lot of its recipients. People may be surprised, however, at Dr. Campbell’s second conclusion – that Social Security enhances senior political activism. In a series of chapters that draws upon an impressive array of data sources (including the National Election Study, the American Citizen Participation Study, and the Roper Social and Political Trends Archive) Dr. Campbell shows that Social Security has had a profound impact on senior civic engagement. First of all, Social Security directly affects seniors’ civic engagement by augmenting older people’s capacity to participate (by providing them with resources). More important and less obviously, Social Security indirectly enhances seniors’ participatory capacity (to use her words). How? Campbell tells us that “cognitive feedback effects provide otherwise scarce and costly information to individuals”. These cognitive effects have “fostered senior interest in public affairs and enhanced their feelings of political efficacy ...” (6). Moreover, the design of Social Security – a design that emphasizes universal eligibility, eschews “mean testing” for benefits, and scrupulously avoids demonizing recipients – sends powerful messages to seniors that their political demands are worthwhile and that their claims
on government are reasonable and just. Campbell’s case that policy design has profound effects on democratic citizenship is best illustrated when she shows that low-income seniors – those most dependent on Social Security – participate in politics at a surprisingly high rate, thus “working against the usually positive income-participation gradient” (63). In short, Social Security reduces political inequality.

“How Policies Make Citizens” is an important contribution to the literature on political participation and civic engagement. It is also an important contribution to the literature on policy design. For those of us concerned about the future of American democracy in the face of conservative assaults on “big government,” this book is essential.

Anthony J. Nownes
University of Tennessee, Knoxville, USA

doi:10.1017/S0021875805270214


In his Music and the Making of a New South, Gavin James Campbell offers a singular exploration of the remaking of the American South after the Civil War. Focussing on Atlanta, Campbell adopts a microcosmic approach that examines the central implications of three annual musical events – the Grand Opera, the Colored Music Festival, and the Georgia Old-Time Fiddling Contest from 1909–1925 – and he explores the shifting roles of gender, race, and class in the reconstruction of Atlanta after the Civil War. According to Campbell, “the complexity of music’s appeal and the fullness of its meaning are more readily appreciated when we understand how they are negotiated in the context of debates about the distribution of political, cultural, social, and economic power.”

Indeed, in this nicely written and carefully researched book, Campbell lucidly identifies the central anxieties pervading the South in the aftermath of the war, and painstakingly explains the centrality of music in perpetuating, as well as alleviating, these experiences. Campbell argues that the yearly Opera Week in Atlanta challenged traditional gender roles and aggravated the already nascent apprehension of (upper- and middle-class) New Southern men about emerging feminism and the apparent decline of conventional notion of masculinity and femininity. Linking this patriarchal privileging of static gender roles with a privileging of whiteness, the Opera, according to Campbell, provided a medium of articulation whereby race and gender are interwoven in the process of social, economic, and political reconstruction. It is precisely this process, Campbell claims, that directed the public’s responses to the Colored Music Festival and to the Georgia Old-Time Fiddler’s Convention.

Methodically investigating how the various social concerns that played so central a role in Opera Week were played out in the latter two musical institutions, Campbell suggests that each, in its own way, enabled a sociocultural as well as physical arena in which other members of Southern society (whites and blacks of all classes) could play their part in the making of the New South. It is “the conflicts, debates, and contradictions that emerged when Atlantans articulated the meaning of what they heard [that] revealed the sinews of a New South in the making.”
Illustrating his analysis with numerous illuminating photos and quoted excerpts from various sources, Campbell fleshes out his ideas, but, at points, teeters too near the verge of a rather repetitive catalogue of evidence. A stronger momentum that propelled the chapters to a somewhat more developed conclusion would have made this otherwise valuable book indispensable for a fuller understanding of the New South.

Goldsmiths College, University of London

KEREN OMRY

Journal of American Studies, 39 (2005), 2. doi:10.1017/S0021875805280210


Gary Dorrien wrote about neocons in 1993 - long before they recently became fashionable again - so it was with intrigue and curiosity that I picked up his new book, devoted entirely to neocon contemporary foreign policy. He claims that back then he recognized, even though the neocons were embroiled in the “culture wars,” that “the foreign policy issue was the key to their identity and political future.” The first chapter of this new book revisits old ground trodden in his previous one, The Neoconservative Mind: Politics, Culture and the War of Ideology; however, he revises his definition of neocons and disputes that the movement died in the mid-1990s as its then leaders, Irving Kristol and Norman Podhoretz, asserted. Thereafter, like his previous study, Dorrien takes a person-centred approach, so Paul Wolfowitz, Charles Krauthammer, Joshua Muravchik, William Kristol and Robert Kagan, among others, are the focus of his study. Although not the centre of attention, it is nice to see that Podhoretz has been rightfully included in this analysis. And unlike most writers on this topic, Dorrien knows what he is talking about. This book is rich and detailed. It is academic, meticulously researched and footnoted, and, unlike many recent offerings on the neocons, not in the slightest bit journalistic. It does not polemize or make unsubstantiated claims (if anything, it is almost quite dry). Thus Dorrien is careful not to repeat what seem to be the current if misguided shibboleths of this topic: (a) Bush is a puppet of the neocons, (b) Bush has adopted a consistently neocon foreign policy, (c) neoconservatism is merely a conspiracy or cover for hardline Zionism, (d) all neocons are Jewish and (e) Leo Strauss is the prime influence behind neocon foreign policy. Indeed, he takes pains on every one of these counts to show that the opposite is closer to the truth. In his conclusion he finally reveals his political colours: “The neocons lay claim to the language of democracy, but spurn its essential values of equality, cooperation, and diversity. They wrongly imagine that American bullying and bashing leads to world democracy. They ignore the contradiction between advocating American unipolar dominance and upholding the United States as the model for other nations.” Whether you agree with Dorrien or not, his book is an essential primer for anyone interested in current neocon and US foreign policy.

University of Aberdeen

NATHAN ABRAMS

The last few years have seen a long overdue renewal in engagement with the ideas and person of Victoria Woodhull – self-publicist, opportunist and flamboyant political activist. Amanda Frisken’s new book is a timely addition to recent monographs by Mary Gabriel, Barbara Goldsmith and Lois Beachy Underhill as well as to feminist re-evaluations of Woodhull’s significance by Sheila Rowbotham and others. Frisken provides a lively and well-researched account of what she calls, at one point, “the Woodhull phenomenon.” And what a phenomenon she was. One of the striking and brilliant daughters of an infamous and quarrelsome family, her early life follows a pattern of private difficulties and public performances that was also to characterize what followed. This period is dealt with in the book’s introduction in which Frisken recounts the now familiar story of Woodhull’s marriage at 14, her career as a clairvoyant healer and her partnership with her sister Tennessee Claflin which ultimately led to the pair’s establishment of the first brokerage operated by women on Wall Street. Frisken passes over Woodhull’s fascinating biography lightly – it has, after all, received recent attention – and focuses instead on the period from 1870 to 1876 and her involvement in radical sexual politics. For Victoria Woodhull the personal was indeed the political, and the highly theatrical interventions in public life that the book primarily engages with revealed just the extent to which she thought, and showed, the two were interleaved. Her involvement in the Beecher – Tilton scandal, an event that had massive ramifications both for its protagonists and more importantly for gender relations and debates about power and sexuality, is dealt with in detail in Chapter 4. Frisken’s book contains many cartoons and sketches of Woodhull, some well known and some less familiar that help make her case that in order to understand the significance of Woodhull’s contribution to the radicalism of the 1870s it is necessary to locate her within a culture of personal performance and political theatre. Her book will help to do just that.

University of Leeds

B. BENNETT


One of the hardest things for historians of the encounter period to rid themselves of is the notion that Europeans moved into the middle of unchanging cultures. What Gallivan manages to do in his interesting book on the colonial archaeology and ethnohistory of the Powhatans and Monacans of the coastal plain of the James River is to demonstrate that the English migrants to Jamestown encountered a society as much in flux as Europe itself was in the late medieval and early modern periods.
Gallivan is especially interested in the operation of power within Native settlements between ca. 1200 and ca. 1500. He shows that what Captain John Smith and other early English settlers observed – an Indian chiefdom organized in terms of centralized decision-making, hierarchical political organization and social inequality – does not match the archaeological record where signs of hierarchy were noticeable by their absence. He argues that in the sixteenth century there was a shift from the predominance of household-oriented economic practices to practices driven by political relations and chiefly authority. He supports this argument with copious archaeological evidence about how changes in communal organization led to political changes not reflected in the archaeological record but which are clearly apparent in the ethnographic observations that early English settlers made about the Native Americans they encountered in the James River region. Thus Native American societies in coastal Virginia had been engaged in dynamic change for a considerable period before European arrival. By insisting on the dynamism of change in this period and by providing a means whereby the region’s ethnohistory can be squared with its archaeology, Gallivan shows how Native societies were able to adapt surprisingly well to the immense changes wrought by contact with Europeans in the early seventeenth century. He demonstrates, in particular, the importance of Powhatan (a weroance, or local chief) as a transitional figure who used the colonists for his own political authority as much as they used him for their own ends.

This book is highly specialist and will be of most interest to students of pre-contact Native American societies. But it has wider application, as Gallivan’s discussion of the significance of Powhatan as a culture broker shows. It provides an important gloss on the nature of the encounter experience in seventeenth-century Jamestown and thus will be useful to historians as well as to anthropologists and archaeologists.

Sussex University

TREVOR BURNARD

Journal of American Studies, 39 (2005), 2. doi:10.1017/S0021875805310218


The first time I heard the phrase “Native American literary tradition” used to denote without irony an Anglo-American literary tradition free from the taint of European influence, I was bemused. This collection of essays, celebrating the centennial of the first publication of Owen Wister’s The Virginian, explains the causes of my bemusement and also deepens my sense of the erasures and silences that were required to establish that tradition. Many critics have commented that while The Virginian initiated a formulaic tradition looking backwards to an Old West, the text itself is more complex and, as Melody Graulich points out in her introduction, is in fact anticipatory of the New West.

The essays gathered in this volume use a combination of deconstructive criticism and new historicist contextualization to tease out the ironies, the erasures, the
silences and the multiple implicit subtexts that mingle in Wister’s narrative style and structure. The result is too rich for a reviewer to do justice to within the word limit. Perhaps as a result of this richness of new readings and interpretations and of new scholarship, the editors offer a useful running commentary at the head of each essay. Their excellent lively introduction, lyrical afterword and summaries throughout contribute to the reading process that is of necessity comparative and reflective. They both also contribute essays to the volume. Tatum’s sets the tone of sound, informed scholarship underpinning imaginative new readings, by investigating the effect of “reading” Remington’s illustrations alongside Wister’s prose. Graulich’s offers a counterpoint to this in a witty, questioning, dialogic, gender-bending performance.

Both the late Louis Owens and Jennifer Tuttle consider the novel’s erasure of the historical American Indian presence in Wyoming at the time the novel is set. Owens writes with characteristic wit and subtlety, beginning his essay with an account of tourists in Yellowstone National Park being surprised and kidnapped by Nez Percé warriors. He argues that “reservation boundaries and fences were meant to be manipulated by those who created them” (85). Thus he juxtaposes the relation to geographical space that white tourists and ranchers have with the totally different relation to space and constructed boundaries that is imposed upon the Native inhabitants of this land. He reads the novel as erasing Indian-ness, whereas Tuttle reads the Virginian as the hero of dominant white masculinity who achieves his position by appropriating Indian characteristics.

One of the pleasures of this volume is that a number of contributors offer critical commentary on the same key scenes, for example the “When you call me that, smile” exchange with Trampas, The Virginian’s rescue of Molly, Molly’s rescue of the Virginian, the “No Dream to Wake From” episode, the final gun battle with Trampas and the admission of ontological uncertainty in the honeymoon scene. Readings differ constructively. To take only one example, Handley reads the honeymoon sequence as showing that “the innate ability to adapt to the imperatives of civilization … has its (natural) limits” (49), whereas Neil Campbell – the one British critic in this otherwise thoroughly American collection – sees the Virginian’s desire to mix and fuse with nature as temporary: “as with all ‘mixing’ and its connotations of hybridity and ‘intertangling’ in the novel, it is short-lived, becoming merely a dream that purges the Virginian of all ambiguity until he is an innocent youth again …” (227).

All this serves to emphasize how appropriate it is to revisit this text and reveal the personal, social and political tensions and anxieties it attempts to contain and write over; to probe its surface style for ambiguities, to analyse its novelist structure for gaps and fissures. Given the importance of the West in the American cultural imaginary, this volume is more than just a centennial collection of excellent new essays. It is also a timely way of thinking about American ideology and identity as it is currently being performed on the world stage. Read it and smile!

*University of Warwick*  
HELEN M. DENNIS
Drawing on an impressive range of sources, *Slave Patrols* provides a valuable contribution to our understanding of slave and Southern history in the United States. Hadden explores the phenomenon of the slave patrol from the earliest seventeenth-century experiments up to the Civil War. She also shows how the patrols prepared the way for the Klu Klux Klan in the Reconstruction period and twentieth-century strategies of repressing the African American population.

Hadden’s history illustrates how slave patrols were a consequence of white fears of slave insurrection and the need – on behalf of slave-owners – to control their property. The patrols evolved as a communal means of policing slave populations, preventing potential rebellions and (more commonly) returning and punishing runaway slaves. Hadden examines how slave patrols differed in terms of composition and professionalism, challenging the assumption that patrols were typically composed of lower-class whites to reveal that they were constituted by a much broader spectrum of Southern society. Differences between rural and urban patrols are also explored. Hadden questions the effectiveness of patrols and the extent to which they were limited by resources and motivation.

The ambivalent relationship of the white Southern community with the patrols is also discussed, demonstrating not all plantation owners welcomed the intrusion of a patrol, or the beating of an absent slave. According to Hadden, the communal emphasis on the patrol, as well as the tacit admission that white populations feared their bondsmen, contradicted the Southern self-image of strength, self-reliance and innate superiority.

Hadden also investigates bondsmen’s attitudes towards patrols, and the strategies deployed to evade and defy patrols or even pitch master against patrol. *Slave Patrols* also reveals how periods of crisis – the threat of Indian attack, the revolutionary war and, most of all, the Civil War – changed the nature of the patrols and could mobilize the entire white population to armed vigilance against their bondsmen.

Clearly written, with generous use of sources, *Slave Patrols* is a valuable piece of scholarship for anyone interested in the history of slavery and race relations in the Southern United States.

*King’s College, University of London*  

JAMES MILLER
draws upon Evan’s previously restricted archive at the Met. The six illustrated essays which span Evan’s career and 187 accompanying plates contain much previously unpublished material and offer intriguing insights about the United States’ most eminent documentary photographer.

Maria Morris Hambourg opens the volume with a fascinating essay about the early modernist influences of Evans; Douglas Eklund discusses the period 1928–34, when Evans developed his documentary method; and Jeff L. Rosenheim, in the book’s most substantial essay, considers Evans’s “lyric documentary” through his work in the South during the 1930s. Three shorter essays yield interesting insights into Evans’s later work. Mia Fineman considers the subway portraits begun by Evans in 1938. Equipped with a 35-millimeter Contax, with its body painted matt black, which was concealed under his coat, Evans hunted for a “true portraiture” which was distinct from the theatrical scenarios of Cecil Beaton and Edward Steichen. Evans sought a form of “non-art” photographic portraiture which Fineman describes as “the authorless objectivity of the photo-booth portrait.” In 1941 Evans took his Rolleiflex camera onto the streets of Bridgeport and repeated the exercise during 1946 in Detroit and Chicago. His fleeting glimpses of pedestrians establish “anonymous connection amid the relentless flow of urban life.” Evans’s ongoing commitment to Americana is revealed by Douglas Eklund in his essay on the photographer’s period as Special Photographic Editor of Fortune, a post which he assumed in 1948. The picture postcard inspired Evans as both subject and form in some early photographic portfolios of the American scene such as “Main Street Looking North from Courthouse Square,” and a sense of a classic American form influenced subsequent features on “Vintage Office Furniture,” “ Beauties of the Common Tool” and “Before They Disappear,” a study of nineteenth-century railroad car insignias. Joining the Yale School of Art in 1964, Evans renewed his interest in decaying roadside, and Mia Fineman points to the formal similarities with the paintings of Roy Lichtenstein and James Rosenquist. Indeed, Evans jested that he invented Pop Art. In the autumn of 1973 he discovered the Polariod, taking 2,600 pictures with it in a six-month period.

Such a prolific output would have amazed Roy Stryker who, as Rosenheim observes, constantly complained about Evans’s productivity. As many of these essays make clear, Evans was the antithesis of the corporate professional whom Stryker valued. As this “serious dandy” rejected the dominant figures of American photography in the 1920s, Alfred Stieglitz and Edward Steichen, whose work he derided as too self-consciously artistic or commercially driven, so he would brook no compromise with the liberal politics of the New Deal. Underlying his irritation with “the establishment” were personal forces as well as intellectual ones, which made independence an obsession for him. It was expressed in his thirteen-month sojourn in Europe during the mid-1920s, in his experiments with camera technology and in his conversion to colour photography in his later work. Ultimately, it was expressed in his distantiated photographs of people and the pursuit of a style which, in Hambourg’s words, was “both a popular art and unfit for easy consumption.” Fineman reveals that in his later years Evans became a compulsive collector of old road signs and kept a tool kit in the back of his Chevrolet Vega which was deployed with military precision, on one occasion to steal a traffic sign from a busy intersection in Old Saybrook, Connecticut. The episode may be read as symptomatic of a
social misfit and/or as typical of Evans’s obsession with signs and his respect for
the nation’s vernacular expression, especially when weathered by the impact of
modernization. His genius was to produce images of a transcendent realism, visual
narratives which deny categorization by the boundaries of their detailed and specific
generic identities. This volume is an excellent introduction to the scope, vision and
contradictions of America’s foremost documentary photographer.

University of Reading  STUART KIDD

Ann Heilmann and Margaret Beetham (eds.), New Woman Hybridities: Femininity,
Feminism and International Consumer Culture, 1880–1930 (Routledge Transatlantic
Perspectives on American Literature) (London and New York: Routledge,

This collection of essays, edited by Ann Heilmann and Margaret Beetham, is a
valuable addition to work on the New Woman. Its main strength is its attempt to
present an international picture of the complex relationship between feminist
discourse and various social constructions of both femininity and the New Woman
between 1800 and 1930. It usefully corrects many previous misconceptions
concerning the New Woman, such as those that portray her as flourishing only in
England and America and as the product of an urban environment. The editors take
the postcolonial concept of hybridity as a lynchpin for the volume, which examines
not only how the idea of the New Woman was inflected by discourses of gender,
religion, nationalism and consumerism but also how it was represented in the
periodical press. We know that the emergence of a social category called “the New
Woman” allowed many women (mainly of the middle class, it has to be said) to
experiment in quite diverse ways with hybrid identities that were often subversive
and disruptive in their social impact. New Woman Hybridities enriches this knowledge
through a variety of perspectives and topics, ranging from (for example) Anglo-
Welsh writing as expressive of a “hybrid” female identity, the representation of the
New Woman in American cartoons and the reception of the New Woman as a social
phenomenon in Hungary and Japan, to ambivalent images of the German New
Woman during the Weimar Republic period. The book is divided into four sections:
“Hybridities,” “Through the (Periodical) Looking Glass,” “Communities of
Women” and “Race and the New Woman” (although it is not really clear to me why
“Hybridities,” which includes only two essays, needs to function as a separate
section, since the concept of hybridity runs throughout the volume). There are
especially good pieces by Laurel Brake (on the topic of “the sex” debates of 1889),
Françoise Le Jeune (on the New Woman and the British Columbian daily press),
Muta Kazue (on the New Woman in Japan) and Angelique Richardson (on the
appropriation by many New Women in Britain and America of eugenics as a vali-
dating discourse). Contributors clearly read each others’ essays before the book went
to press and this results in a lively sense of debate and some useful cross-referencing.

This is a rich volume, offering fascinating insights into the emergence and re-
ception of the New Woman in Hungary, Japan, British Columbia, Germany, Ireland
and Wales as well as England and the United States. It is a book that no student of the fin de siècle or the early twentieth century should ignore. Such richness prompts the reader to ask further questions, however. How was the New Woman being represented and received in countries such as Austria, Holland, Sweden or Scotland? Was the Catholic response to the New Woman (a.k.a. “the flapper”, as explored in an essay on the Irish popular and ecclesiastical press by Maryann Gailanella Valiulis) replicated in other Catholic countries such as Spain and Italy? If not, why not? Nevertheless, the mark of a good collection is that it opens up new areas for exploration. This volume certainly does that and will no doubt lead to further nuanced and detailed work on the New Woman.

Kingston University

AVRIL HORNER

Journal of American Studies, 39 (2005), 2. doi:10.1017/S0021875805350213


Since the closing of the frontier, America has suffered a perpetual identity crisis. According to Kimmel and Rotundo, it has resolved this crisis as it periodically rears its head through masculinization processes. What died with the frontier has risen in a number of symbolic and anomic forms. America appears masculine largely because of this periodic compensation process. World War II is a context and turning point for much of its gendered identity.

Jarvis’s The Male Body at War has quite a niche to fill given her topic of American masculinity during the World War II. She fills that niche and opens a few others in this comprehensive and deep book. According to Jarvis, the war was an opportunity for Americans to restore their nationhood by restoring a masculinity beset by the Great Depression. Explicit in this text was that the process of labeling men, forming them into soldiers and putting them through combat was grounds for the formation of the white masculinity America experienced immediately after the war. Implicit in this text is that the masculinization process, dubious as it can be, was a great motivating force that oriented battlefronts with homefronts and enabled an apprehensive nation to make ultimate sacrifices. The book engages three big problem areas. It engages the initial restoration process that took place during the Great Depression and early years of the war. It shows how the nation managed threats to the restored masculinity when confronted with abjection, wounds, and death. And it describes how the process was racialized in a complex interplay between Asians as friends and foes, and between American blacks as suitable workers and bad soldiers. All the while white men were normalized and leveled with common privileges. These were the grounds for America’s postwar manhood and nationhood.

For Jarvis, the reformation of this American masculinity began during the Depression. New Deal programs reinsituted young men as “socially useful.” Propaganda from these programs emphasized turning idle boys into constructive men and highlighted the transition with images of action, muscles, and orderly appearances. Even Roosevelt, challenged from polio, benefited from a code of
honor among photographers not to show him in a crippled state. As America’s involvement in the war appeared more imminent this social construction helped solidify the war effort. In the book, Jarvis shows posters from the period illustrating men changing from weak during the Depression to strong during the war and the icons of American moving from porcelain-skin Lady Liberty to a wiry and stern Uncle Sam. Army classification systems confronted the reality of Depression-era malnutrition and defined the ideal man as athletic and heterosexual. Jarvis further points out that this masculinity differed fundamentally from that imagery put forth by Germany. American male bodies were depicted in action with bulging, sweating upper bodies. The male body of Germany, a country with a clearer nationalist and socialist orientation, was steel-like and hairless, but also desexed and indistinguishable from the Volks it protected and represented.

The lived consequences of World War II on men’s bodies, however, threatened these symbols of American masculinity. Jarvis points out that the technological intensity of World War II showed little mercy to flesh and blood. The traditional clean war wounds from rifle bullets were relatively rare in this war fought largely between machines. The little people who found themselves in the middle were often reduced to charred pieces. The military had to manage massive numbers of amputees, unidentifiable bodies, and psychological trauma cases. The individual soldier on the front had to manage the dissonance between their own pumped-up sense of subjectivity and the ultimate image of objectification, the corpse that he commonly encountered. In two chapters Jarvis outlines the elaborate processes America went through to sanitize death for its public and to fix the broken masculinity of individual victims. Prosthetic devices, novels about wounded men regaining virility, and tombs and precise rituals for unknown soldiers were nothing less than cultural objects of a nation bent on impression management. For the men on the ground, however, the experience commonly broke the boundary between life and death and between masculinity as touted by the propaganda and their sense of vulnerability.

I found it especially vivid when Jarvis turned her lens to race. America had to manage the classic racial dilemma described by Gunnar Myrdal on two fronts: in the Pacific theater and at home. Racism drove its propaganda machine to racialize the Japanese as mysterious, dangerous, and suddenly masculine. Yet many similar-looking people in that region had suffered from the Japanese and were allied with the United States. The American military played two hands, the fulcrum of which was gender. Asian allies of the United States appeared as colonized, subordinate and effeminate compared to the masculinized Japanese. This created the Japanese as a dangerous enemy and preserved other Asians as nonthreatening and humble allies. On the home front, America needed the labor of blacks more than ever. To this end, Americans emphasized a degree of solidarity and actually pictured muscular black and white working men on the same posters. But African Americans were still not allowed to prove their manhood in combat under a Jim Crow-style discrimination and the rationale and that blacks did not have what it took. This allowed the war machine to compartmentalize blacks as labor and preserve the process of manhood-making for white men.

Jarvis provides a great description of the creation and re-creation of wartime manhood. I contend, however, that the story feels plopped in the middle of the
twentieth century with little deeper baseline than the sad state of Depression-era American men. For instance, such a logical question of why World War II masculinity was different from World War I masculinity remains unexplored. Are we to believe this tremendous and, according to Jarvis, lasting inflation of identity was simply a rebound from bad economics? Jarvis’s fine, accessible book lacks a beginning chapter, premising this manhood in the style of Kimmel or Pleck, to address the deeper origins of such an immense effort.

*Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania*  

GREGORY W. WALKER


During his retirement John Adams asserted that the “real” American Revolution took place in the decade before the Continental Congress declared independence. By this Adams meant that most Americans underwent an intellectual revolution in the years prior to 1776 that prepared them for the Declaration of Independence. Many historians of the Revolution agree with this view and have paid particular attention to the intellectual history of the period from the 1763 Peace of Paris until 1776. Chief among these is Bernard Bailyn, whose 1967 book *The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution* is a classic study which asserted the importance of the Real Whig ideology in explaining the origins of the American Revolution. Bailyn based his study on a wide reading in the voluminous and rich pamphlet literature generated by the British–American political crisis in the decade before independence. A year before the publication of *The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution* Bobbs-Merrill published a collection of revolutionary-era pamphlets edited by Merrill Jensen entitled *Tracts of the American Revolution*. Now, nearly forty years later, Hackett Publishing has republished Jensen’s original collection.

Jensen’s selection stands the test of time quite well. *Tracts of the American Revolution* presents the complete texts of seventeen pamphlets concerning various aspects of British–American relations between 1764 and 1776. Unsurprisingly, most of the pamphlets concern the legal and constitutional questions arising from British taxation policies, although “[A Short Narrative of the Horrid Massacre in Boston]” by James Bowdoin, Joseph Warren, and Samuel Pemberton (which, along with Paul Revere’s famous engraving, gave birth to the notion of a “Boston Massacre”) provides a perspective from the street protests of the period. In making his selection from among hundreds of pamphlets, Jensen carefully balanced whig and tory views: Daniel Leonard’s “Massachusettensis” appears alongside John Adams’s “Novanglus” and Thomas Paine’s “Common Sense” is answered by James Chalmers’s “Plain Truth.” Similarly, Jensen presents both well-known names such as Adams, Paine, Jefferson and Otis, and less well-known writers such as Martin Howard, Jr. and William Hicks. While both sides of the political equation are represented, the authors of the pamphlets are exclusively white middle- and upper-class men. This of course was the demographic group most active in American
politics prior to Independence. Overall this collection provides a representative view of the pamphlet literature of the pre-revolutionary era.

Hackett Publishing has reprinted the complete text of the original 1966 edition of *Tracts of the American Revolution*. As such it contains Merrill Jensen’s original introduction, which provides a useful summary of events from 1763 to 1776 as well as biographical information about the authors in the collection. A revised introduction, taking account of the conceptual and historiographical advances concerning ideology and the coming of the revolution would have been a welcome addition. None the less this is a welcome (and inexpensive) introduction to the literature of the American Revolution.

*University of Edinburgh*  
FRANK COGLIANO

*Journal of American Studies, 39* (2005), 2. doi:10.1017/S0021875805370216


This book belongs to the Greenwood Press series “Exploring Social Issues through Literature.” The preface explains that the book aspires to “generate informed discussion by providing information about the many issues involved in the formation, operation, and effect of youth gangs”; it “has been written with secondary-school students, educators, and librarians in mind. Although the book will be used primarily by teachers, it has been designed and written to be accessible to young students as well” (ix). That assortment of intended readers is the book’s greatest failing, as it is unsure of its audience and thus of its approach. The introduction seems intended for teachers, providing a working definition of the term “gang,” a lucid overview of the historical development of youth gangs in Europe and America, and a section which cites commonly shared aspects of gang cultures, such as socioeconomic deprivation and consequent desires for security and respect. However, the strongly censorial tone in which gangs are discussed slides at times from analysis into sentiment: “The ruin is as deadly and pervasive in our society as systemic cancer” (xxiv) – suggesting authorial attentiveness towards a young audience who must be warned about the evils of gang culture. Confusion over audience means that the introduction anxiously negotiates between providing information and sermonizing.

However, the broad content and range of literary material ensures that the book has a claim to value. Each chapter uses an extract from a single text – fiction, poetry, or memoir – to supplement discussion about particular youth gangs. For example, Herbert Asbury’s *The Gangs of New York* (1927) provides contextualization for an exploration of Irish immigrant youth gangs in the 1920s. A substantial chronological range is combined with a broad representation of gangs, ranging from outlaw gangs in the late nineteenth-century American South to the contemporary rise of Chinese youth gangs in the United States. Texts are flanked by analysis of primary documents from the historical moment in which their depicted gangs exist, and by discussion of how that particular gang illustrates themes in the introduction, so that the title is misleading, with works treated not as “literature” but as case studies.  

*Joyce Carol Reviews 325*
Oates’s *Foxfire* (1993) is valuable not as fiction but for what it says about girl gangs in the 1950s American Northeast. Despite inconsistencies in tone and focus, this book goes some way towards illuminating the complex topic of youth gangs.

*University of Glasgow*

---


David M. Kennedy’s significant study first appeared while I was completing the research for my own book *From Progressivism to Prosperity*. I remember how my heart sank when I read this sparkling book. However, there were significant differences in both the content and the argument of our respective volumes. In recent years several other writers, including Robert H. Zeiger (2000) and Ronald Schaffer (1991), have added further to the body of scholarship dealing with the impact of World War I on American society. Strangely, the twenty-fifth anniversary edition of Kennedy’s book does not take account of any of the subsequent studies. There is no reference to these general works, nor to monographs dealing with gender, labour and race – all areas that are dealt with rather briefly by Kennedy, and with conclusions that have to some extent been challenged.

Perhaps we should not be surprised – despite the title and the claim that he was writing “a reasonably complete account of events in the United States,” Kennedy somewhat confusingly also said his book was not “strictly speaking, a study of the impact of the war on American society.” His nineteen-page Afterword to the new edition makes this even clearer. Kennedy suggests that his focus was on the impact of the war on progressivism and particularly the relations between government and civil society. He wanted to use the war as a “lens” through which to examine “the progressive mentality.” Further, he wanted to look at the war and what it revealed about the USA in relation to the Old World, and what participation in the conflict revealed that was distinctive in the American character. There is no doubt that his book achieved those aims. As well as looking at politics and domestic mobilization, his chapters on the military experience and its effects on US servicemen added a feature lacking in most other works, my own included. His incorporation of material from diaries and literature detailing the soldiers’ responses to their experience was most effective. It is that element that one would have wished to see more of rather than the focus on Woodrow Wilson’s idealistic vision of a “world made safe for democracy” which Kennedy argues is “still the animating spirit that drives American foreign policy.” President Bush’s recent inaugural address suggests, however, that, for good or ill, Professor Kennedy is correct.

*University of Gloucestershire*

---

Neil A. Wynn

Part of a series of biographies published by Greenwood Press, *Emily Dickinson: A Biography* by Connie Ann Kirk is aimed at an audience of sixth-form and undergraduate students. It provides an accessible account of the poet’s life and the major influences on her work, including her relationship with parents and siblings and important friendships such as that with Susan Gilbert, who was to become Dickinson’s sister-in-law. The chapters follow a broadly chronological pattern, and discuss themes such as family, education and religion, Dickinson at home, Dickinson’s relationship with her pet dog Carlo, her travels outside of Amherst, literary influences on her work, and meetings with literary figures of her day. Subsequent chapters discuss the “flood” years when Dickinson’s poetic production was at its zenith, the editing and publishing of Dickinson’s poetry (in the nineteenth century, in the twentieth century and in the Internet age), Dickinson myths and mysteries, reception of her work and the legacy Dickinson has left to literature. There is a timeline prior to the chapters, beginning with 11 December 1620 and the establishing of the Plymouth Colony by Mayflower pilgrims, and ending with 3 April 2004 and the opening of the Evergreens nursery to the public after more than 120 years. This timeline sets Dickinson’s life in chronological and historical context, enabling the reader to review at a glance significant events in the poet’s life, and when they occurred in relation to other events of historical importance. Another notable feature is a series of appendices, including Dickinson’s family tree, poems authored by her and published in her lifetime, an index of first lines, selected titles from Dickinson’s reading and a list of places and holdings in Dickinson studies, including websites. The bibliography also lists websites, including the user-friendly Dickinson Electronic Archives. These listings, combined with the preceding text, enable the student with little or no previous knowledge of Dickinson to gain a sense of the importance of this figure within American letters, simultaneously providing resources for further research. A photo essay approximately midway through the book puts faces to names and enables the reader to see the buildings and places described in the text, also including an image of a Dickinson fascicle.

As a biographical work rather than literary criticism, the focus in on Dickinson’s life and the significance of her literary legacy, with relatively little analysis of the poems themselves, as one would expect. However, *Emily Dickinson: A Biography* is a clearly written and admiring appraisal of the poet’s life, with a conscientious attention to detail that ensures Dickinson becomes a vivid presence in the mind of the attentive and reflective reader. It is a valuable reference work for students new to Dickinson and Dickinson studies, and deserves a place on the relevant recommended reading lists.

*Lancaster University*  
*Stephanie Munro*
State of the Union is an intelligent survey of the US labour movement, a grand narrative demonstrating both the author’s bibliographic mastery and his engaging writing style. Laden with insight, State of the Union is as invaluable for those already familiar with the US labour movement’s trajectory as for those from other fields who wish to introduce themselves to the subject. The scope of Lichtenstein’s knowledge and his polemical views on how scholars and activists should combat the movement’s decline make this book an enjoyable, informative read.

 Readers should be aware, however, that this is not a systematic, dispassionate survey of the labour movement in the twentieth century. For such purposes Robert Zieger and Steve Babson have written far more useful studies. Lichtenstein is more concerned with exploring the theme of declension, a topic that informs much of his work and that of so many US labour historians. True to this theme, Lichtenstein begins his narrative by focussing on the Progressive Era’s debates on the meaning of industrial democracy, when many of the nation’s intellectuals took seriously the challenge that industrialization posed for democracy and citizenship. He then details the glory days of the 1930s, when the brash new Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO) secured union victories over seemingly impregnable corporate giants such as General Motors and US Steel. What made the CIO so powerful, in the author’s view, was not simply its organizational structure or leadership, but its compelling vision of a broad social democracy that promised a new direction in US political economy.

 The remainder of State of the Union charts the decline of the movement since the heyday of the 1930s. Lichtenstein is at his best when chronicling the shortcomings of the movement itself that contributed to its current malaise. Short-sighted and unimaginative, too ready to retreat from the broad social democratic vision to protect their own fiefdoms, union leaders receive a great deal of criticism. Above all, the author claims that the labour movement’s refusal to embrace the “rights consciousness” of the 1960s, to join hands with others in combating racial and gender discrimination, left the labour movement “ghettoized” and isolated culturally, socially and politically. Yet the movement is not dead, Lichtenstein argues. American labour can still help forge a broad, decentralized coalition of “rights conscious” groups. It is not too late to revive the spirit of the 1930s by injecting the movement with greater internal democracy, increased militancy and a strong dash of independent political thinking.

 Although fully aware of the internal problems, Lichtenstein and others wedded to the theme of declension are less concerned with the external factors that are in fact the real reasons for the weakness of the US labour movement. Cataclysmic economic and political shifts since the 1930s are less important in his narrative than AFL-CIO President George Meany’s deficiencies. The ever-growing sophistication of corporate anti-unionism, the systematic perverting of the Wagner Act and other labour laws, the economic forces that weakened the industrial sector of the economy (which was the basis of the CIO) and expanded the service sector (which is far more
difficult to organize), the impact of globalization on labour and its ability to organize – these and other factors that shape labour’s environment are given short shrift. Blaming the movement itself would prove even more difficult had the author adopted a more comparative approach that showed similar patterns of decline in British and European unions since the 1980s.

University of Wales, Swansea

CRAIG PHELAN


From the start, LoBrutto stresses that “independent” is a relational term. As he says in the introduction, few independent films are “created, financed, produced or distributed outside the commercial, corporate conglomerate structure” (xiii). On the whole, he ignores the biggest-budget independents (example: the $100–$120 million Gangs of New York (Scorsese, 2002)), concentrating instead on films and filmmakers that, as 2003 Independent Spirit Awards selection criteria mandated, proffer “original, provocative subject matter” and showcase “uniqueness of vision.”

The book is clearly a labor of love, written largely by LoBrutto. Emphasis is on New York (where LoBrutto lives and works), rather than on other American independent film scenes. Inevitably, there are gaps in what is treated; LoBrutto admits that his criteria for inclusion are selective. A few entries engage with foreign films, filmmakers, and transnational film movements (e.g. Jean Rouch and Edgar Morin’s 1961 Chronicle of a Summer (Chronique d’un été), Lars von Trier, Dogme95), but, as the title promises, focus is squarely on the US.

LoBrutto’s background (as editor, production designer, teacher, and author, of collections of interviews with editors, sound designers, cinematographers, and production designers, and of a book on Stanley Kubrick) ensures acknowledgement of d.p.s, editors, screenwriters, sound designers, publishers, archivists, producers, distributors, and exhibitors. This attention is laudable, and relatively rare, among surveys of American independent film. Certain technical and industry terms (e.g. “franchise,” “above-the-line deferrals,” “dated film stock,” “direct-to-video”), even film gauges (“Super 8 mm,” “16 mm,” “8 mm”) are incorporated. Other terms are lacking (e.g. video formats) or embedded in entries without explanation (e.g. “List actors”). All in all – as usual – directors dominate. Occasionally there are startling omissions – while producer Ted Hope is mentioned in the index.
(“see Good Machine”), James Shamus is not; Marimbas and American International Pictures receive entries, but Focus Features and Strand Releasing do not.

Much material is gleaned from the Internet. Bibliographic citations accompany some but not all entries. The appendix on “100 Significant Independent Films” gives to indication why these particular hundred; the appendix on “Distributors” list companies without providing contact information. Several of the entries on directors make no distinction between (relatively) independent as opposed to studio productions; distinctions of scale should have been considered as these are often significant. Nor is entry length necessarily motivated by the importance of the person, work, or issue. Most disappointing is the handling of “identity” categories like “African American cinema,” “Asian American cinema,” “women in film,” “gay cinema,” “lesbian cinema,” and “queer cinema.” Though efforts are made to include people of color and/or women, directors glossed remain primarily white men; the same is true of the academics and critics listed in the final bibliography.

The Encyclopedia of American Independent Filmmaking nevertheless constitutes a welcome addition to the handful of books that survey the field. (Hundreds of others, of course, focus on individual independent films and/or directors). For additional information, consult Emanuel Levy’s Cinema of Outsiders (on feature films from 1979 to 1998), Greg Merritt’s Celluloid Mavericks (a history from the silent to 1999); John Pierson’s Spike, Mike, Slackers & Dykes (an investigation of key makers, films, and venues from 1985 to 1995), E. Deirdre Pribram’s Cinema and Culture (a study of recent foreign and US feature fiction films), Richard K. Ferncase’s Outsider Features (on ten male auteurs from the 1980s and 1990s), Jim Hillier’s American Independent Cinema (a compilation of Sight and Sound articles), and my own and Justin Wyatt’s anthology Contemporary American Independent Film (essays appraise directions taken – and constraints confining – independent film from the 1970s to 2003).

Bottom line, today’s skillful marketing of independent films as “cool,” “new,” and “now” (foremost by Miramax and New Line), combined with their visibility (in art house theaters and sometimes wide release, as DVDs and videos, on cable, public, and network television) guarantee readership for this encyclopedia. It is definitely a worthwhile addition to university, college, and public libraries. For those interested individuals who can afford a copy of their own, it will be eminently useful as a reference book. Just don’t be surprised if your particular topic of interest doesn’t appear!

University of Tennessee

CHRIS HOLMUND


Comparing the English families and family cultures of colonial New England with that of their near neighbors, the Narragansett Native Americans, this work of Gloria L. Main, Professor of History, Emeritus, at the University of Colorado, Boulder
stands out as an interesting and readable account of early America. Concentrating on the emerging social, religious and economic circumstances in New England for both groups, Main begins with a thorough look at the Native Americans of New England and their cultural background, and concentrating specifically on their cultural evolution upon contact with English settlers provides a useful deep background for the work. Main’s work unfolds by theme, following the parallel progress of the Native American and English emigrant settlements and cultures in areas of land and land ownership, gender issues and marriage, children and childhood, interactions between the age differences of young and old, and finally ending with how both the Narragansetts and the English transitioned into the era of the Revolutionary War.

Main uses sources such as letters, diaries, court records, and wills to show the reader how the two societies compare, and sometimes how they interact, in circumstances like farming, work, education, childbearing and childrearing, age, death, laws, and religion. Indeed religion understandably, influenced many aspects of colonial New England life, in fact every aspect of the English emigrants’ lives, and Main weaves the theme of religion throughout with great success, showing how it permeated colonial life. One of the high points of Main’s skills in this book is the personal sources that she has found, a combination of diaries, letters, accounts, and estate valuations, which allow her to use the same families for examples right through the book. By keeping that continuity, Main allows the reader to become more familiar with certain individuals and families, and this adds to the reader’s understanding of the work. Because Main has written in such an easily readable style this book may seem on the surface to be more geared towards a general readership rather than an academic one; however, social and cultural historians of every kind will find this text useful for research and as a basis for further study.

University of Dundee

MEGAN C. FERGUSON


In his imaginary ride through frontier farmland, in Letters from an American Farmer, Crevecoeur’s “Farmer James” describes a society of recent immigrants united only by the contiguity of their farmsteads; a Catholic ploughs his land just a mile from a “good plodding German Lutheran”, next to the latter a Seceder burns off his religious zeal in isolation from other members of his sect; beyond him lives a “Low Dutchman”, and so on. The social patterning of Crevecoeur’s frontier settlement here symbolizes the “fragmentary union” of American culture itself, which, as Susan Manning argues in this important new book, had its roots in the intellectual preoccupations of another post-union polity, that of Enlightenment Scotland. Manning does not minimize the difficulties of forging such Scoto-American “transatlantic connections” – then or now – in the face of stubborn facts (of course the whole point of “fragmentary union” is the looseness of its principle of association, which refuses the hierarchical ordering of more incorporative entities). Most of the Scottish literati – with the notable exception of David Hume – were hostile to
American independence, and many of the Scots living in the rebellious colonies were loathed for cleaving to the loyalist cause. But in this wide-ranging, erudite book Susan Manning probes the whys and wherefores of the ambivalent intimacy between Scotland and America, brilliantly drawing together the intellectual debate around the Scottish–English union of 1707 with that of America’s Declaration of Independence later in the century.

*Fragments of Union* approaches its difficult task with exemplary critical tact. Unpacking the subliminal reticulations of prose style (Deleuze’s “foreign language within a language”), Manning distinguishes two distinct styles running through the literature considered here. On the one hand, a hypotactic syntax, the clauses of which are strictly subordinated to the main verb, is isolated as the linguistic register of incorporative union. On the other hand she sets a federative, associative and paratactic writing, the discrete elements of which are linked by contiguity rather than subordination. The latter style embodies the ideological play between the discourses of post-1707 Scotland, and the cultural progeny of Crevecoeur’s American farmers, precipitously settled on the frontier like a paratactic sentence. Although Hume the historian was an avid British unionist, in common with his friends in the Moderate clergy, Manning finds in the epistemology and parataxis of his youthful *Treatise of Human Nature* (1739–40) the inspiration of a tradition of “fragments of union” which she reads as characteristic of much nineteenth-century American writing. In this account Hume’s notion of mind as “nothing but a heap or collection of different perceptions” feeds ultimately into Elizabeth Bishop’s modernist claim that “everything is only connected by ‘and’ and ‘and’.”

Manning tells us at the outset that her book is itself structured associatively and paratactically, “a literary study with political, psychological, epistemological, and grammatical strands,” cognizant of the danger that her own position might be vulnerable to the fissiparousness of which it treats. Fortunately there is no sign of her carefully constructed, loosely chronological, argument in the book’s six chapters ever running out of the cumulative energy, or dissolving into free association. *Fragments of Union* articulates an illuminating range of readings in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Scottish and American literature, progressing through studies of Hume and Mackenzie, Boswell and Franklin, Crevecoeur and Jefferson, William James and Emily Dickinson, to name only the most prominent figures. Manning is equally amenable to considering fragmentary union in the “object relations” psychoanalysis of Melanie Klein or Wilfrid Bion, as in the anxious self-fashioning of seventeenth- or eighteenth-century journal writers like Virginia planter William Byrd, or James Boswell, that careful reader of Hume (the book even aspires to discern the intellectual roots of the object relations school in eighteenth-century discourses of “fragmentary union”). Although showing herself at her best as a historical critic, Susan Manning’s writing is given pace by its theoretical and psychoanalytical *apercus*. Connections and disruptions (rather than the symbolic hierarchies of a more familiar Coleridgian pattern of fragmentation) are shown to structure the relations between Anglo-Scottish and Anglo-American writing. Paratactic discourses familiar to students of modernism and post-modernism are brilliantly conjured from the preoccupations of eighteenth-century epistemology and political discourse. Like Boswell seeking in his journals to “make up masses or larger views of my existence” in order to dispel Humean anxieties of identity, literature offers a connecting
principle to the self and to society alike. With the proviso, as this fine book shows, that the forms of connection are themselves both various and conditioned by history.

University of Glasgow

NIGEL LEASK

Journal of American Studies, 39 (2005), 2. doi:10.1017/S0021875805440219


This book adds considerably to the historiography of slavery in the South. While many historians have been aware of slave hiring, and the role that it played in the Southern economy this is the first detailed exploration of the institution, how it worked in day-to-day terms, and what the participants thought of it. Martin is to be congratulated for his inclusive approach, which sees an enormous range of sources from almost every slave state being consulted for his study, dating from the early eighteenth century through to the 1860s. Undoubtedly serious scholars will want to read this book and assign it to their students.

The central theme of this study is the sheer pervasiveness of slave hiring. Masters hired out their slaves in every region where they were permitted to own slaves, and others hired them to undertake almost every task imaginable. Hiring brought a flexibility to slavery that continued to make it a profitable institution when some traditional plantations were becoming less economic. This allowed some slaveholders to become more like agents that masters, and is one aspect of the peculiar institution that historians have hitherto overlooked, raising interesting questions about paternalism as an overarching ideology of Southern masters. Martin also makes a strong case for hiring helping to democratize slavery, since it brought numerous non-slaveholders into the web of master–slave relations. Since hiring offered a taste of masterdom, and the status and control that were supposed to go with it, Martin argues it was very popular among those who lacked the resources to purchase their own slaves.

Martin is also very anxious that the voices of slaves should not be lost in this system. He utilizes the letters that hired slaves sometimes wrote to their masters to argue that slaves could retain a degree of agency in their hiring, expressing preferences for particular masters, for instance. He also argues strongly that the rosy view sometimes taken of self-hire should be tempered by the testimony of those who experienced it, who definitely made a distinction between this system and freedom.

One particular tension that I would have liked Martin to explore in greater depth was that between hired slave and free white labour, especially in the cities. Martin argues that prospective employers generally preferred to hire slaves than employ whites, and cites the complaints of white artisans in support of this position. Yet several chapters of this book detail the trouble that hired slaves caused: disputes between owners and hirers, slaves playing off their master against their employer, and recalcitrance among hired slaves. Given these problems it is not surprising that,
especially in the 1850s when thousands of mainly Irish immigrants thronged to Southern cities, the numbers of whites engaging in work that was formerly done by hired slaves has been understated. The benefit for employers in using immigrant Irish labour was that there was no one to compensate for any work-related injury or death, and several historians have demonstrated that it was white labour that generally built canals and railroads throughout the South. While Martin has done a fine job of showing us how complicated labour relations could be in a slave society, the reality was probably even more complex.

University of Warwick

TIM LOCKLEY

Journal of American Studies, 39 (2005), 2. doi:10.1017/S0021875805450215


I came across McAllister on www.quakerbooks.org, while trying to find something for a local Amnesty International group to read on the death penalty. The arena within which the book operates is thus quite clear: those most American of traditions, of telling truth to power, where possible, and offering non-violent resistance to the state, where necessary.

Pam McAllister, as in her activism, seeks to address the complex issues that underlie both violence and victimization. She writes for those who feel that the whole issue of the death penalty is just too large a task to know where to start. Going beyond her critique of the death penalty (basically it continues rather than addresses a cycle of violence), she offers activities with which to start challenging violence through challenging the death penalty. From prayer to financial support for pro bono lawyers, McAllister presents an array of activities that can sustain that long-held view that it is better to light a candle than to curse the dark.

For scholars this is a mixed bag; it offers some very succinct paragraphs on topics such as the weakness of the deterrence argument, and for those in American studies of cultural history it offers an array of ideas across criminology, popular culture and theology. For those of us used to reading tomes within a more legal, analytical framework this can be both exhilarating and disappointing. There is mention of Susan Sarandon for her portrayal of Sister Helen Prejean, but nothing on Austin Sarat’s denunciation of Dead Man Walking for being constrained by the nature of commercial movies.

As an example of an abolitionist tract I will be recommending that my death penalty students are aware of McAllister’s book. But I suspect that as with other such tomes this is for the already converted. Those who support the death penalty in theory but remain nervous about a lack of concern for “due process” for indigent defendants will probably find this less to their taste. For them I recommend Scott Turow’s recent thoughts on punishment within a flawed legal system, which he developed while on the Illinois Governor’s Commission on Capital Punishment (Ultimate Punishment: A Lawyer’s Reflections on Dealing with the Death Penalty, New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2003).

Keele University

STEPHEN F. MILLS
As Professor McPherson remarks, “anti-Americanism” is a concept that defies easy definition. While anti-Americanism has undoubtedly been a pervasive factor in historical relations between the United States and Latin America, it has remained evasive and has been curiously neglected by historians. One explanation is that critics of US policy have preferred to concentrate on the issue of US imperialism rather than on anti-Americanism. McPherson expertly redresses the balance. His study focusses on the decade from 1956 to 1965 when 65 out of 171 anti-American demonstrations worldwide were located in Latin America. Indeed, it was the attack by an angry mob on the motorcade of Vice President Richard Nixon on May 13, 1958 in Caracas, Venezuela that not only shocked and mystified officials in the Eisenhower administration but also inaugurated a decade of mass hostility against the United States that spread beyond Latin America to the whole world. McPherson argues that Eisenhower mistakenly interpreted the event as a consequence of communism rather than as anti-Americanism. In fact, the President’s subsequent policy of “passive watchfulness” (12) is held responsible for assisting Fidel Castro’s rise to power in Cuba. In contrast to the Caracas incident, the Cuban Revolution posed a clearly perceived threat to US national security especially when Fidel Castro unleashed what McPherson describes as a strategy of revolutionary anti-Americanism. US policy failed in Cuba, but it proved to be more effective elsewhere in the Caribbean region. One of the many interesting points highlighted in this study is the amount of effort that US policymakers put into conducting opinion polls and monitoring the attitudes of Latin Americans towards the US and its particular policies and values. The result was a better-informed approach that marked the response of the Johnson administration towards the Panama riots of January 1964 and the aftermath of the disturbances in the Dominican Republic in April 1965. By taking a pragmatic approach that facilitated cooperation with the Panamanian elite, officials in the Johnson administration showed “their genius” (106) in demonstrating that anti-Americanism in Panama was “inherently manageable” (15). McPherson is critical of Johnson for “stumbling into a civil conflict” in the Dominican Republic and turning it into “an anti-U.S. war” (142). Nevertheless, the administration skilfully secured its objective in installing a favourable government and thereby demonstrating that important lessons had been learned since 1958. Professor McPherson is to be commended for writing an excellent and original case study that is based on impressive archival research including personal interviews and recently released White House transcripts.

This book eschews a sustained argument for indistinct if occasionally provocative meditations on Tocqueville’s contemporary relevance. Although Mitchell does not condescend to Tocqueville, he does criticize Tocqueville’s failure to theorize how minority groups might be incorporated into the society he otherwise so carefully analyzed. At the most basic level Tocqueville was too beholden to Enlightenment conceptions of civilization, history, and the universality of liberty and equality to address how Native and African Americans might survive Western civilization’s transition to modern mass democracy. His theory of democracy was inherently arrayed against cultural and racial difference (as suggested by Mitchell’s title). It is somewhat surprising that after this analysis Mitchell rejects identity politics and the ideology of victimhood so typical of contemporary American public life. Even though Tocqueville himself did not adequately reconcile democracy and difference, Mitchell still counsels elaboration of some version of Tocqueville’s Enlightenment-derived commitment to universality, liberty, and solidarity as a counter to the balkanization wrought by the current focus on and often the essentialization of difference.

Today, however, it is more difficult to realize a truly common good through public deliberation because democratic authority no longer works as it did in the New England township. Gone are the politics of affection in a community that was tightly knit physically, psychically, and morally—where “the fulfillment of duty was indistinguishable from the exercise of a right.” Now we have the politics of difference, withdrawal, apathy, materialism, and well-funded, highly organized special interest groups. Mitchell warns that these factors likely make pluralism a mirage, and, moreover, that the overarching “hyperindividualism of a full-blown market society” means that the quasi-Tocquevillean “civil society” movement’s confidence in voluntary associations is misplaced. Thus, near the end of a frequently meandering and diffuse book whose motivation is too often obscure, we find a key assumption that should have been stated at the beginning: economics determines politics, and America needs a new “beginning” to achieve the egalitarian promise of true democracy. This tardily announced view clarifies Mitchell’s valorization of the Tocqueville who warned of the stupefaction of individualism and materialism, his attempted anachronization of the Tocqueville who warned of state power, and his near inattention to the Tocqueville who insisted upon preserving a religiously inspired culture of moral self-restraint. Nor does Mitchell adequately address the Tocquevillean teaching that liberty is defended and democracy educated by preservation of standards of judgement not rooted in precisely the kind of modern egalitarianism which Mitchell seeks to advance.
Nelson grapples with the 1960s to the 1980s in New York, focusing on the internal machinations of women’s and feminist organizations involved in the movement(s) to secure reproductive rights. She argues that the reproductive rights movement, generally associated with a white feminist agenda, is one concrete example of how women of color shaped mainstream feminism, through the voices and activism of select groups whose realities and agency alter the discourse. Through this narrative, Nelson tears apart the notion of homogeneity of ideas, politics, goals, and strategies within a movement, whether it be reproductive rights, or any other social movement.

She goes beyond the black/white binary by including women’s activism in the (Puerto Rican) Young Lords Party as well as in the Black Panther Party, while also narrating the work of the various predominantly white women’s groups. In traditional (read white, middle-class) feminism, voices of women of color have been subsumed under the aegis of sisterhood, trivializing, or not taking into account, the crippling effects of class and race. She engages with the larger debates among different groups for inclusion in feminist definitions and discourses through a focused discussion of reproductive rights. As such, a feminist platform fighting for rights to hinder conception and birth faces those women struggling for the right to bear children against historical roots of involuntary sterilization and federally funded birth control clinics. Nelson maintains that defending middle-class women’s rights does not guarantee the rights of poor women. Rather, activism must focus on the most vulnerable women, addressing on current welfare reform policies (186). Fundamentally, the fight should be for the right for women to choose and the availability of facilities to support women’s choices. She proves her point by illuminating those moments where inclusive narratives and platforms have ushered tangible change in policy and looks forward to future activism in the sea of current conservatism.

Nelson points out what her project does not accomplish. The anti-abortion fight does not get consideration. This book is particularly useful alongside Dorothy Roberts’ Killing the Black Body, a detailed study of race, reproduction, and the meaning of liberty for women of color. Nelson cites Roberts’s historical and contemporary focus on the direct battles between racist parties exercising sophisticated methods of reproductive coercion and their targets’ struggles to dodge the blows. Her work centering on black women and Nelson’s work centering on the historical feminist movement complement each other in painting a picture of the differing agendas and activities within this particular social movement.

Yale University

FRANÇOISE N. HAMLIN

Few things are certain in the study of William Faulkner, but one thing scholars can be sure of is company. From the earliest stages of Faulkner’s career, opinion has been various, voluminous, and strident; rich as this critical discourse is, it can also be dazzlingly complex, particularly when taking one’s first steps into Yoknapatawpha County. Along with Richard C. Moreland’s forthcoming Blackwell \textit{Companion to Faulkner}, an unrelated edited collection attending to the fiction itself, Charles A. Peek and Robert W. Hamblin’s new companion to the criticism means that Faulkner readers will soon have two large new single-volume works of major interest.

The editors ostensibly suggest thirteen ways of looking at the Faulknerian critical blackbird, each contributor providing a survey of criticism from a particular theoretical perspective, for instance biographical, postmodernist, textual, or feminist. Reading the collection in sequence, however, one increasingly agrees with Caroline Carvill’s point (in the chapter on feminist criticism) that “Faulkner’s works defy encapsulating in theory,” an observation evinced by both the apparent range of criticism discussed herein, and how paradoxically similar much of it begins to seem, notwithstanding the varying theoretical tools. As such, the directions indicated might more properly be seen as critical nuances than as hard positions; tellingly, for instance, some of the same critics are included in the surveys of historical and formalist criticism (and the immediate juxtaposition of these two chapters is a nicely suggestive editorial move). But if this suggests the sometime repetitiveness of both Faulkner studies and literary theory, it diminishes neither the book’s usefulness as a resource for either, nor the quality of many of the chapters in themselves—it is more valuable as a companion to dip into, as and when, than a book to read cover-to-cover. The styles of the contributions vary, some giving a particular reading of Faulkner with reference to some relevant extant work (these generally the more interesting to read as individual pieces), while others use a more survey-like approach to the body of criticism (these perhaps more useful in the terms of the book they are collected in). Particularly strong pieces, for me, included Doreen Fowler’s chapter on psychological criticism and Pamela Knights’s on reader-response criticism.

Despite the inclusion of worthy chapters on cultural-studies criticism (Peter Lurie) and thematic criticism (Peek), themes as such, tend to get spread a little thinly between the various approaches. Peek points out that race, for instance, has been treated at various junctures, but I still came away feeling that this essential element of Faulkner and the criticism has got rather short shrift, and might have benefited from a dedicated chapter, as might other more “content” oriented approaches. But one can always wish that already encyclopedic books had more in them, and this one largely achieves the laudable goals the editors have set. Given what it is, this will never be the most interesting book on Faulkner one will read; read appropriately, however, it could well be one of the most useful.

University of Essex

OWEN ROBINSON
From John White’s illustrative watercolours of Native Americans to the drama of Benjamin West’s “The Death of General Wolfe” (1770), Elizabeth L. Roark’s contribution to the *Artists of an Era* series provides a whistle-stop tour of artists and artisans from the period of early exploration to post-revolutionary North America. The scope of this project spans three centuries and the target audience for *Artists of Colonial America* is, presumably, a popular readership that has little background knowledge of art history or colonial history. This book is deliberately designed to provide a basic introduction to the field and, as a result, there is little opportunity for Roark to concentrate on a more detailed and sophisticated analysis of each of the artists she chooses to discuss. That said, the ten chapters of this book, each devoted to a different artist, work well together in describing and comparing the variety of drawing, painting, printing and stonework that characterized the colonial era.

Due to the very nature of the project, Roark admits in the introduction that her choices are selective (choosing to focus on artists of European ancestry from the British colonies) and in no way provides a comprehensive guide to the development of art in colonial America. Within what we might call a well-established canon of early American artists, including White, West and John Singleton Copley, for example, Roark proves to be imaginative in her decision to evaluate the aesthetic and cultural importance of printers and gravestone-cutters, specifically John Foster and Joseph Lamson. In these two chapters the role and status of the artisan is addressed and, due to this focus perhaps, in these particular chapters her analysis of art and craftsmanship is, I would argue, the most innovative and successful.

John Foster’s career is particularly fascinating; he was the first printmaker in North America, and his approach to artistic production appears to be based on purely mercantile principles. In seventeenth-century Massachusetts Foster produced a variety of prints, including a woodcut of Richard Mather, a map which accompanied William Hubbard’s narrative of “King Philip’s War,” and a print of the “Man of Signs” (a representation of the signs of the zodiac). In a similar way to Paul Revere, whose work includes prints of the revolution and intricate silverware design (Chapter 8), Roark argues that religious, political and new “scientific” influences were as important to Foster as they were to later, more skilled artists. The intriguing aspect of Foster’s business design, given the religious and political tensions of seventeenth-century Massachusetts, is his unwillingness to let any one faction define his subject matter or his marketability.

The gravestone-cutter Joseph Lamson, a near contemporary of Foster, is another interesting case. In this chapter Roark provides insights into the design of seventeenth-and eighteenth-century gravestones. Since the colonies lacked materials and equipment, sculpture on a European scale was impossible and gravestone-cutting provided one of the only means to work in this medium. Roark delivers informed analysis of Lamson’s relief sculpture, which illustrates his skill as a craftsman and his artistic sensibility, as he expresses in symbolic visual form Puritan approaches to death and the afterlife.
Most striking in Roark’s *Artists of Colonial America* is the recurring transatlantic dimension. In each chapter some attempt is made to establish a connection with European art; Henrietta Johnston’s pastel portraits of the early eighteenth century are described as reflecting the more from Baroque to Rococo, and Gustavus Hesselius’s portraits of Native Americans from the mid-eighteenth century are discussed in terms of his successful attempt to reflect the realist portraiture of Europe. More specifically, the personal influence that Joshua Reynolds had on Copley’s work is well documented, and Benjamin West’s visit to Rome further demonstrates the immediate impact Europe had on talented eighteenth-century American artists. On the whole this is a successful strategy, as it does enable the reader to contextualize the work within a wider framework (which is one of the self-defined aims of the project). However, when John White’s watercolours and de Bry’s etchings are described in terms of mannerist principles, I found the parallel a little overstated.

Roark’s introduction to the major players in Early American art is well organized and well illustrated by the colour plates which reflect the variety of work under discussion. My only criticism might be that at times the social or political context outweighs discussion of individual artworks. To compensate for this to some extent, the selected bibliographies at the close of each chapter do provide a useful guide for further research. Moreover, they hint at the many different books that could easily emerge from the variety of artworks, artistic practice and thematic links which Roark can only summarize in a project of this scope.

*KATHRYN NAPIER GRAY*

*University of Plymouth*

*Journal of American Studies, 39* (2005), 2. doi:10.1017/S0021875805510211


Utopia can mean “good place” or “nowhere.” Reading and/or reviewing a critical work which takes as its subject the acts of reading and reviewing utopian literature threatens to be a bewildering experience fraught with the same sense of stasis, the same sense of anxiety about location (is this a good place?) associated with the utopian text itself. Kenneth Roemer’s text offers ways for readers to navigate, rendering the reading experience an adventure.

It is an adventure through new terrain. This is the first study to use a range of reader-response approaches to define the nature and impact of utopian literature. It asks how readers might turn an author’s utopian *nowhere* into a *somewhere*, and it seeks to answer this by examining how textual, cultural and historical forces – Roemer’s term is “transformational associations” (6) – combine in their infinite configurations to create spaces in which readers can make transformations. Roemer provides a “promotional catalogue” (19) of utopian literature, surveying practitioners as diverse as More, Twain and Le Guin, and texts such as the lesser-known *Ultimo* (1930) by American husband-and-wife team John and Ruth Vassos, who collaborated on narrative and illustrations. Arguing that the hybridity of genre and form
associated with utopian literature make it a fruitful site for investigating reader responses, Roemer takes Edward Bellamy’s *Looking Backward* (1888) as his case study, juxtaposing analysis of nineteenth-century reviews of this utopian text with responses of 733 late twentieth-century readers who completed a questionnaire on Bellamy’s text. In Roemer’s afterword, these dead and living readers congregate in a fictional space, a nowhere, in which their consensus and dissensus on utopia offer ways of understanding how readers do indeed locate nowhere.

Perhaps most impressive, even beyond the combined breadth and specificity of Roemer’s argument, is the way in which this book utilizes the utopian paradigm in which the narrator guides his readers through a strange place. Roemer takes pains-taking care to situate his reader, discussing complex issues in clear, elegant and engaging prose. His preface acknowledges the impossibility of offering a single summary of reader response or of utopian literature; his afterword encourages readers to read and write more on the subject. As Roemer would wish, the journeys will continue, but *Utopian Audiences* insightfully lays the groundwork and indicates multiple points of departure.

*University of Glasgow*

**RACHAEL MCLENNAN**


Emily Rosenberg’s important study examines the evolution of Pearl Harbor as a cultural narrative, a commemorative event, a national symbol, a framing device for contemporary events, and a metaphor in American Japanese relations. Extensive and wide-ranging, Rosenberg explores the contested meanings and discursive struggles surrounding the Pearl Harbor attack across a range of cultural and political production sites – movies, books, magazines, political speech-making, memorial sites, public ritual, television, and the Internet. Importantly, the book concludes with an examination of how one of the most dominant of Pearl Harbor narratives was appropriated by the Bush administration as a discursive frame for interpreting the meanings of the 11 September 2001 attacks.

*A Date Which Will Live* is a penetrating and elegant work of cultural and social history that challenges the contrived distinctions that are frequently drawn between “high” and “low” history, or between so-called “rational” history and “nostalgic” myth. Instead, it explores the intertextuality that exists between cultural memory, historical production, media representation, and public political discourse, and the intense political contests that lie behind the articulation of national narratives. Rosenberg’s study also makes a real contribution to our understanding of the ways in which national symbols and histories are manipulated politically to justify foreign policy orientations to domestic audiences, and how the social construction of threat and danger frequently functions to write identity, maintain internal/external boundaries, and discipline opponents. Notably, the book reveals striking parallels between the treatment of Japanese Americans by the authorities in the aftermath of
the Pearl Harbor attack and the treatment of Muslim Americans since 11 September 2001; to groups caught in the middle of contests over historical meaning, the outcomes of discursive struggles can have devastating material consequences. More broadly, the book reveals how history (or rather the narratives that are constructed around historical events) has affected to re-legitimize and revitalize the practice of the “good war” in American political life in recent years, thereby dislodging the “bad war” narrative that haunted American foreign policy following the inglorious Vietnam campaign.

In sum, this is an excellent book that makes a genuine contribution to the growing literature on the national myths and narratives that lie at the centre of American identity and political discourse. It reminds us that history is never fixed, and that there are infinite possibilities for the contestation of historical narrative and for discursively resisting hegemonic projects. This seems particularly important in a time when history is openly manipulated by the authorities as a means of manufacturing consent for terror wars and draconian domestic security measures.

University of Manchester  RICHARD JACKSON

Journal of American Studies, 39 (2005), 2. doi:10.1017/S0021875805030214


The author’s stated ambition is to combine “political, economic, and cultural histories – with their distinctive methodologies and epistemologies … and to broaden the parameters of what used to be narrowly called ‘diplomatic history.’” (vii) While there is no clear explanation of what constitutes these distinctive methodologies and epistemologies, there is no doubt that the author generally succeeds in effectively drawing together diplomatic, economic and cultural matters into an impressive historical narrative.

Dollar diplomacy was developed and implemented by bankers, financial advisers and government officials as a peaceful means to exert US influence and disseminate good banking, business and commercial practices that would benefit all. From another perspective it promoted US commercial self-interest and greed, exploiting other countries and creating a changing form of informal imperialism. None of this is particularly novel, but the detail provided paints a subtle picture of developments in dollar diplomacy and the author emphasizes the roles of different discourses that “… intertwined with cultural contexts that fostered the growth of professionalism, of scientific theories that accentuated racial and gender differences, and of the mass media’s emphasis on the attractions and repulsions of primitivism” (3).

The author carefully reconstructs the growth of dollar diplomacy from Roosevelt and Taft through Woodrow Wilson and on through the Republican ascendancy of the 1920s. There are important departure points along this way as policy develops, for example the move from government to private arrangements, the adoption of
some practices developed by Britain in Egypt, the gradual accumulation by 1918 of two colonies, two protectorates and four countries over which the USA exercised comprehensive fiscal oversight (92), to the Dawes plan to attempt to stabilize Europe, and the decline of dollar diplomacy as capitalism came under stress at the end of the 1920s. Throughout this the author weaves important threads that illustrate the importance of rhetorical images of masculinity and femininity with positive and negative characteristics respectively attached, scientific expertise and professionalism, and adulthood and childhood, all of which were invoked to promote and justify dollar diplomacy.

While much of this is well done, occasionally the emphasis on cultural tropes does not add much other than an analogy which either does not hold up very well under close scrutiny or else looks a little overstrained: “Marriage, like dollar diplomacy, involved a contract in which the dominant (male) party promised monetary support (loans) and supervision in return for obedience and acceptance of regulation” (73); “Civilized men conserved value by restraining and regulating use: whether the currency of potential value was semen or money, civilized men kept control of the quantities produced” (34).

There is the odd typographical error (30). There is no bibliography, but a comforting number of endnotes. Generally the book is well produced.

This is an impressive scholarly work that will appeal to many interested in economic and political diplomacy with a cultural dimension.

Professor of Politics and Director Institute for Transatlantic, European and American Studies, Dundee University

ALAN P. DOBSON
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Schneiderman and Walsh’s provocative collection of essays develops Burroughs from his usual critical contexts of postmodern aesthetics, beat and queer studies, by proposing him as a prescient social critic in relation to current theories of globalization and resistance. As contributor Roberta Fornari states, Burroughs’s texts are, in this context, “both a warning and a blueprint.”

The book is divided into three thematically based parts: Part I presents essays that read Burroughs in terms of global “Theoretical Depositions,” nicely summarizing the theories the reader will encounter. Timothy S. Murphy elucidates the global politico-aesthetic movements contemporaneous to Burroughs by investigating the connection between Burroughs and the Situationists by way of their “common friend and ally” the Scottish novelist and enfant terrible Alexander Trocchi. And for those in need of a history lesson, Jon Longhi traces the antecedents of Burroughs’ cut-up theory and practice to Dada and surrealism.

Part II, “Writing, Sign, Instrument: Language and Technology,” deals with the materiality of Burroughs’s work—his cut-up experiments with text, image and sound; his typewriters and shotgun paintings. The transdisciplinary nature of
Burroughs’s oeuvre is reflected well here, as in the collection as a whole. Edward Desautels speculates upon Burroughs’s views on computers as a method of surveillance and control, in light of the increasing penetration of the Internet into American homes since the author’s death in 1997.

Part III, “Alternatives: Realities and Resistances,” is organized around the critical miscellany resulting from the meeting of theory and production; from the under-theorized comedy in Burroughs to magic(k) and Lemurian times wars (!).

Some of this seems rather specious even if informative, such as Ron Roberts’s discussion of Burroughs the “High Priest” in relation to Aleister Crowley the “Great Beast.” Roberts’s main proposition rests on their shared advocacy of homosexual sex magic practices as evidenced in their texts, although each author’s case is not thoroughly contextualized and conclusions are clumsy.

Schneiderman and Walsh’s editorial choices are brave, aware they are operating in “a space beyond the familiar safe channels of literary analysis.” In the cranky, Lovecraftian contribution “Lemurian Time War” the Cybernetic Culture Research Unit (Ccru) posit that “Burroughs’s equation of reality and fiction had been most widely embraced only in its negative aspects – as a variety of ‘postmodern’ ontological scepticism – rather than in its positive sense, as an investigation into the magical powers of incantation and manifestation … “[I]t is of course imperative that Burroughs is thought of as merely a writer of fiction. That’s why they have gone to such lengths to sideline him into a ghetto of literary experimentation.”

Ccru’s example is one of several in the collection that experiment with the form of the academic article. Their claims are based on a meeting with a mysterious informant, “William Kaye” and the overall tone is as pranksterish as Burroughs himself, while Desautels’s piece shifts from his insider-agent persona to the voice of Naked Lunch’s crazed tyrant Dr. Benway. Akin to Burroughs’s work, while informed as well as entertained, Desautels gives the reader practical advice and pointers on clueing oneself up to the machinations of the online Powers that Be.

The collection’s diversity of voice means their shared concerns towards globalization and resistance do not seem repetitious and the essays and thematic sections connect together well, with a refreshing dovetailing effect. Overall this is a collection of essays with a clear agenda which potentially is as entertaining and thought-provoking for general readers as for those based in the academy or even outer Lemuria.

University of Glasgow

KATIE STEWART
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The “blog” or “weblog” is a relatively recent phenomenon whereby Internet users post autobiographical hypertext daily or weekly on the web – an online, public diary. Serfaty’s study, one of the first full-length studies in this field, contextualizes the blog from an interdisciplinary perspective. In doing so, she draws on autobiography studies, philosophy and literary theory, but has no direct contact with the authors of
any of the blogs studied. While this does make for a slightly detached, purely theoretical study, Serfaty does achieve her aim: avoidance of the creation of a “hagiography” of “bloggers,” whereby individual writers are valued above others. This non-elitist attitude does of course tie in with the aim of the “bloggers” themselves and, as such, her work focuses on structure rather than content.

Serfaty’s research methods are carefully outlined in the introduction, an important aspect of a study of which the Internet, with its fragmented and transitory nature, is the primary focus. Unusually for an academic monograph, the primary texts in question are readily and cheaply available to readers, and the websites consulted, notwithstanding the fact that some blogs are posted only for a fixed time period, are listed at the back of the book. The lack of close reading, focus on content or biographical information about the “bloggers” is thus generally unproblematic.

Her fourth chapter, “The Private–Public Divide,” is perhaps the most insightful. The concept of a divide not only between the writer and his/her reader, but also between the writer and his/her text, boundary by the computer, which acts as both a mirror and a veil, is fascinating dialogue fundamental to any study of this type of autobiographical writing. Serfaty discusses here the concept of the “implicit” reader, an issue augmented for “bloggers,” who cannot possibly know who will and indeed has read their work although they can and do suggest target audiences at the top of “blogs.”

Overall this book is a persuasive attempt to integrate online autobiographical texts into mainstream academic research. Serfaty is clearly an enthusiast of “blogging” as well as a knowledgeable academic critic. Such a wide-ranging study is of necessity a starting point, and it is to be hoped that future scholars will continue the fascinating work begun here.

Sussex University

TREVOR BURNARD
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Weldon Kees and the Arts at Midcentury has been a long time in the making, originating with the University of Iowa’s Cultural Affairs Council and Stephen C. Foster's Weldon Kees project of 1992. Several contributors then attended a related Kees symposium and exhibition, at the Sheldon Memorial Art Gallery and Sculpture Garden (University of Nebraska), organized by the editor in 1998. They are joined here by other highly reputable Kees champions. Amongst them are Dana Goia, whose article in the 1979 special edition of Sequoia, devoted to Kees, was “the first extended consideration [Kees’s] poetry had ever received”; James Riedel, editor and biographer of Kees; and B. H. Friedman, whose contribution adapts a paper first given at an earlier Kees exhibition in 1979.

The volume contains a broad selection of essays covering Kees’s biography, literary and artistic milieu, critical and cultural reception, and his relation to currents in contemporary criticism. It provides not only a useful introduction to Kees’s life and work, but a challenge to present academic approaches to 1950s culture.
A recurrent theme throughout the book is Kees’s lack of critical recognition. One explanation is Kees’s vigorous interdisciplinarity: Dore Ashton and Irving Sandler, in helpful opening essays, make clear that Kees’s oscillation between different artistic modes was treated with caution at best, and more often suspicion, by Kees’s friends and contemporaries. Moreover, such caution and suspicion was reciprocal, as Kees evaded definitive attachment to any particular circle he moved in.

Both Goia and Nicholas Spencer, in delightfully different essays, call into question current modes of response to “late modernism” and “minor” art. Once again, Kees’s diverse interests must be posited as an at least partial explanation of his academic neglect. Just as Kees would not be tied down to one movement or theory, so too his work evades easy catagorization, so that in a theory-driven climate the significance of his work is unevenly appreciated. Both essays call for new methodologies and receptiveness, currently lacking, in academic study of both Kees and 1950s artistic culture. Indeed, the whole endeavour to which this book is devoted, of rehabilitating Kees’s cultural position, stands as a timely challenge to critics of the arts in the twenty-first-century: how will we develop our discipline? How will we do justice to our rich cultural heritage and in particular that of the past hundred years? The contribution of Siedell and his colleagues is a promising start.

KATHERINE ISOBEL BAXTER


The World Next Door: South Asian American Literature and the Idea of America provides a welcome antidote both to the predominance of studies of Chinese and Japanese American literature in the Asian American critical canon to date, and to the critical tendency in Asian American critical studies to either privilege nationalist perspectives or to rather blithely promote globalism. To date, only four books (Shameen Dasgupta’s Encounters: People of Asian Descent in the Americas (1998), Chelva Kanaganayagam’s Configurations of Exile: South Asian Writers and their World (1993), Lavina Dhingra Shankar and Rajini Srikanth’s A Part: Yet Apart: South Asians Map North America (1998) and Sunaina Maira and Rajini Srikanth’s Contours of the Heart: South Asians Map North America (1996)) have addressed the lives and literary output of this constituency of Asian America. What marks this study as innovative, though, is much more than its subject matter. The book grows out of the question “What is South Asian American writing and what insights can it offer us about living in the world at this particular moment of tense geopolitics and interlinked economies?” (1). Srikanth’s answer is that such an engagement engenders “a discussion of global phenomena against which the idea of American emerges” (ibid.) in a clearer, if less secure, perspective.

The category “South Asian” is defined here, as it usually is elsewhere, to include writers who trace their ancestry to Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Pakistan, the Maldives, Nepal and Sri Lanka, and who currently are resident, or who have been
resident, in the United States or Canada. Thus the book covers all the well-known South Asian American writers of both fiction and non-fiction including Bharati Mukherjee, Amitav Ghosh, Meena Alexander, Michael Ondaatje, Ginu Kamani and Indran Amithanayagam, as well as many less familiar names: Dalip Singh Saund, Zia Jaffrey and Shani Mootoo, amongst others. Amongst the most interesting chapters was “Trust and Betrayal in the Idea of America,” which highlighted the overlooked plight of South Asians in a post-9/11 climate of intercultural distrust, especially the far-reaching and quite devastating implications of the ill-conceived and hastily passed USA Patriot Act (passed by Congress in October 2001) for South Asian Americans, of which I was largely unaware. As a result of reading this very worthwhile study, my bedside table now has three new South Asian authors waiting to be sampled, and I will certainly be receptive to reading many more.

University of Wales, Aberystwyth

HELENA GRICE


This edited collection adds to the growing literature on the group (or to use Irwin Stelzer’s formulation, “persuasion”) known as the “neoconservatives.” It is divided into five sections which define neoconservatism and address its foreign and domestic policies, its intellectual and political origins and its future. It is Stelzer’s goal to “replace heat with light, and separate the truths underlying some of the fears of neoconservatism and neocons from the fantasies.” Indeed, in his lucid introduction, Stelzer goes some way to debunking many of the myths surrounding the neocons, particularly those concerning the distortions and exaggerations of the extent of their power, their roots in the work of Leo Strauss and their sole focus on foreign policy. Given that neocons tend to brag, it is a sobering account not least because it is written by a key (economic) neocon. As for the collection itself, it goes some way to illustrating that neoconservatism is a broad church, as well as the range of neocon thought, which extends beyond foreign affairs, as many would have it. Stelzer also includes a useful list of key neocon individuals at the end of the book, although I take issue with some of his blander descriptions of them. Many familiar and expected contributors are included, such as Irving Kristol, David Brooks, Max Boot, William Kristol, Robert Kagan, James Q. Wilson, Jeane Kirkpatrick and Joshua Muravchik. (But where is Norman Podhoretz, the doyen of the neocons? If Kristol is their so-called “godfather,” then Podhoretz is their leading tactician or “general.”) Yet, at the same time, there are some familiar and unexpected names in here like Margaret Thatcher, Condaleezza Rice, Michael Gove and (yes) Tony Blair. These People are not neocons (and I am not suggesting that Stelzer is saying that they are because he does not) but their very inclusion will uphold some of those very myths and misconceptions that this collection will – paradoxically – hopefully go some way to dispelling (a columnist in The Guardian in 2004, for example, made the absurd claim that Blair was a neocon). I also do not buy Stelzer’s claim that the neocons’ resources “are skimpy by comparison with those of their intellectual
adversaries’, his economy of the truth here belies the fact that far more conservative foundations are funded with far more money than the liberal ones ever were and that even “left-leaning universities” (as he puts it) like Harvard have employed their Murrays and Huntingtons. This collection also does not help to answer the question of why the media, the intelligentsia and the academy are currently so fascinated with the neocons and it is left to future scholars to answer this question. Nonetheless, overall, this collection is an essential primer for any student, or scholar not already familiar with it, of neoconservatism.

Nathan Abrams


This book is really an extension of the work begun by Annette Kolody’s pioneering 1975 book The Lay of the Land, although it goes back to 1956 for its key assumption that America has perceived itself to be “Nature’s nation,” in the phrase of Perry Miller’s Errand into the Wilderness. Cecelia Tichi chooses six examples of how American culture has invested places with images of the body that contribute to “the embodiment of a nation.” Under three sections headed “Crania America,” “Frontier Incarnations” and “Bon Aqua,” Tichi pairs chapters to deal with a historical and more recent example. Her chapter titles indicate her examples: “Mt. Rushmore: Heads of State and States of Heads,” “Walden Pond: Head Trips,” “Pittsburgh at Yellowstone: Old Faithful and the Pulse of Industrial America,” “America’s Moon: ‘A Dream of the Future’s Face’,” “Hot springs: American Hygeia” and “Love Canal: Hygeia’s Crisis.”

Taking an environmental and cultural studies approach, Tichi argues that tropes of environment-as-body, persistent in American culture, have been neglected by scholars since Kolodny because of a distaste for anthropomorphism. But Tichi’s historical contrasts of mediation by different eras beyond the sites themselves reveal insights into the changing states of the national myth itself. She asks, “What interests are served by this identity formation? How and why might certain sites, at specific moments in time, prompt the cultural work of geographic embodiment? What happens when bodily geo-identity is not stable but subject to reinterpretation and reinvention?” What combination of elements, for example, made Walden Pond a focus for the psychedelic “head trips” of 1960s countercultural America? Why did Love Canal come to represent the cancerous body of post-industrial America rather than Woburn, Massachusetts whose town wells were similarly polluted by local industries? Could Love Canal be reframed as a body open to healing and renewal? How might ecofeminism frame this toxic discourse?

Sometimes Tichi’s connections between tropes can stretch the imagination (“The American West was already identified with the moon in the national monument called ‘Craters of the Moon’,” 133). Often the commentary is complex and subtle, as in the conclusion that Norman Mailer’s reclamation of the female moon of dreams from the technological WASP NASA project was actually for his own misogynist
purpose to install her as “heroic mistress.” This is a richly rewarding book that combines thorough scholarship with fascinating journeys of interpretation.

_Terry Gifford_
Former Reader in Literature and Environment,  
University of Leeds


Blending history and literary analysis, this book explores how four of the United States’ “founding fathers,” Thomas Jefferson, Alexander Hamilton, John Adams and James Madison, attempted to come to terms with the increasingly democratic world they had helped to create following the American Revolution. What had the Revolution actually meant? How would their new nation develop? And what would their role in it be? These were some of the crucial questions faced by the founders during the 1780s and 1790s, and the key to understanding how they answered them, Trees argues, is to be found in the “politics of character.” It was in the construction of their personal characters, he says, that Jefferson, Hamilton, Adams and Madison created the models they would employ to reshape the character – or identity – of the nation as a whole. Jefferson’s principal concept was one of “friendship,” Hamilton’s “honor,” Adam’s “virtue” and Madison’s “justice.”

Focussing on four distinct “textual performances” – a 26 January 1799 letter from Jefferson to Elbridge Gerry, Hamilton’s infamous “Reynold’s pamphlet” of 1797, extracts from Adam’s diary, and Madison’s _Federalist #37_ essay of 1787 – Trees is particularly interested in how each of his four founders struggled to negotiate the difficult and contested terrain that lay between public and private life in the early republic. He argues that Jefferson’s politics of friendship created a bipolarized world of friends and enemies that allowed little room for genuine political differences; that Hamilton’s politics of honor narrowed the political world to a small elite, leaving no means for resolving conflicts short of violence; that Adam’s politics of virtue made him mistrustful of everyone, including himself; and that Madison’s politics of justice, although based on a clear distinction between public and private life, continually ran foul of the “cloudy medium” of language itself.

Surprisingly, though, George Washington, the founding father who, for Trees, was “more successful” than any other in constructing his “character” during this period, receives little extended analysis in the book, and that which there is deals not with any of Washington’s “textual performances” but with those of his biographer, Mason Locke Weems. Nonetheless, and even if one does not agree with all his assessments – Is _Federalist #10_ really “underappreciated” as a “masterpiece of political rhetoric and political education”? – Trees still provides an impressive example of how historians can profitably give greater attention to matters of rhetorical invention, genre, style and symbolism.

_Wilfrid Laurier University_  
_Darren J. Mulloy_

This book accompanies a 1999 volume in which Tushnet, sizing up the likely center-right control of the Supreme Court for the foreseeable future, pronounced it high time to undermine the long-standing judicial domination of constitutional interpretation. Favoured instead was a populist reconstruction of the principles of the Declaration of Independence that would promote a more redistributionist and regulatory “social welfare” regime – this rather than recognizing that those principles actually are the quintessential statement of the liberal natural rights – social contract justification for limited government. While maintaining this fundamental dissatisfaction with liberal constitutionalism and the supposed impossibility of the rule of law, the present volume undertakes the more prosaic but scholarly task of charting the contours of the constitutional system since the truncation in the 1980s of New Deal – Great Society statism. The book concludes with advice about how advocates of more welfare state regulation should respond to the constraints placed on their ambitions by the nature of policy formation in the new constitutional order.

Tushnet calls upon an established political science literature to describe the central features of the new constitutional order as divided government (opposing parties controlling Congress and the Presidency), as the ideological polarization but internal unity of the major parties, and apathy and as loose party affiliation among much of the public. In this order the baseline social welfare structures of the New Deal – Great Society era have been neither seriously challenged nor elaborated. For Tushnet this means that the aspiration of the regime for justice has been “chas-tened” because recently more influence is given to such bogeys as the market, individual responsibility and federalism. Apparently a polity has given up on justice once it recognizes that every social ill cannot be remedied by a centrally administered government program. Still, the book’s lengthy chapter on the Supreme Court should help dispel the canard that the Rehnquist era has been in any sense revolutionary. Tushnet shows in great detail that the court has only trimmed at the margins of the doctrines of the New Deal – Great Society order and has not fundamentally repudiated its central commitments. Although Tushnet puts the argument for the existence of a new order somewhat tentatively and allows that currently we may witness merely the stasis of politics within the parameters of a mature order (that of the New Deal – Great Society), his analysis of recent institutional relationships, jurisprudential trends and political culture does suggest that together they constitute a distinct and self-reinforcing pattern.

*Institute for the Study of the Americas, University of London*  
JOHNATHAN G. O’NEILL
In these supposedly postmodern times, the nature of historiography and history itself is consistently up for debate. Can history still be viewed as a grand meta-narrative or is it closer to Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari’s conception of “haecceity,” the molecularization of history into discrete, localized chunks of narrative?

Luckily for us, Professor Wynn gives us both options in a book which is, intentionally or otherwise, as much about the various ways of conceiving and redacting history as about the period under scrutiny. The first part beings with a “Chronology” of dates and events, from the tensions between the United States and Mexico in 1913 up to the attempted assassination of Roosevelt in 1933 and the establishment of the New Deal. Wynn then adds a little meat to the bones in the Introduction, with a narrative outline of the key political, economic, social and cultural movements during the period. Fascinating though the period undoubtedly is, Wynn’s tendency to make bold and largely unsubstantiated statements soon becomes wearing. For example, my appetite was whetted but ultimately unsated by the declaration that during the 1920s “[m]ost of American popular culture turned its back on Europe, looked steadfastly inward, and reflected a mood often misleadingly described as ‘isolationist’” (xli). Which areas of popular culture? And in what way is the appellation misleading? I would have liked to know the answers to such questions.

That the Introduction lacks real analytical depth becomes less surprising, and marginally less frustrating, when one proceeds to the dictionary itself. Here is a typical entry: “KU KLUX KLAN, Originally formed in the aftermath of the Civil War, the Ku Klux Klan was revived in 1915 at Stone Mountain, Georgia, by William J. Simmons, apparently inspired by D.W. Griffith’s movie, The Birth of a Nation” (158). Cross-references are printed in bold type, proclamationg the possibility of a non-diegetic, lateral approach to reading in which narratives and figures overlap and reflect upon each other in unexpected ways, thereby deconstructing a linear, cause – and – effect view of history. Perhaps my expectations were too grand, but to then arrive at the entry for “Griffith, David Wark” (115), only to discover no mention of the perceived racism of his early films, merely repeats the aggravations of the Introduction. One is left with a feeling of incompleteness and the sense that the two approaches – linear and rhizomatic – expose each other’s limitations instead of complementing each other. Moreover, the dictionary, while never purporting to be exhaustive, confirms nothing more than the suspicion that historical recollection is ultimately fragmentary and partial rather than an aggregative testament to intrasubjectivity.

These criticisms aside, if Historical Dictionary from the Great War to the Great Depression is intended to act as a springboard to further investigation of the period then it succeeds. The variety of entries, the sporadic suggestiveness of the cross-references and the impressively extensive bibliography ensure that it just manages to

The reprinting of Howard Zinn’s *New Deal Thought*, originally a volume in Bobbs-Merrill’s American Heritage series, recalls the challenges by revisionists to established New Deal scholarship during the 1960s. Perhaps it is symptomatic of those times that they were taken so seriously. Certainly, it is remarkable how a school based on only a handful of essays could have generated such controversy and have exercised so much influence. Given the dearth of “revisionist” works, Zinn’s introduction of twenty-two pages was appropriated as a vanguard text of the New Left creed. Contemporary readers may wonder that the fuss was all about because his comment appears balanced and his critique of the New Deal rather tempered. However, it is well to remember that *New Deal Thought* was and is a collection of documents, and that Zinn departed from convention by providing his volume with a decidedly dissenting contextual twist. First published in 1966, it pre-dated the work of Barton J. Bernstein, Ronald Radosh and other scholars of the New Left, but in broad outline it anticipated the trajectories of their scholarship.

Zinn was not overwhelmed by the New Deal’s achievements. Despite its accomplishments, it provided only a “skeletal structure” of social reform, avoiding serious liberal initiatives and leaving millions still awaiting “a genuine ‘new deal’.” The New Deal’s achievement was to “refurbish middle-class America” and, despite unemployment of four to five million, began to “sputter” during the late 1930s once the initial crisis had been weathered. The ideals of the New Dealers did not stretch beyond maintaining the traditional structure of the American economy and FDR’s thinking was sealed in “an airtight chamber” impenetrable to currents of Marxism and collectivism which would have enriched the New Deal’s political economy. Zinn uses the figure of John Dewey to serve as a yardstick against which Roosevelt’s experimentalism is found wanting. The contrast between the depression, when “FDR’s ideas did not have enough clarity to avoid stumbling from one approach to another –,” and wartime, when social and economic experimentation was uninhibited, fearless and productive, suggests that Roosevelt’s vision had a crucial ideological component.

Zinn believes that FDR spurned the opportunity to cultivate the political instruments for purposeful change, preferring to work within existing institutions to effect his programme. Unwilling to support candidates to his “left” – such as Upton Sinclair and Gifford Pinchot in 1934 – and half-hearted in his attempt to “purge” the Democratic Party in 1938, Roosevelt made no real attempt to build a coalition of “new political forces” consisting of the unemployed, ethnic minorities and poor farmers, which would have championed a more adventurous and progressive economic and social agenda. Those familiar with Zinn’s *A People’s History of the United
States will register how he would later elaborate his ideas about working-class agency during the 1930s by drawing upon the work of Frances Fox Piven and Richard Cloward.

Of course, the volume is primarily a collection of documents and in this respect it remains a valuable resource. Containing 420 pages of documentation, it is divided into eleven sections which correspond with Zinn’s preoccupations – national economic planning, monopoly power and public enterprise, social welfare, and the interest groups which the New Deal failed to mobilize. It is republished as it was conceived, including the use of the term “Negroes” in the introduction. For a historian who has been resolute that history is instrumental, surely Howard Zinn deserves some editorial tweaking to ensure that his text maintains its relevance?

University of Reading

STUART KIDD