process was, and how, even when it had run its course, important strains of producerism complicated it. For example, building on some of Robert D. Johnston’s The Radical Middle Class: Populist Democracy and the Question of Capitalism in Progressive Era Portland, Oregon (2003), the book argues that even though the producerist emphasis on putting land into productivity diminished substantially, best exemplified by the failed effort to impose a Georgist single tax on unimproved land, producerism did not die. Hydroelectric dams, for example, were high on the Oregon labor movement’s priorities throughout the 1920s and 1930s. Nor did consumerism just appear on the scene in a puff of smoke. Lipin shows clearly that the ease and rapidity of workers’ absorption into car culture—and the hunting, fishing and vacationing it made possible—was a product of the fact that “worker-consumer” is an old dual identity, one we could trace back to the problem of the wage itself.

In short, this is a very good, worthwhile book. My only reservation lies in the fact that as a way into nature and natural resources, Lipin focuses almost solely on fishing and fisheries. There is good reason for that, of course: many urban workers discovered a consumable nature in the form of a fish on the line, and this complicated their relations to commercial fishers. But that focus makes the production-consumption problem a little easier than it might have been if Oregon’s other economy, forestry, had been taken into account. Forest workers do not feature in the book, perhaps because the shift was not so marked for them.

That said, anyone interested in western labor or environmental history will enjoy this book and learn a lot from it. It would also be well-matched with much of the excellent recent work on consumer culture, like Meg Jacobs’s Pocketbook Politics: Economic Citizenship in Twentieth-Century America (2005), especially because of the way Lipin puts the car at the center of the story, suggesting the rich possibilities of an examination of the urban consumption of the rural in the United States. Hopefully, that will be the subject of his next book.

GEoff Mann
Simon Fraser University


This book dispels the notion, common among liberal academics, that Theodore Roosevelt was a racist xenophobe. Rather, Leroy G. Dorsey argues, Roosevelt was an ardent nationalist committed to the idea of American greatness. Roosevelt insisted that America could not be great while some percentage of its citizens owed partial allegiance to other countries or while some swore allegiance to no country at all. To be sure, this made for much overblown rhetoric about the dangers of hyphenates and cosmopolitans. But it also made Roosevelt sensitive in his own way to the alienation within American society of Indians, African Americans, and the poor.

Roosevelt was an ardent exponent of the transformative power of the American frontier. He viewed the frontier as the hothouse of American virtue and the source of the enlightened equality that made the United States exceptional. Roosevelt worried that individuals and groups lacking frontier experience would consequently lack the virtues requisite of self-government. Hence his logical and rhetorical burden in forging one nation from many peoples was to somehow include new petitioners for citizenship into the frontier legend. This burden is what this book is fundamentally about. It depicts Roosevelt defending the eligibility for citizenship of Indians, African Americans, and new European immigrants in terms of their participation in the frontier experience (or some suitable proxy). Readers may be surprised to learn that Roosevelt regarded European immigrants rather than Indians or African Americans as the biggest threat to civic solidarity. With no frontier left at the time of their arrival, immigrants’ transformation into pure and simple Americans remained dubious and incomplete.

It has always struck me that, however pompous, arrogant, and often unbearable Roosevelt may have been, he was not, strictly speaking, racist. Roosevelt regarded hierarchical differences among nations and peoples as a function of culture (or “civilization”) rather than blood. Dorsey confirms this impression in what is to me the most engrossing chapter of the book, chapter four, on the “Negro Problem.” Unable historically to transport African Americans to the frontier, Roosevelt situated them in functional equivalents (war, hunting) where individual exemplars demonstrated African Americans’ capacity for virtue. By focusing on individuals rather than the group, Dorsey suggests, Roosevelt charted a middle ground between intractable racists, who categorically denied African Americans’ capacity for virtue, and starry liberals, who called for granting African Americans full civil and social rights. Dorsey credits Roosevelt with a realistic reading of the temper of his times. His “moderation,” if that is the right word, is certainly alive and well in our times, visible, for example, in the tendency of contemporary conservatives to view individual success stories like those of Clarence Thomas, Condoleezza Rice, and Colin Powell as evidence that the nation has at long last vanquished its racist past.

But what else, besides a few historical parallels, has Roosevelt to offer us? More than an exercise in historicism, this book seems to have been conceived of as an intervention into debates about American civic identity. “The relevance of Roosevelt’s rhetorical discourses in contemporary American society is unmistakable,” Dorsey writes in his conclusion (p. 148). But read this way the book gives the impression of someone arriving at a party long after the party has dispersed. The book poses the question, “what does it mean to be American?” (with no acknowledgement of Michael Walzer’s 1990 essay by that title), thus taking us back

Tom Goyens’s deeply researched study of German anarchists in New York City makes a significant contribution to the scholarship on urban radicalism and immigration history. The author situates his subjects in two contexts: their German homeland, where they had been originally radicalized, and the densely populated urban neighborhoods in New York where huge numbers of Germans settled. (About one in seven New Yorkers, Goyens reminds us, were born in Germany as of 1890.) In immigrant neighborhoods, such as Yorkville and Kleindeutschland on the Lower East Side, Germans fostered a highly organized, left-wing cultural life of immigrant German anarchism: theater groups, self-defense groups, lectures, saloons, choirs, and the German-dominated Socialist Labor Party—anarchism nonetheless constituted a vital subculture. This book can be considered among the most thorough studies of immigrant German radicalism in the English language.

Attentive to diverse, often conflicting, ideas and programs, Goyens skillfully leads the reader through various schools of anarchist thought. The question of violence was perhaps the most controversial issue. Despite longstanding misconceptions, anarchists, Goyens shows, did not uniformly celebrate violence. Many of them opposed “terror” and even its advocates rarely embraced it wholesale. For instance, the firebrand Johann Most, a former Reichstag deputy and the editor of Freiheit, New York’s premier anarchist newspaper, denounced Alexander Berkman’s 1892 assassination attempt on Henry Clay Frick (p. 133). One wishes Goyens would have devoted even greater attention to the question of violence. His one-page discussion of the 1884 “firebug story,” in which a number of anarchists, apparently landlords, torched their own buildings for insurance money, is intriguing but all too brief (p. 119). This “defining incident” surely deserves greater examination.

Goyens’s main purpose is not to explicate anarchist thought, recount factional conflicts, or chronicle the lives of colorful figures like Moe. He does an excellent job at all three, but Goyens seeks primarily to map “the anarchist movement’s geopolitical space,” an original approach to the subject. In doing so, Goyens wishes to show that “German anarchists were no freak phenomenon but rather a small component of the larger immigrant fabric spun across America’s largest urban region” (p. 2). It is not clear which historians have viewed anarchism as a “freak phenomenon” or denied its place in New York history. Nonetheless, Goyens’s method of examining anarchism in the physical spaces in which the movement “moved” (p. 7) is important for understanding this and other radical movements. In venues such as beer and lecture halls, individuals expressed themselves, traded ideas, and forged personal bonds. The anarchist subculture flourished in such “oppositional spaces.” Yet Goyens’s strongest contentions fall short of convincing. He describes anarchist gathering places, such as Justus Schwab’s famous saloon on First Street, as places “of defiance and a space of resistance and revolutionary consciousness” (p. 8). This seems overstated. Did any of Schwab’s customers directly defy or resist anybody when they purchased a glass of beer, argued with a fellow anarchist, or listened to lectures in the back room? Did anyone ever try to stop them from doing so? Greater conceptual nuance and empirical evidence is needed to substantiate such claims. Ultimately, the author concludes that the anarchists failed to “subvert capitalist normality.” Rather, Goyens writes, anarchists were merely “aware of the revolutionary possibilities of . . . space appropriation” (p. 182).

Notwithstanding the persuasiveness of Goyens’s main contentions, he recreates the rich social and cultural life of immigrant German anarchism: theater groups, self-defense groups, lectures, saloons, choirs,