
It takes a brave and learned scholar to undertake a “global history of malaria.” It is a history that antedates the written word and extends into the twenty-first century. It is a narrative of nature and culture, of center and periphery, of microclimates and immune mechanisms. It is a complicated history indeed and by its nature interdisciplinary. This book is part of an environmental history series, but it demonstrates the ultimate elusiveness of that category. It is, by necessity, an economic history, a cultural history, a history of social policy—as well as a micro-history of the human immune system in its changing ecological circumstances. It is a history of yams and fava beans, of irrigation and war, of quinine and Paris green, of slavery and population movements, of public-health debates that have for more than a century turned on the most effective means for reshaping the relationship among human beings, mosquitoes, and the plasmodia that inhabit both.

It is no accident that historians have begun to pay attention to such questions. Anyone who has taught college students during the past decade is well aware of how widely felt such concerns are among undergraduates. There is a still-growing interest in global health, global warming, postcolonial realities, and related economic and environmental issues. Humanity’s Burden also reflects what is now two generations of increasing scholarly attention paid to what might be called historical epidemiology. One thinks of, the path-breaking syntheses of Crosby, McNeill, and their many successors.¹ The strength of Webb’s history of malaria—especially for general readers and most historians—is, in fact, its synthesis of the published literature from a variety of disciplines and sub-disciplines, ranging from parasitology and entomology to African studies and environmental history.

The book is also, by its very nature, a contribution to the canonical history of medicine with its emphasis on ideas and innovations. The history of disease as history of a growing insight into the mechanisms of sickness and health has always been a key aspect of medical history—and thus of public health and public policy. Malaria provides a particularly illuminating instance. Elucidation of the role of parasite and vector did not, and does not, automatically translate into public-health practice. Responses to malaria, like the incidence of the disease itself, are a function of time, place, and resource.

At times, Webb is too facile in applying the conclusions of contemporary scientific knowledge, but he more than compensates for his

¹ See, for example, Alfred W. Crosby, Columbian Exchange: Biological and Cultural Consequences of 1492 (Westport, 1972); William H. McNeill, Plagues and Peoples (Garden City, 1977).
reductionist enthusiasm by his commitment to a multi-level, labile, and interactive presentation of an ever-changing, yet implacably real, subject matter. The ultimate value of this book lies in its providing a circumstantial example of how to think in systemic terms about complex multi-dimensional systems evolving over time. Malaria is actor and indicator, cause and consequence, input and outcome; the histories of yellow fever and anthrax, of tuberculosis and typhus teach parallel lessons of ever-renegotiated interdependence and mutual interaction.

That individual elements in Webb’s argument may be tentative is of little moment (we assume, for example, that our knowledge of the human immune system at the molecular level is a work in progress), compared to his effort to demonstrate interconnections normally unexplored or ghettoized in disciplinary and subdisciplinary job descriptions. Webb’s vision of the historian’s task undermines the coherence of the field’s traditional internal boundaries and helps to define a new readership as well as new disciplinary possibilities.

Charles Rosenberg
Harvard University


A typical list of the American food crops that have shaped the diets and economies of Africans and Eurasians would probably have maize and potatoes at the top, followed by cassava, beans, tomatoes, and tobacco. Most likely, pineapples would be missing. Native to South America, the pineapple spread first to the Caribbean basin, where Carib Indians introduced it to Columbus during his second voyage to the Americas, and then to Europe (despite many obstacles to its cultivation there), Africa, Asia, and the islands of the Pacific. Whereas maize and potatoes took decades to be accepted into Old World diets, only to become primarily foods for the poor, the pineapple caused an immediate sensation for the wealthy. French and British nobles constructed absurdly expensive hot houses for the privilege of putting these treasured tropical fruits on their temperate climate tables.

Okihiro uses this unique quality of the pineapple—its status as an object of consumer desire—as a point of departure for this intriguing book. For Europeans, the pineapple was a symbolic representation of a verdant, fecund, and, above all, passive and feminine tropical zone, contrasted with their own vigorous, active, masculine temperate zone. Thus does it provide Okihiro with a trope through which to explore the historical relationship between the West and its colonies.

The book is stunningly erudite and easy to read; the author demonstrates an amazing range of knowledge. His evidence stretches from
Greek geographers to Alexander von Humbolt’s journals to advertising copy produced by the Dole Fruit Company to illustrations on cruise-ship menus. In Hawaii, Okihiro’s case study, the chain of events that led to the discovery, depopulation, repopulation, and exploitation of the Americas is replayed 300 years later like a recurring nightmare with a slightly different cast of characters.

In other ways the book disappoints. It begins with an attack on “glib assumptions of solid space and inexorable time” and threatens to substitute “historical formations” for the linear progression of time (1). Mercifully, Okihiro does not really follow through on this aim; the book has a fairly conventional narrative flow—beginning with the ancient Greeks and ending with Dole Foods. But a more thorough discussion of what Okihiro means by “historical formations” and how he meant to use them would have been helpful.

Okihiro chooses unusual and potentially interesting units of analysis, but he never provides a satisfactory explanation for them. His world is divided between the tropical and the temperate zones, but his temperate zone is really just a reified version of the West. He does not clarify why his loose geographical distinction is any more informative than more traditional formulations like the North and South or West and East. Had he moved beyond the West in his examination of the temperate zone and considered, for example, Islamic ideas about the effect of climate on human societies, the book might have developed a fundamentally new line of thinking. As it is, his temperate West imagines, exploits, commodifies, and domesticates tropical Hawaii in a not unfamiliar narrative.

Erik Gilbert
Arkansas State University


This ambitious book looks beyond the histories of the nation-states that have dominated our vision and understanding of how the Atlantic world developed, instead highlighting peoples, regions, and stories long considered to be “peripheral.” Focusing on ethnic homelands on both sides of the Atlantic and on three continents, Chávez traces their evolution and transformation over six centuries; examines the impacts of trade, imperialism, colonialism, internal colonialism, decolonization, and federalism; and draws on wide-ranging scholarship.

His study embraces Inuits, Mi’kmaqs, Iroquois, and Cherokees in North America; Tlaxacans in Mexico; Arawaks in the Caribbean; Berbers, Temne, and Wolof in Africa; Canary Islanders; and Basques, Bretons, and Irish in Europe. He shows how European imperialism imposed
new structures, built colonies on homelands, and set people in motion. For example, the Mi’kmaq homeland became the French colony of Acadia, then the British colony of Nova Scotia, and finally a Canadian province. Mi’kmaqs clung to whatever piece of their homeland they could; Acadians found themselves dispersed at the dictates of the British Empire, building new homelands in Louisiana and elsewhere. Attachment to place remained a crucial marker of identity in a world characterized by movement. The globe’s migrants “while looking for a living, always seemed to be searching for a home” (5); sometimes they built new homelands on other people’s, older, homelands. U.S. Indian policies demonstrated that a republic could be just as devastating as the old empires in its disruption and dispossession of native peoples, but Chávez concludes that federalism, in the form of the Iroquois Confederacy, the United States, Canada, or the European Union, offered the best chance for individuals to maintain concentric loyalties and identities.

Such a broad survey inevitably invites criticism from a particular field or region. Chávez is not at his best in Indian country, where he sometimes relies on general secondary sources. He emphasizes that Native Americans envisioned themselves as members of communities—tribes, bands, towns, nations, confederacies—and he recognizes the existence of clans, but nowhere does he discuss kinship as the core of community, the key to identity, and the basis of a different kind of nationhood. He cites the Bering Strait theory of the populating of America but ignores Native insistences that they have always been here. He refers to the Laurentian Iroquois as a single nation, which they were not, and he calls Powhatan a king, which he was not: his was a chiefdom, not a kingdom. The chronology and content of the Cherokee Nation v. Georgia and Worcester [sic] v. Georgia are confused (136), and southeastern Indians were not transplanted into Arapaho lands. In fact, the Southern Arapahos were relocated to Indian Territory on lands surrendered by the southeastern Indians. Such criticisms could be dismissed as nitpicking, but an accumulation of quibbles undermines confidence in a global history built on local histories and detracts from an otherwise welcome perspective on the Atlantic world.

Colin G. Calloway
Dartmouth College

*Smuggling: Contraband and Corruption in World History.* By Alan Karras (Lanham, Rowman and Littlefield, 2010) 199 pp. $34.95

Karras’ *Smuggling* is a small but interesting attempt at synthesizing current knowledge about the role of contraband in world history. Karras’ expertise in Caribbean history is a real benefit in his discussion because few world arenas have seen as much smuggling as this body of water; the mechanics and dynamics of contrabanding were already part of Karras’
“intellectual fabric.” Illegal trade was vitally important to the political economy of this region during this time, and to its connections with a host of other places (Britain, France, Holland, West Africa, and the New World among them). Karras’ clear familiarity with the problems and questions that make smuggling a fascinating institution to study, in the Caribbean or anywhere else, is admirable.

The book is strongest when dealing with the early modern Atlantic and with political economy and theory in general. Karras clearly knows the sources on Atlantic history like the back of his hand; the British archives, both in the India Office and in Kew (the Public Records Office, now known as the National Archives) are gloriously represented in his notes. He has also utilized the French archives, though comparatively less. Karras’ case studies, usually a few pages each, are rich nonetheless, providing “local color” as well as explaining some of the modalities of contrabanding and the importance of smuggling in larger political-economy frameworks.

Karras is understandably less sure of himself in his forays into the world history that lies beyond the reach of his chosen archives. His jumps from the seventeenth-century Caribbean to late eighteenth-century China, nineteenth-century India, or present-day Somalia, etc., feel slightly disjointed. Recourse to a more uniform set of secondary sources to stabilize the vantage points throughout the book might have been helpful in a survey like this one, allowing for greater coverage. Karras himself admits that Latin America is almost absent in his text (Russia and the wider Eurasian landmass is also under-represented, as are Japan or Australia). Despite the merits of his analysis, given his area of specialization, the book floats a little unevenly at times between one approach and another—on the one hand detailed and instructive, and on the other overly general. But the book can certainly be recommended to anyone who wishes to learn about smuggling and its many global contexts.

Eric Tagliacozzo
Cornell University

The Imperial Map: Cartography and the Mastery of Empire. Edited by James Akerman (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 2009) 384 pp. $60.00

This beautifully illustrated collection of essays critically examines the historical relationship between imperialism and cartography. The volume allows for a comparative understanding of imperial representations of space by considering early modern Russian, Chinese, and Iberian colonial designs, along with lesser-known aspects of imperial endeavors by the United States and Western Europe. The Imperial Map questions assumptions about what an empire “looks like” by eschewing familiar Eurocentric visions, uncovering the agency of mapmakers and map readers, and expanding the limits of our cartographical thinking beyond maps.
If maps can help to reveal the ideological underpinnings of empires, differences in cartographical language may suggest alternate approaches to empire building. Valerie Kivelson’s examination of seventeenth-century tsarist Russian maps of Siberia and Laura Hostetler’s survey of maps produced under the Qing dynasty suggest that not all empires silenced alternative and subordinate cultural understandings of space. Whereas British and Spanish maps sought either to render natives invisible or to celebrate the conversion of indigenous populations, Muscovite representations explicitly highlighted Siberia’s complex ethnic and religiousmakeups, because, as Kivelson argues, “Russian status was elevated rather than threatened by the heterogeneity of the subject population” (87). Hostetler demonstrates how the Qing strategically commissioned maps in different cartographical styles that appealed to diverse cultural sensibilities. While the European-influenced Kangxi surveys of the early eighteenth century justified claims to an international audience, domestically, the Qing cultivated its legitimacy over a growing territorial expanse by producing images that were based on long-standing indigenous Chinese mapping methods.

The volume highlights recent trends in the history of cartography by turning attention to readers and makers of maps as problematical agents of empire. For instance, Matthew Edney’s interrogation of the seemingly natural category of “the imperial map” cautions against differentiating maps of colonies from those of national places if they were drawn in the same cartographical mode. Instead, Edney emphasizes the ways in which individuals constructed subjective self-images (be they national, colonized, and/or colonizing) through the making and reading of maps. A map therefore could just as easily serve the purposes of empire as it could those of anti-imperial politics. Much like map readers, mapmakers had agendas of their own. D. Graham Burnett’s examination of the United States Exploring Expedition reveals how hydrographical charts of Pacific islands produced—and were produced through—the disciplining and coercion of the expedition’s crew as well as island natives. As the dramatic courtroom proceedings that open and close the chapter demonstrate, cartographical inaccuracies were employed as evidence of insubordination during navy court-martial trials. Burnett’s study also reminds us that American imperial pretensions in the Pacific started long before 1898. Complementing Edney’s attention to the perspective of the colonized, Burnett shifts his focus to that of the colonizers, namely, the foot soldiers of early nineteenth-century U.S. imperial cartographical expeditions.

Two essays fruitfully examine how changes in mapping technologies, broadly speaking, may have informed how audiences in the heart of empire viewed colonial places. Michael Heffernan comparatively analyzes French and British newspaper maps during the height of these countries’ imperial designs from 1875 to 1925. He demonstrates how the expansion of empire abroad stimulated consumer interest in printed maps at home, driving a new kind of printing technology and visual cul-
ture. Neil Saffer calls attention to the importance of “repositories of spatial knowledge” other than maps, examining the documentation produced by eighteenth-century Iberian boundary-making expeditions in the Amazonia. The charts, epic poems, drawings, and ethnographical reports of Amerindian spatial thinking that appear in Enlightenment scientists’ writings reveal how people tried to make sense of peripheral territories “on the ground.” They also suggest how readers of this material might have colonized Amazonian territories and peoples in their own minds, however unstable European presence was in these loosely held territories.

As Akerman’s introduction rightly points out, no single analytical framework adequately encompasses the nuanced approaches employed by each author. All of the essays agree that maps predictably tend to benefit the interests of those who possess the economic and political wherewithal to commission them. Nevertheless, the authors show that imperial representations of space were far more complex and varied than has been acknowledged heretofore. The naturalization of an “imperial map” image depended on the active imagination and acceptance of agents of empire—the men charged with mapping far-away lands and peoples, the communities who supplied the explorers with resources and information, the mapmakers and printers who composed and disseminated the resulting cartographical images, and the readers who avidly consumed imperial visions.

Lina del Castillo
Iowa State University


For the last thirty years, Drescher has made groundbreaking contributions to the economic, social-political, and comparative history of modern slavery and anti-slavery in domestic and external territories of Britain, France, Brazil, the Netherlands, and Nazi Germany. His new and magisterial work both builds on this previous scholarship and expands it (based on extensive reading in the secondary literature) to the broader premodern world, as well as the modern United States, Spanish America, India, the Islamic Middle East, sub-Saharan Africa, and the Soviet Union.

Unlike Drescher’s previous writings, this book is not organized around a set of analytical arguments but rather traces the rise, abolition, recovery, and virtual disappearance of slavery over several centuries (mainly from 1700 to 1990) in a number of locales (focusing on the Atlantic New World). This narrative represents an argument about the relationship between slavery and capitalist development (consistent with
Drescher’s major monographs) and is punctuated by other specific con-
tentions with other scholars. Although the general account is masterful
and persuasive, there are some problems with both the causal explana-
tion of abolitionism and the care devoted by both author and publisher
to presenting this rich material.

The narrative and (understated) central argument center on stages
of tension between the liberal nature of northwestern European society
(mainly Britain and the colonial/postcolonial United States plus France
and the Netherlands) and its involvement in large-scale plantation slav-
ery. In stage one, c. 1500, slavery was a normal aspect of life everywhere
else in the world (including the rest of Europe). During the rise of their
own plantation economies, these cradles of both liberty and capitalism
maintained a distance between their domestic and overseas social orders.
Eventually, certain social groups began to attack slavery. During the
“Age of Revolutions” (c. 1770–1815), Britain abolished its slave trade
and imposed similar restrictions upon other western nations. Simulta-
neously, the slaves of the richest New World plantation colony, St.
Domingue, freed themselves and established the independent Republic
of Haiti. Drescher notes (against much recent historiography) how both
the continuing vitality of slave-based capitalism and the threats of vio-
lence and economic damage connected to revolutionary politics delayed
the continuity of abolition during the first half of the nineteenth cen-
tury.

Britain ended slavery throughout its Atlantic empire between 1834
and 1838, but the plantation economies of the southern United States,
Brazil, and Cuba flourished. Only when abolitionist pressure brought
about the American Civil War and the much slower death of slavery in
Cuba and Brazil (1888 for the latter) did Atlantic slavery finally end.
Even under British and French colonial rule or diplomatic pressure, slav-
ery expired very slowly in India and tropical Africa, as well as in inde-
pendent Islamic countries. The institution even enjoyed a brief but
large-scale revival in the Stalinist USSR and Nazi Germany (Drescher
stresses the role of Slavic conscripted labor rather than Jewish genocide
targets).

Drescher states emphatically that if moral protest had not ended At-
lantic slavery well before its “natural” demise in favor of ultimately more
efficient free-labor systems, the history of twentieth-century struggles
against totalitarianism might have been different. The ultimate weight of
this argument must rest, however, not only upon a demonstration that
capitalist logic did not dictate the timing of abolition but also upon an
explanation of the forces that succeeded in bringing about what
Drescher once famously labeled “econocide.” In this regard, Drescher
offers only references to the tensions inherent in “the differential devel-
opment of western Europe and the Western Hemisphere” and frequent
evocations of “civil society” and representative political institutions as
the context in which abolition could be pursued (18). Left out is any de-
tailed concern with ideology (he even denies, against David Eltis, that
ideology was the basis for not initially choosing Europeans over Africans
as forced plantation labor) or religion, the modern transformations of
which proved a major vehicle for anti-slavery efforts.

Drescher will also irritate some readers by giving limited agency to
enslaved people or ex-slaves in bringing about their own freedom. He
argues, with considerable evidence, that slave revolts, or fear of them,
widespread as this phenomenon may have been, did not seriously
threaten the institution (the exceptional Haitian case also damaged abo-
litionism) and that blacks best served the cause when they played accord-
ing to the rules of “civil society,” either in nonviolent resistance (putting
the moral onus on the repressors) or as valuable but auxiliary members of
anti-slavery organizations.

Given the importance of this book, the editors might have invested
more in its presentation. Drescher’s extensive references are difficult to
trace, first because there is no bibliography and, second, because a num-er of footnotes are mangled or misplaced. The text could also have
benefited from more careful editing.

Ralph A. Austen
University of Chicago

Staley (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 2008) 494 pp. $98.00 cloth
$38.00 paper

The title of this book involves a well-chosen pun. In displacing Einstein
from the center of a familiar narrative about the relativity “revolution,”
Einstein’s Generation brings to our attention the network of contempo-
rary theorists, experimentalists, and instrument makers who were in-
volved in what the author terms “relativity physics” (in distinction from
a more narrowly conceived relativity theory). Unsurprisingly, given both
the number of people involved and the diversity of their training, that
brand of physics was multifaceted. The first few years after the publica-
tion of Albert Einstein’s 1905 paper witnessed many relativities; the sec-
ond meaning of “generation” emerges as Staley tracks the means by
which a singular narrative about the content and history of relativity was
created through a collective disciplinary engagement that increasingly
cast Einstein as the sole creator of a revolutionary theory.

Einstein is rarely mentioned in the first half of the text, which is
concerned less with either theory or experiment (the staples of much
history of modern physics) than with instrumentation. The central char-
acter for the first several chapters is Albert Michelson, the first American
to win a Nobel Prize for physics and the inventor of the interferometer,
an instrument for making precise measurements of both length and ve-
locity. It is Michelson’s failure to detect the effect of the Earth’s motion
through a postulated ether, for which he is most famous today; Einstein
would eventually make that result central to his own analysis, which jet-
tisoned the ether entirely. Staley, however, avoids a focus on “ether
drift” alone, offering a detailed reconstruction of Michelson’s path to the interferometer and the instrument’s later multiple uses within the broad culture of precision that characterized late nineteenth-century American science. It is an elegant irony that Michelson touted the interferometer’s success in determining the length of a standard meter to remarkable precision after Einstein’s paper destroyed the notion of absolute length and time entirely.

Specialists concerned with the history of fin-de-siècle physics will find much of importance in the second half of the book. The significance of experimental work on fast-moving electrons to the development and reception of electrodynamic theory around 1900 has long been noted. The detailed reconstruction of the material culture of such experiments and the “intimate dialogue between experiment and theory” that Staley provides in this section, however, makes a genuinely original contribution to what might be the best-studied topic in the history of modern physics (258). The book provides the most thorough treatment of the relationship between the cultures of experiment, theory, and instrumentation since the publication of Peter Galison’s *Image and Logic* (Chicago, 1998).

For the nonspecialist reader, later chapters about the uses of history within physics may prove most illuminating. Eschewing the tired critique of the whiggish, teleological histories often written by scientists, Staley’s takes more interest in how history is used to develop scientific content and communal understanding. Looking at the “participant histories” by those who worked in relativity physics after 1905, *Einstein’s Generation* recovers the function of historical analysis as a means of “articulating, clarifying, and stabilizing” contemporary scientific work rather than merely describing or shaping it after the fact (297).

The book’s penultimate chapter, continuing this theme, examines the creation of the most important mode of periodization for both physicists and historians of physics alike—the distinction between “classical” and “modern” physics. The terms, which were co-constructed, carried the weight of multiple meanings until the Solvay conference in 1911 helped to solidify the particular understanding prevalent today. Such is the thought-provoking conclusion to a book that manages to accomplish the rare feat of combining empirical depth with theoretical bite.

Suman Seth
Cornell University


Recently I sat on a habilitation jury at the Université Paris-Diderot. The successful candidate, an authority on mathematics in the Arab world, observed that no one who goes deeply into the history of the exact sci-
ences can emerge as an epistemological relativist. This standpoint is not to deny the great interest in the form by which the sciences were expressed, in the institutions where the sciences were prosecuted, or in the means by which the results were disseminated. But, after all, there are conic sections and algebraic equations across languages and civilizations. What is evident in the more remote past holds a fortiori in the recent past, as Melia contends in this short, popular, and indifferently edited discussion of general relativity and Roy Kerr’s place in it. According to the narrative, accomplishment in mathematical physics—an ideal realm—derives from innate genius, which is insensitive to local context.

In 1963, Kerr’s genius led him to discover an exact solution to Albert Einstein’s field equations of general relativity for a rotating spherical mass, a “metric” that has been used to describe the physics of black holes (the dust jacket of the book depicts Einstein’s hair swirling into a massive black hole, perhaps inspired by the 1979 Disney film of the same name). Kerr, who had matured in New Zealand during and after World War II, left Christchurch, as Ernest Rutherford had done more than half a century earlier, for advanced studies at Cambridge. Like Rutherford, Kerr landed a post in the New World, although he had to wait for a permanent slot at a major university. After camping at the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base (it is worth contemplating why the Air Force would fund and lodge a research group devoted to general relativity), Kerr moved to the University of Texas, Austin, then awash in oil money. There Alfred Schild, a former student of Leopold Infeld’s, had set up a group of relativists, and there Kerr formulated his solution.

The excitement over general relativity in Texas is due in some measure to Einstein’s co-author Infeld, who in 1950 left his adopted home of Canada to head the physics institute in Warsaw, which he developed as a center for research into general relativity. Leopold Infeld visited Texas twice, Austin in 1964 and the Graduate Research Center of the Southwest in Dallas (the nucleus for the University of Texas at Dallas) for most of the academic year 1965/66; his colleagues at the Research Center included Ivor Robinson, André Lichnerowicz, Istvan Ozsvath, Wolfgang Rindler, and Yuval Ne’eman. There were a number of mechanisms by which scientists east and west could meet during the height of the Cold War. Infeld was one of the facilitators for this exchange in physics. Socialist, pacifist, Polish patriot, and Canadian citizen (until asked to return his passport), Infeld was able to pass under the gaze of both the Kremlin and the Pentagon. During this time, Infeld convened international conferences on general relativity, loosely connected to the Pugwash movement. This enterprise, in addition to generating new interest in gravitational physics, indirectly contributed to the ban on atmospheric testing of nuclear weapons and to the strategic-arms limitation talks.

Melia’s purpose is not to elaborate on geopolitics. He emphasizes, rather, that general relativity acquired talented adherents following the experiment in 1959 of Glen Rebka and Robert Pound, who were able to use Mössbauer spectroscopy to demonstrate the Doppler shift re-
required to emit and re-absorb gamma rays from and to iron samples situated at two distinct heights (the very small difference in gravitational field produced a so-called gravitation redshift, for which Rebka and Pound successfully compensated). The experiment, along with theoretical innovations (by Kerr, David Finkelstein, Roger Penrose, John Wheeler, Brandon Carter, Werner Israel, Achilles Papapetrou, Andrzej Trautman, and others), connected with dramatic observations of pulsars to stimulate interest in super-dense astrophysical objects.

Life outside the ivory tower enters episodically into *Cracking the Einstein Code*, via such venues as dismal offices filled with cigarette butts and coke cans. One chapter concerns the murder of a promising physicist, visiting Austin, in the Texas Tower massacre. The segment about Kerr’s developmentally disabled daughter, who died in childhood, suggests that physicists overcome sadness and misfortune by dedicating themselves to abstraction, the proper focus for their genius. Kerr remarried; the U.S. economy stagnated; and nuclear war was somehow averted. But for modern men (only one woman physicist appears in this account, Roza Michalska-Trautman), transcendental ideas provided compensation for a short, mean, and bewildering existence.

The message: In the realm of the sharpest minds, as in the music of Franz Schubert, themes are divinely inspired. Lesser minds, condemned to wash the dishes and deliver the mail, look on in awe. Physicists in urban misery or rural poverty, the Muse can touch your shoulder, too.

Lewis Pyenson
Western Michigan University


In the third and fourth centuries c.e., Caesarea in Palestine witnessed major developments in the metamorphosis of Christianity from a lunatic fringe to the established Church. According to Grafton and Williams, these steps were technological as much as doctrinal: Book design was reshaped to facilitate a particular view of the intellectual place of Christianity. Origen’s *Hexapla* was an innovative codex that presented the text of the Bible in six or more parallel columns containing the Hebrew text next to multiple Greek versions. Eusebius echoed this format to give a tabular presentation of human history in his *Chronicle*, and in other works, he devised new approaches to the use of documentary evidence. The library of Caesarea, which both authors used and helped to create, became an institution for scholarly research and the dissemination of knowledge and Christian propaganda; the ties between the Bishop Eusebius and Emperor Constantine led to a new funding system for scholarship that in return supported the imperial church.
Grafton and Williams offer an engaging account of generally unfamiliar material, deploying an impressive range of evidence and methods. They discuss Origen in the context of the textual studies of Greek philosophers. They use demography to explore the world of early Christian scholarship and life. They examine Alexandrian techniques of exegesis, the study of the Bible by both traditional and Hellenized Jews, the role of patronage in ancient literary life, and the culture of the book in transition from roll to codex and from private home to institutional scriptorium. They show Origen and Eusebius breaking new ground by subsuming “barbarian” materials (Jewish, Samaritan, Egyptian, and others) into the methodological worlds of Greek philosophy and history.

Though a readable introduction to obscure materials, the book may not satisfy experts. Origen’s Hexapla was a technical and scholarly marvel, but no more than one complete copy of it may ever have existed. Eusebius’ Chronicle was difficult to design, but no more difficult to copy than any other book. These were major works, but they did not change the world; even Grafton and Williams do not claim any direct effect on Western European scholarship. Their accounts of much of the technical material (the philosophical schools, the demography of early Christianity, and even the format of the Hexapla itself) each come from one modern source on which they rely to excess; they rarely discuss the primary evidence in any detail, and when they do, they make mistakes. To buttress their claims for Caesarea, they pay little attention to earlier examples of complex texts or sophisticated patterns of dissemination. Institutional structures for the dissemination of Christian learning and texts existed earlier in the East, but ecclesiastical scriptoria in Italy soon took up the task that the government abandoned. Moreover, although Eusebius’ construction of human history in an accessible (and tendentious) form was, through Jerome, hugely influential, writing about Christian historiography without once mentioning Augustine’s City of God seems odd.

There was no one path that led from the Christian Bible to later European scholarship. Oversimplification of this nature can result in a good story, but the reality was much more complicated.

James E. G. Zetzel
Columbia University

La famiglia nell’economia europea secoli XIII–XVIII. Edited by Simonetta Cavaciocchi (Florence, Firenze University Press, 2009) 790 pp. €65,00

La famiglia nell’economia europea secoli XIII–XVIII comprises forty-three essays in Italian, English, French, Spanish, and German (one). In addition to poor editing and, in some cases, inadequate English translation, the volume evinces uneven scholarship. It neither advances new, provocative theses about the history of the family and its economic role in pre–industrial Europe nor applies innovative research methods. That the
history of the family has long been at the center of lively debates and fertile cross-disciplinary collaborations in the humanities and social sciences is not the object of any consequential reflection. Most of the contributions either discuss isolated cases studies or offer a bird’s eye view of a topic based on secondary literature.

Experts in the field will not learn any important new lessons about such classic topics as the transition from partible inheritance to primogeniture, the role of marital alliances in elite class formation, and the function of dowries in commercial and artisanal activities. (Little attention is devoted to peasants, in part because of the paucity of primary sources and in part because of the topics selected by the authors who responded to the call for papers.) Historians of the family may thus wish to consult the table of contents online to determine whether any of the essays pique their curiosity.¹ For non-specialists, the absence of a comprehensive thematic bibliography limits the usefulness of this collective volume. Finally, unlike older proceedings of the conferences held by the Datini International Institute of Economic History, this one does not include a transcript of the Q&A sessions, during which controversial ideas are aired and debated.

The most substantial piece in the volume is Tina de Moor, Jan Luiten van Zanden, and Jacob Zuijerdijin’s study of the credit market in a Dutch mid-size town and its surrounding countryside from 1452 to 1563. On the basis of a large dataset and an initial but revealing comparison with fifteenth-century Tuscany, the authors argue that women of all social strata had considerably more access to capital markets in Holland than in Italy. Although only partially based on original research, other essays nonetheless contribute insightful syntheses and suggest new research venues, particularly Giovanni Ceccarelli’s on marine insurance and Simon Teuscher’s on property devolution in the late Middle Ages. Surprisingly, only one author (Ariadne Schmidt) mentions and engages with de Vries’ concept of “industrious revolution,” undoubtedly the boldest recent reassessment of the economic role of women’s work and the household in pre-industrial Europe.²

Francesca Trivellato
Yale University

¹ http://www.fupress.com/Archivio/*pdf\3355*.pdf.

Political scientists’ presentist and teleological focus on the early modern period as a stepping stone to the sovereign nation-state has long frustrated historians, since it requires a painful simplification of early modern institutional structures and a blatant misreading of early modern forms of political development. In this book, however, Nexon does a splendid job of marrying historical insights to international-relations theory, thereby enriching the former while correcting the flaws of the latter. This combination might not please political scientists, but historians will surely cheer.

Nexon argues that international-relations scholars have erred either by placing too much emphasis on the question of the emergence of the modern state system, or, in the case of the realist school, by using the early modern period merely to bolster their theories of “hegemonic overextension or the workings of the balance-of-power mechanism” (12). Instead, the interesting question—and the main topic of this book—is why the Reformation precipitated such an enormous political crisis in Europe. In addition, he posits two secondary goals—“to assess the status of the early modern period as a case of international change” and “to specify precisely such an analytic framework for the study of international continuity and change” (4).

Nexon first attacks these issues by discussing the current major schools of international-relations theory and analyzing how these theories fail when looking at early modern Europe. He introduces an alternative theoretical framework, which he calls “relational institutionalism” and which focuses on the role of institutions and structures as “networks composed of social transactions” (14). “We can think about any corporate actor in international politics,” he argues, “in terms of its constituent social ties and categorical identities” and view “international politics as nested configurations of categorical identities and social networks” (25, 28). Key to this approach is Nexon’s welcome appreciation for the complexity of the early modern political scene, which was dominated by dynastic agglomerations and other forms of composite states, and his willingness to allow for the role of historical contingency within a larger generalized framework. His points are compelling, and even though international-relations jargon abounds, his careful definition of terms and his use of illustrations make this section fully comprehensible to non-specialists.

In the second half of the book, Nexon presents as case studies a number of historical episodes—the revolt of the Netherlands from Spain, the reign of Charles V, the history of Spain under Philip II and Philip III, the French Wars of Religion, and finally the Thirty Years’ War and Peace of Westphalia—to prove that the Reformation led to a political crisis because it “exacerbated all of the problems inherent in dy-
nastic states” and provided new pathways for “significant collective re-
sistance to dynastic authority” (129, 265). He elaborates this point
throughout the later chapters, using it to make some intriguing argu-
ments about the comparative development of such states as France and
the Holy Roman Empire. It also informs his analysis of international
change. He argues that the Peace of Westphalia and the Reformation in
general were more consequential than political scientists have appreci-
ated, since they ushered in “significant changes in the texture of interna-
tional politics” and dramatically altered “the balance of power among
and within political communities,” and at the same time less consequen-
tial, since the Peace of Westphalia was neither the end of religious and
dynastic war in Europe nor a watershed event in the development of the
sovereign state (287). Thus, Nexton directly challenges not just current
international-relations theory but also the popular historical theory of
“confessionalization,” for he argues that the Reformation was in many
ways merely “an interruption in longer-term processes of state and system
formation” (287; emphasis in original). Such challenging ideas appear
throughout this valuable and impressive work, which will surely spark a
great deal of discussion among scholars of early modern politics and in-
ternational relations.

Tryntje Helfferich
Ohio State University, Lima

Geographies of Empire: European Empires and Colonies c. 1880–1960. By
Robin A. Butlin (New York, Cambridge University Press, 2009) 673 pp. $125.00 cloth $54.00 paper

For the first century or more of its existence as a social science, geo-
ography was closely connected to colonialism and imperial expansion.
The discipline has not, however, experienced the kind of severe self-
questioning about the relationship that has helped to tear anthropology
apart during the last few decades. This immunity may be due to the fact
that the colonial connection has never been disguised, or it may be due
to the absence of a central, defining, and justifying construct like anthro-
pology’s “culture” that could be exploded by postcolonial criticism. In
any case, geography has been spared both the agony and the surge of in-
tense creativity that have transformed anthropology.

This circumstance is immediately apparent in Butlin’s encyclopedic
overview of the connections between geography and empire. In his in-
troductory chapter, Butlin surveys a wide range of approaches to under-
standing imperialism, placing them, when he can, in geographical con-
texts. He describes and comments on ways in which contemporary
geographers have addressed the involvement of their predecessors with
imperialism, but he betrays little evidence of reflection about what this
involvement implies for the basic concepts of the discipline, either in his
commentary or in the works that he discusses throughout the book. For better or worse, the engagement of recent academic geography with the history of colonialism does not seem to have affected the core of the field in a major way.

Most of the book is divided into chapters defined by standard categories of geographical analysis—population size and movement, patterns of settlement and land usage, mapping, transportation, urban areas, and economic and environmental interactions. In each one, Butlin is mainly concerned to identify the interpretive questions about colonies and imperialism that are prominent in the literature on the topic and to summarize important contributions, sometimes adding his own comments and pointing out, if not often resolving, disagreements between the texts that he summarizes. His emphasis on studies by geographers is helpful because such research is often neglected by specialists in colonial history, but he does not ignore the work of scholars in other fields. Each chapter proceeds methodically—even relentlessly—from one discussion to the next—beginning with a description of the sub-topic followed by sequential summaries of several contributions, comments, and then the next sub-topic. More conventionally historical chapters about exploration and geographical associations are organized in the same way. The book is essentially a compendium, an extremely thorough and useful one, but not a volume that most readers (except, perhaps, students using it as a course textbook) are likely to go through from cover to cover. No central thesis is evident, nor does the author claim that he is presenting one. Scholars are likely to find chapters on topics outside their immediate areas of expertise more interesting than ones that deal with literatures that are familiar to them, but the breadth of coverage is so wide that almost all readers will find a great deal that is new to them.

Woodruff D. Smith
University of Massachusetts, Boston

_Selling the Tudor Monarchy: Authority and Image in Sixteenth-Century England._ By Kevin Sharpe (New Haven, Yale University Press, 2009) 588 pp. $45.00

_Selling the Tudor Monarchy_ is the first volume of a projected trilogy that will carry the analysis all the way to the end of the Stuart dynasty. This hefty volume is the one based on the fewest remaining records because print and domestic visual arts were still new during the reign of the Tudors. Not until Elizabeth did councilors understand the power of distributing texts of royal speeches and not until then was a native-born royal portraitist employed by the Crown. Moreover, the brief reigns of Edward VI and Mary I sharply curtailed their abilities to create and sustain a royal image. Indeed, Sharpe’s discussion of the reign of Mary I brings many of the complex analytical questions raised by this book into
bold relief. Conventions for queens differed markedly from those of kings, especially when it came to public appearances and speaking. Sharpe can recover only one important royal speech from this reign, that to the Guildhall during Thomas Wyatt’s rebellion. Moreover, the images of the unmarried queen are more exiguous than those of her with her husband, Philip II. Sharpe poses the central question about image making in this chapter when he reveals the frequently contested representations of Mary by Catholics and Protestants. These conflicting depictions were not done in retrospect but were a feature of the reign itself, especially in print. The queen and her consort were not capable either of controlling cultural representation or spinning interpretation of its meaning. Hispanophobia was not as virulent then as it was later to become, but the queen became doubly tainted by her Catholicism and her foreign husband in the eyes of rabidly Protestant subjects.

Sharpe moves from darkness into the light when Elizabeth accedes to the throne. In this context, his thesis is not novel; the conscious efforts made by the Queen and her councilors to create an association between Elizabeth and England have long been known. “Glorianna,” “Good Queen Bess,” and “the Virgin Queen” were all cultivated images. So too were overt comparisons between her and the female heroines of the Bible, especially Deborah. If Elizabeth were alive today, she would be a movie star, and it would be said that the camera loved her. She had a natural ability to attract and inspire; she could manipulate cheering throngs or veteran parliamentarians, using all manner of public appearances to polish her image. Her speeches are among the most famous in the annals of British statesmen, compared in this book to those of Winston Churchill. She revived the habit of her father of traveling the countryside and compelling the hospitality of her richest subjects. These excursions brought her into contact both with local elites and adoring crowds who lined the roads to catch a glimpse of their monarch. She routinely ended each year’s sojourn with an entry into London where she required the Lord Mayor and all of the liverymen to attend her.

Sharpe mines a rich vein when discussing the political representations of this queen. His chapter on Elizabethan portraiture is an outstanding survey. Although he relies on Strong for much sensible interpretation, he adds his own compelling readings of certain traditional images. Unfortunately, there is no section of color inserts in the book, for Elizabeth’s are among the richest of all royal portraits, especially in their self-conscious iconography. (Hopefully, the upcoming segment on Charles I with its promise of lush portraits by Sir Anthony Van Dyke will have color illustrations.) After reading the portraits, Sharpe attempts to survey the overabundant literature that created one set of myths about the queen. His overarching point about Elizabethan image making is that it was unstable, changing throughout the long reign to reflect both

immediate events and a long range narrative. When she rallied the forces at Tillbury, she was the warrior monarch; when she lashed out at Catho-
lies and Puritans, she was the defender of the Protestant equipoise. She
could pose as a weak woman weeping or as a termagant howling. All of
her moods were reflected in the print culture of the age, one of the rich-
est in all of Britain’s history.

_Selling the Tudor Monarchy_ is an astonishing achievement. Cultural
historians as well as historians of literature and of art will plunder it for
information and insight. One awaits the next installment impatiently.

Mark Kishlansky
Harvard University

_The Empire Project: The Rise and Fall of the British World-System 1830–
800 pp. $38.00

This formidable and magisterial study of the final 150 years of the British
Empire is an extremely useful text, providing a calm and evenhanded
approach to what is potentially a volatile and certainly a complex sub-
ject. Its title, which interestingly casts the story under the comparatively
modest term “project,” as contrasted with the sweeping “world-system”
in the subtitle, signifies that Darwin includes the “informal” empire in
his study, most importantly during the nineteenth century in Latin
America (as well in the United States, too often forgotten) and, in differ-
ent ways, the twentieth-century Middle East.

This is an eminently reasonable book; the story could have been
told with a little more color, given the geographical ubiquity of the Brit-
ish (well illustrated by the book’s maps) and their extensive influence on
world history. As many parts of the former empire would probably like
to forget, the present world owes much to the British, for both good and
ill. What was the project? What was the system? As Darwin states, his
approach derives from the seminal fifteen-page article by Robinson and
Gallagher, “The Imperialism of Free Trade,” written fifty-seven years
ago. A consequent emphasis on geopolitical issues enables Darwin to tie
together the unruly mass of the “project” as Britain enriched, expanded,
and glorified itself and to explain the highly complicated and varied sys-

tem that made Britain’s policies possible.

London was the closest approximation to a world center—more
particularly Westminster, Whitehall, and the City. The British system
was full of both rigidities and flexibilities; its players were politicians,
civil servants, and a complex network of financial, manufacturing, and
shipping interests. It operated on vast tracts of land occupied in varying
degrees by immigrants and indigenous populations. Thankfully, Darwin

does not pay too much attention to the vexed present debate about the effect that the system had on those who lived in Britain itself (that is, beyond the players themselves). Ireland, characteristically, plays an anomalous role in his account.

With extraordinary dexterity, Darwin enriches our understanding of how the British shaped the modern world. Although the parts of the system were extremely different from one another, they interlocked nonetheless, particularly in terms of strategy. Yet, the regions could sometimes hold the mother country hostage because of its strategic and financial needs, especially in the cases of Egypt, the Union of South Africa, and India. In strategic terms, the Suez Canal and the Cape might not have mattered so much had India not been so important to protect. Britain clothed its intent to control India in democratic rhetoric; Darwin presents the tragic climax of India's chaotic independence in 1947 too blandly. His discussions of the Britishness of Canada, Australia, and New Zealand are splendid.

The project and system have now virtually ended, having left a legacy throughout the world. Darwin has, with the use of primary and secondary material, provided a complicated yet clear story and a sophisticated analysis of the forces that drove the British Empire.

Peter Stansky
Stanford University

Murder in Aubagne: Lynching, Law, and Justice during the French Revolution.
By D. M. G. Sutherland (New York, Cambridge University Press, 2009)
316 pp. $95.00 cloth $76.00 paper

Originating as a study of the White Terror of 1795 in the small town of Aubagne, this book raises important general issues about the relationship between popular violence, democratic politics, and criminal justice during the French Revolution. It does so by situating the local history of Aubagne within a larger regional framework of revolutionary politics centered on Marseille and other cities in Provence. The argument of the book is that Jacobinism in this part of France fostered a violent form of democratic politics that transformed factional disputes into a deadly cycle of vengeance and counter-vengeance. Just as lynchings of anti-Jacobins in 1791/92 foreshadowed prison massacres and lynchings of Jacobins in 1795, so did both factions invoke democratic rhetoric to justify popular mobilizations and extraordinary justice in 1793/94. After the Convention abandoned Terror as an official policy, its representatives on Mission to Marseille relied in vain on regular criminal tribunals to redress the injustices committed by Jacobin militants before and during the Terror. The paralysis of normal justice, which characterized the entire period from 1789 to 1795 in Provence, helps to explain the wave of anti-Jacobin violence perpetrated by murder gangs in 1795.
Sutherland has done extensive archival research for this book, which is nearly always based on primary sources. Aubagne is featured in the first section of the book, which presents systematic evidence about the economic and social basis of factionalism in Aubagne (Chapter 1) and a detailed narrative of local struggles for power in this town from 1789 to 1792 (Chapter 2). Social historians will be impressed by Sutherland’s use of census and tax records to prove that Jacobins at Aubagne drew much of their support from poor farmers and craftsmen, while more prosperous segments of the population, including most of the elite, supported the anti-Jacobin faction. Other historians have emphasized patron–client relationships that cut across class lines in the factionalism prevalent in Provence; Sutherland finds tantalizing evidence that factionalism inside the town of Aubagne was based more on neighborhood networks of sociability, perhaps linked to rival confraternities, than on class antagonisms. Nonetheless, the most distinctive feature of Jacobinism at Aubagne was its successful mobilization of the rural section of the commune.

Political historians will find equally persuasive Sutherland’s analysis of how Jacobinism emerged in Aubagne as a popular movement for local tax reform. Led by cultivators who resided outside the town, as well as by townspeople of middling income and social position, this movement brought Jacobins into municipal office in November 1791, albeit via elections contested by the losers. Sutherland might have placed more emphasis on the tactics of the anti-Jacobin faction, which included denunciations and arrests as early as March 1789. These tactics paralleled those used by adversaries of local patriots throughout Provence in the spring of 1789.

This struggle for power was especially intense in Marseille, as Sutherland shows in Chapter 3. In shifting his focus to “Aubagne’s Universe” in this chapter, Sutherland opens up the issue of Jacobin violence, setting the stage for a dramatic narrative in Chapter 4 about lynchings perpetrated by crowds against anti-Jacobins in numerous localities of Provence. Sutherland highlights the regional context for two lynchings that took place at Aubagne in September 1792. Against this background of popular violence, often with the complicity of Jacobin officials who neglected to investigate the murders, Sutherland describes in Chapter 5 the struggle during the spring of 1793 between Jacobins and anti-Jacobins at Aubagne and then at Marseille, where section assemblies responded to Jacobin extremists by closing down the club, replacing the Jacobin municipality, and defying the Convention in an insurrectionary movement that Jacobins denounced as “federalism.” Sutherland makes the important analytical point in Chapter 6, about federalism at Marseille as well as Aubagne, that the federalists resembled the Jacobins not only in their rhetoric of popular sovereignty, as other historians have emphasized, but also in their eagerness to denounce political enemies and to send them before an extraordinary tribunal for judgment without appeal.
Sutherland’s analysis of the Terror in Chapter 7 is titled, misleadingly, “Terror in a Small Town.” Much of this chapter is about the Terror at Marseille, perhaps in part because the only evidence that has survived about the arrest of suspects at Aubagne concerns those sent before the revolutionary tribunal at Marseille. However, Sutherland can be criticized for disregarding William Scott’s *Terror and Repression in Revolutionary Marseille* (New York, 1973), which analyzes the operations of the revolutionary tribunal in great depth, concluding, unlike Sutherland, that it based its judgments on careful examination of written documents, often heard witnesses, and allowed testimonials from friends and neighbors to be read in court. According to Sutherland, the revolutionary tribunal at Marseille delivered hasty justice with minimal procedures and became increasingly vague about the charges that justified a death sentence. Yet he gives a detailed account of only one trial involving defendants from Aubagne, all nine of whom were condemned to death. According to Scott, sixty-five people from Aubagne were judged by the revolutionary tribunal, of whom fifteen were condemned to death. Sutherland does not mention any acquittals and alludes in passing to only one prison sentence—of a mason, Joseph Guillermy, who was released from prison during the Thermidorian reaction and became a leader of the gang that murdered fifteen Jacobin militants from Aubagne in June and July 1795.

Sutherland also fails to mention an attestation that the Jacobin club at Aubagne provided for a cultivator from this commune, Honoré Bens, whom the tribunal acquitted of the capital charge of serving in the federalist army as a lieutenant. After describing this case, Scott adds that the club at Aubagne “gave identical certificates of civisme to other villagers, and, like Honoré Bens, many of them were released by the Tribunal (Scott, 281). By contrast, Sutherland leaves the impression that local Jacobins made no effort to protect townspeople who were sent to Marseille for trial before the revolutionary tribunal.

Sutherland’s analysis of the Thermidorian reaction in Provence as a “Revolution of the Antiterrorists” (Chapter 8) and his detailed investigation of the anti-Jacobin gang that murdered the fifteen Jacobin militants from Aubagne (Chapter 9) are both excellent. Particularly noteworthy are the details that he culls from depositions and interrogations about the murders, the killers, their patrons, and their protectors in the town. Like a detective, he solves the crimes and then, as an historian, he explains why it took six years to bring any of the accused to trial, and why the trial, although handled by a special tribunal, failed to convict most of the killers and acquitted all of their accomplices. The final twist in this story came when the government, now in the firm hands of Napoleon, refused to order the release of those acquitted by the court. As Sutherland comments, the end result of the “grande affaire d’Aubagne” was a type of administrative arrest.

In an insightful conclusion to the book, Sutherland reflects on this failure of law courts to end the cycle of vengeance in Provence during
the Revolution. Revolutionary violence, which Sutherland interprets as a democratic phenomenon in Provence, could not be stopped through normal judicial procedures. It required the firm hand of an authoritarian state, which under Napoleon’s leadership imposed social order on both of the factions that had shattered civil society in Provence with their violent conflicts during the 1790s. This is a fitting conclusion to a fascinating book.

Ted W. Margadant
University of California, Davis

Composing the Citizen: Music as Public Utility in Third Republic France. By Jann Pasler (Berkeley, University of California Press, 2009) 789 pp. $60.00

This exceptional book is cultural history at its richest and most thought-provoking. Though it is a long text, Pasler’s prose is unfailingly engaging, with a strong sense of narrative flow notable for its lucidity, detail, and depth. She offers a survey of French musical culture in the late nineteenth century from perspectives that are different from those in any previous study, taking as her starting point the role of music as “utilité publique.” This approach may sound a little dry as a concept, but its realization is revelatory. Pasler’s thesis is that musical activity of all sorts was an essential component in the revitalization of France after the Franco-Prussian War and the Paris Commune—whether in the realms of high art (especially opera), popular song and dance, or musical accompaniments to public occasions—ranging from state celebrations and political manifestations to trips to the zoo and department store.

Her text is illustrated and illuminated with a vast array of documentary material. One of the triumphs of this book is that it brings these documents vibrantly to life, puts them into a context broader than a purely musical one, and demonstrates that music played a central part in defining French identity during the years following the humiliation of the Franco-Prussian war. It did so thanks to music of all sorts, by composers both unknown—like Jean-Jacque Debillemont, Louis Cesar Desormes, L. Ratz, and Felix Bayle—and known—like Jules Massenet, Léo Delibes, Camille Saint-Saëns, and Maurice Ravel (whose La Valse is the subject of the book’s brief “Coda”). Pasler uses all of them to exemplify specific social or emotional aspects, or ways in which “Frenchness” was asserted. The rewriting for the Opéra-Comique of Ambroise Thomas’ Mignon is a fine case in point, the ending now providing a suitable affirmation of the family values that contributed to making this work a hit (179–183).

Divided into twelve chapters, Pasler explores a number of themes: music as public utility, its use in public instruction and festivals, its role in defining politics and culture, its contribution to a spirit of national re-
newal and pride, its relationship with colonialism and resistance, its central place in popular entertainment and everyday experience (such as informal concerts presented by department stores), its importance as part of an emergent artistic avant-garde, and the significance of “exotic” and “bizarre” music at the 1889 Universal Exhibition.

In other hands, the deluge of documents presented as evidence might have proved intractable, but not in Pasler’s. Pasler presents examples that include a number of entertaining images, such as F. Chaffiol-Debillemeont’s “Marche of the Rajahs” from his incidental music to Jules Verne’s *Around the World in 80 Days* (415), the relatively well-known Alphonse Allais funeral march “for a great deaf man” (539), and a delightful Cham (Amédée de Noé) cartoon depicting the conductor Jules Pasdeloup falling down a staircase made up of Wagnerian marches (281). Pasler’s other illustrations give the reader substance, too, in the form of carefully chosen music examples.

Presentation is exemplary; illustrations are clear and well-captioned; a series of appendixes provide valuable documentary support; and the index is as useful as it is thorough. Surprisingly, even though books, articles, newspapers, manuscripts, concert programs, and other documents are all scrupulously referenced in footnotes, the book has no bibliography. This omission is the only potential weakness in an otherwise highly distinguished publication. This inspiring and brilliantly original book will be essential reading for anyone interested in the broader impact of music in France at the end of the nineteenth century.

Nigel Simeone
Sheffield, South Yorkshire, UK


Rage, set off by the spectacle of social inequality in one of the world’s richest cities, is the subject of this absorbing and richly detailed narration of the life and times of Emile Henry, the young anarchist who tossed a bomb into a crowded Paris café in February 1894, wounding about twenty, one of whom later died. Fifteen months earlier, a bomb that he had placed outside the chief offices of the Carmaux Mining Company exploded instead in a police station, killing five. In May, he went to the guillotine in the small Place de la Roquette, outside the prison by the same name, standing on the frontier between the glittering bourgeois financial center and the darker reaches of the working-class Ménilmontant hinterland.

Henry, who was just twenty-two when he was executed, had moved for several years among anarchists in France, Italy, and Britain, always able to find shelter and sustenance in their semiclandestine cos-
mos of shared beliefs and proud camaraderie. He and his comrades despised the bourgeois capitalist order, deeming it dependent upon the ambient misery of the working masses, though they had no precise idea of what social arrangements might follow its demise or how to resolve the intrinsic contradiction in the notion of an anarchist order.

Henry, however, had no time for fellow anarchists who did not share his belief in the virtues of violence, of “propaganda by the deed.” Errico Malatesta, a far more prominent anarchist than he, had warned about acts of murder inspired purely by hatred. But Henry knew where he belonged in the emerging rift between “associationalists,” who aspired to moderate their members, and “individualists,” who rejected any restraints upon the extremism of their acts. But what kind of violence was warranted? Not all anarchist violence was the same. Auguste Vaillant had tossed a small bomb into the Chamber of Deputies, enough to wound but not to kill, in 1893, and Santo Caserio was to murder Sadi Carnot, the president of the Republic, the following year. François-Claudius Ravachol cast his net more widely, hoping to kill the judicial persecutors of anarchism wherever they lived, no matter what other bourgeois persons went down with them. Henry soon took the notion a step further. He resolved to kill bourgeois tout court, the mainstay of the detested order.

Like most political assassins, Henry denied the immorality of his acts. Louis Louvel, who had assassinated the heir to the throne in 1820, had enlightened his captors in much the same way that Henry did during his last days at the Conciergerie: “What you call crimes others see as acts of virtue.” But Henry, who came to approve of Ravachol’s acts and even more of his motives, exuded similar satisfaction at provoking fear and hatred, as though to announce a motivation that the connoisseur of modern terror instinctively recognizes—to provoke the established order into overreacting, to polarize, and to sharpen the battle lines. Perhaps he does merit the book’s subtitle.

Provoke the state Henry and his fellows certainly did, and the lois scélérates directed at anarchism did much for a while to undermine the liberal credentials of the Republic, equating political crime with villainy. Anarchism became as menacing as anarchists. But voices were soon raised, not to sanctify Henry, whose celebrity even in his own camp was limited, but to decry the futility of demonizing the anarchist cause. In France, the movement dissolved into broader labor and political movements. Henry would have been disappointed.

Can a psychological microscope explain him? Unlike so many of the anarchist extremists, who sprang from wretched backgrounds, he was a bourgeois—perhaps a self-hating one—or perhaps he was just trying to avenge his father, who was sent into exile following his participation in the Commune of 1871. In any event, there was enough discontent in Belle Epoque Paris to explain him without such speculations.

Paul Jankowski
Brandeis University
This ambitious and sweeping work proposes several interrelated corrections to, and recalibrations of, complicated historiographies related to the genesis and goals of Christopher Columbus’ “Enterprise of the Indies” and its relation to early modern European colonialism. According to Wey Gómez, Columbus believed that the Torrid Zone—the belt of the tropics—was inhabitable and passable. Having located the Indies and its riches there, he set out to reach this region by deliberately sailing south as well as west. In other words, “latitude was an integral and explicit organizing principle in the Indies enterprise” (47). Bartolomé de las Casas inherited Columbus’ “open geography,” but, as is well known, he passionately rejected the notion that the peoples of the newly discovered lands were bestial and therefore natural slaves, incapable of self-governance. These conceptions of an inhabited and fertile Torrid Zone and the conflicts regarding the moral and legal status of its inhabitants were fundamental to the “invention of the Tropics” that Wey Gómez views as the essential (and enduring) mark of early modern European colonialism.

Wey Gómez argues that the historical significance of the early modern shifts in this broadly construed conception of latitude must be understood as a “philosophical problem” articulated within the context of learned theoretical conceptions of the “nature of places” that stretch back to Greco-Roman antiquity. Accordingly, he elects not to focus on what might be called praxis—the techniques developed by Portuguese and Iberian navigators and cosmographers in the course of the fifteenth-century to determine latitude.

The thesis unfolds in a series of extended excursions through the history of ideas, organized into seven overlapping chapters. They review well-known sources and narratives, texts generally believed to be read and annotated by Columbus and Las Casas, the Diario of Columbus as copied and interpreted by Las Casas, the medieval fortuna of various ancient models of the terraqueous globe, and conceptions of the location of India and Cathay in pre-Columbian Europe. The goal is to reveal and emphasize the deep historical roots and implications of the “open” geographical system imagined by Columbus and Las Casas in which the equatorial zone, not northern Europe, was central. However, because these excursions are not always tightly or obviously tied to the larger themes of the book, the overall design of the argument is sometimes difficult to follow.

For example, in Chapters 1 and 4, Wey Gómez attaches particular importance to a text that has not traditionally occupied a place in the scholarly analysis of the genesis of the “Enterprise of the Indies”—Albertus Magnus’ De natura loci (c. 1250). In the first chapter, he argues that Albertus, Pierre d’Ailly, Columbus, and Las Casas “uniquely
shape[d] the geographical history of the early Euro-Caribbean encounter” (64). It is well known that d’Ailly’s Imago mundi (1410), long recognized as an important source for Columbus, incorporated sections of Roger Bacon’s Opus maius (1266). Wey Gómez does not claim that Columbus himself knew De natura loci, though he occasionally seems tempted (98, 235), or that the De natura loci was a source for Imago mundi. Instead, his innovation is to propose that De natura loci “crucially informs Las Casas’s explanation of Columbus’s geography and its sources,” and that it provided Las Casas with a model for his own permutations regarding the notion of latitude (64).

In various notes, Wey Gómez provides citations from Las Casas’ Historia de las Indias (written between 1527 and 1561) that may indicate the influence of De natura loci, and he offers an extended discussion of Albert’s conception of place and some of its historical antecedents in Chapter 4. But a close textual analysis demonstrating the direct influence of De natura loci on the Historia de las Indias (or other of Las Casas’ writings) is missing. The possible influence of Bacon on Las Casas’ conception of latitude also merits further consideration.

It may be surprising to conclude about a book of such length that work still remains to be done before its thesis regarding the importance of the idea of latitude for the “enterprise of the Indies” and its historical aftermath can be securely established. More precise textual analyses are necessary; consideration of materials related to the development of navigation in fifteenth-century Portugal and Iberia that Wey Gómez has chosen not to discuss may be crucial to his argument. Finally, the sources of Las Casas’ apologetical writings and his famous disputations with Juan de Sepúlveda have generated a considerable body of scholarly literature that this book does not take into account. Wey Gómez’s awareness that his thesis is provocative and provisional, however, is a notable feature of his book; he presents a credible challenge to rethink the origins and the conflicted legacy of an important historical moment. It will be fascinating to see how other scholars harvest this work and how Wey Gómez moves forward from it.

Pauline Moffitt Watts
Sarah Lawrence College

The Plague Files: Crisis Management in Sixteenth-Century Seville. By Alexandra Parma Cook and Noble David Cook (Baton Rouge, Louisiana State University Press, 2009) 296 pp. $40.00

Reconstructing life in a major urban center during the late sixteenth century, Alexandra Parma Cook and Noble David Cook offer a lively, interesting, and detailed picture of Seville during a short span of multiple crises, from 1579 to 1582. In these years, city leaders faced a variety of

Downloaded from http://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/pdf/10.1162/JINH_r_00100 by guest on 17 May 2021
problems, including swarms of locusts, famine, the royally mandated
quartering of several hundred soldiers, the threat of internal revolt by
Moriscos, and epidemics of both influenza and plague. The authors
chose to examine this specific time period in part because it coincides
with the management of a single governor—Fernando de Torres y Por-
tugal, the Count of Villar—and in part because these years are well doc-
umented by extant records in the municipal archive. The bulk of these
records, and thus the bulk of their study, relates to a plague epidemic in
1582.

The authors’ approach is largely narrative, offering an interesting
tableau of life but no analysis of events. Instead, they follow the docu-
ments themselves, offering translations and summations of what officials
discussed, decided, and then did in response to these myriad crises.
Though not interdisciplinary in its approach or methodology, this work
holds an interdisciplinary appeal in its subject matter. This brief but de-
tailed look into life in Seville illuminates a great deal about the function-
ing of the city’s government, the interaction of residents with city
officials, and the relationship of an urban center to its more rural hinter-
land. Scholars of urban history, public-health history, and economic his-
tory may find this work useful; others will certainly find it interesting.

The emphasis of this book is on the ability of the city’s administra-
tion to continue its work diligently and to deal with constant challenges.
One drawback of the narrative approach is that, despite its wealth of de-
tail, it leaves unanswered questions. To cite one example, the book of-
fers an interesting view of how city councilmen responded to plague di-
agnoses by medical practitioners; they accepted these diagnoses only
sometimes. The authors offer no commentary for why the wine mer-
chant Gonzalo Martín was ordered to leave his house in the city despite
a diagnosis from Bartolomé Hidalgo de Agüero, “one of the most cele-
brated surgeons of his time,” that Martín did not have plague (144). Nor
do they comment on why, in a later instance, when another surgeon di-
agnosed plague in a young girl, councilmen chose to seek a second opin-
ion (204). After reporting the diagnosis of the second doctor that “she
did not have ‘a disease from which there can be danger of contagion, be-
cause it is maturing like a tumor,’” the authors then shift attention to
other events in the city without addressing this resort to a second opin-
ion or the curious conflict that it created (204).

Despite the sometimes frustrating lack of continuity to these stories,
the authors effectively bring to life the people and events of this era. Ul-
timately, this fragmentation of stories may well be an appropriate
reflection of the disruptions or chaos that such epidemics produced,
even when relatively well managed.

Kristy Wilson Bowers
Northern Illinois University

Despite the important role that lawyers have played in the modern period, they have been surprisingly neglected in sociological and historical analyses of what used to be called the “bourgeoisie.” Classic studies have simply lumped them into a larger category of “elites” who were presumed to share basically the same class interests. From this perspective, their role was either to reproduce bourgeois hegemony or, more affirmatively, to act as rational agents of modernity, in Weberian terms. Jacobson’s meticulously researched social history dis-aggregates lawyers from these heterogeneous and functionalist categories, framing them as distinct corporate agents in the major developments of the “long” nineteenth century, from the Enlightenment to nationalism to the liberal and industrial revolutions.

In pursuit of this goal, Jacobson adopts Barcelona as the site for his case study of the continental bar. Barcelona participated in all of the major developments experienced by other European cities—a shared corporate trajectory for the profession, from the liberalism of the early nineteenth century to the conservatism and corporatism of the century’s end. What drove this evolution, argues Jacobson, was the unique corporate interests of the profession, as lawyers worked to adapt to changing power structures. Thus, many lawyers joined the liberal revolution because, as Toqueville once claimed, they wanted access to political power.\(^1\) Moreover, Jacobson insists that lawyers did not simply join the revolution; they helped to shape the direction that it took, in particular, to forge liberalism into what he calls an ethos of the elite and educated. Once the elitist constitutional order had stabilized after the 1830s, the profession took a conservative turn, although Jacobson notes that historians have paid little attention to this trend. This conservatism took shape in the defense of their specific material and corporate interests, which focused on clients, courts, and fees, not markets, prices, and tariffs.

What is unique about the Barcelona case, however, is how the corporatism took a nationalist turn after the 1880s, largely as a result of legal conflicts about centralizing law codes. Although such legal conflicts existed elsewhere, only in Catalonia did they develop into an open conflict that fed the emerging “home rule” Catalanist movement. Once again, Jacobson persuasively suggests that lawyers inclined toward Catalanism not just because it suited their interests; they actively participated in the movement’s construction, which depended as much on their legal disputes as it did on the famed “literary renaissance.” For nationalism to move from literary/cultural celebration to political organization, it must

---

\(^{1}\) Alexis de Tocqueville (trans. Henry Reeves), The Republic of the United States of America and Its Political Institutions Reviewed and Examined (New York, 1855), 298.
appeal to interest groups who have something to gain by it, and who have the resources and prestige to vie for political space. Jacobson asserts that the civil-code compromise of the 1860s in Catalonia largely satisfied the mercantile or industrial bourgeoisie but not the lawyers, who eventually rejected the compromise and opened a battle in defense of Catalan law. This legal defense of Catalan identity preceded the more popular linguistic defense of Catalan, but the two arenas were linked in the nationalist (and jurist) Prat de la Riba’s 1895 manifesto. Given this context, it is hardly surprising that, in the first political Catalanist Union, 30 percent of the deputies were lawyers.

As the first social history of a continental bar, Jacobson’s study has much to offer those legal scholars, sociologists, and historians who do not have a specific interest in Barcelona or Catalanism. As such, it will undoubtedly serve as a model for future efforts to analyze the role of professional groups—lawyers, in particular—during the “bourgeois” century.

Pamela Radcliff
University of California, San Diego


If ever there were a book ideally suited to appear in a digital edition, it is this magisterial study of the social geography of Florence in the first century of the Medici grand dukes. It is no coincidence that it is Litchfield’s work. Litchfield has been on the cutting edge of the use of new technology in social history since the 1960s, and he was early alert to the possibilities of the digital revolution. While shedding light on the urban population that gave birth to the Renaissance, the book uses post-Renaissance sources to chronicle its momentous transformation from a republican citizenry into ducal subjects. The process by which a courtly culture supplanted the rich civic traditions of Florence has broad implications for students of regime change in any period, but Litchfield deepens the political story by attaching it to demographic, social, and economic shifts. He presents the history of a community that became a ducal capital, not just how a new princely family acquired power.

Even more significant, however, is the manner in which Litchfield tells his tale—a series of population maps and commentaries that analyze several state censuses from 1551, 1561, and 1632. These sources mainly count heads of households, often providing specific occupations and locations, as well as rent assessments, for a city of 59,000 inhabitants (growing to 66,000 in 1632). Computerized databases were obviously essential to ordering such a massive number of households, but Litchfield wanted not only to classify but also to locate these units and to show how the residential patterns of specific social groups and occupations changed between 1530 and 1630. For this purpose, he had to design a methodology
for reading urban space socially and to give it visual form. Although the wealth of knowledge already available about the Florentines ultimately determined how he would discriminate, for example, between rich and poor or urban center and periphery, he also employed statistical factor analysis to good effect and developed an online gazetteer to sixteenth-century Florence.

The E-Book format partners brilliantly with Litchfield’s online gazetteer. This magnificent resource is a grid of eighty-seven squares imposed on a 1584 map of Florence; each square is interactive and provides a map detail with descriptions of major monuments and a brief social survey of households. When the author mentions a particular street or building, the reader can simply click on the grid square referenced, see it within the context of the whole urban map, and, if she wishes, go more deeply into the map detail and social description.

The Florentine case teaches us that residential patterns are resilient and that economic factors may be just as influential as political ones in reshaping cities. The book’s real value, however, is to provide a model for how to analyze and visualize a society in transition. As such, Litchfield’s example will hopefully inspire similar studies of other urban communities and ultimately foster a genuinely comparative history of urban change.

Laurie Nussdorfer
Wesleyan University


The Last Witch of Langenburg tells the tale of Anna Schmieg, a cantankerous miller’s wife charged with witchcraft in 1672 after the mysterious death of a neighbor. The neighbor, a village woman who had recently given birth, died in agony on Shrove Tuesday after eating a cake baked by Schmieg. Suspected of witchcraft and poisoning, Schmieg, a quarrelsome and disreputable old woman, became the center of a dogged investigation. Robisheaux ably tells the twisting story of Schmieg’s contest with the local authorities, her community, and even her own family, uncovering the close relationships between supernatural belief and scientific knowledge, between court elites and rural villagers, and between witchcraft prosecution and political and religious order in early modern Germany.

Robisheaux’s approach to the Schmieg case is microhistorical. This methodology, rooted in historical anthropology, focuses closely on small cases and individual experiences in order to gain new insights into larger historical questions.1 In this work, microhistory also takes advantage of

1 For works that explain the microhistorical approach and its development, see Hans Medick, “Missionaries in the Row Boat? Ethnological Ways of Knowing as a Challenge to Social History,” Comparative Studies in Society and History, XXIX (1987), 76–98; Carlo
the competing narratives that surrounded the Schmieg case, including both judicial testimony and village gossip. Deftly weaving together the complex strains of these surviving sources into a gripping narrative, Robisheaux uses a close examination of the accused witch’s experience to shed new light on the most important features of the witch-hunts that were winding down during the late seventeenth century. Thus, he situates Schmieg’s case within the folklore traditions, religious climate, and political situation of the Langenburg region in the aftermath of the Thirty Years’ War and within the complicated web of village animosities, family relations, and gossip networks that defined the old woman’s life.

The book makes a valuable contribution to our burgeoning understanding of witchcraft prosecution in early modern Europe, challenging many of the assumptions about the witch-hunts still current in the historical literature and popular culture. Most importantly, Robisheaux dispels the notion that convictions during so-called “witch panics” were inevitable. Schmieg, maintaining her innocence until the bitter end, came close to beating the charges against her. Meanwhile, the magistrate in charge of prosecuting her pursued the case with careful attention to procedural guidelines and a zealous conviction to his god-given duty to judge her fairly. He was not the benighted, bloodthirsty witch-hunter often imagined.

Robisheaux also demonstrates the close links between the Langenburg court and humble villagers like Schmieg, revealing the permeable border between so-called “elite” and “popular” culture. The count of Langenburg and his officials proved intimately acquainted with village gossip and Schmieg’s bad reputation among her neighbors; meanwhile, the stories of witchcraft that the local villagers recited in their testimony were shaped, in part, by the expectations of magistrates and pastors at court. Furthermore, the Schmieg case was not contained within the tiny village that spawned it; it soon drew the attention of noted jurists and physicians at leading German universities. Consulting these erudite professors for advice, the magistrate in charge of Schmieg’s case engaged the emerging science of forensics, elucidating the close links between science, religion, and magic in a Europe on the threshold of modernity.

The Last Witch of Langenburg offers a fascinating look at witchcraft in early modern Europe, presented in a compelling, suspenseful manner that both engages and enlightens. Robisheaux’s spellbinding account of Schmieg’s story provides a wealth of fascinating insights about early modern witch-hunting that will profit specialists and students alike.
The history of the Holocaust in the Soviet Union has been the topic of much recent scholarship by specialists in German and, increasingly, Soviet history. Greater access to archives in the former Soviet Union throughout the past generation has permitted historians to paint a more variegated portrait of this previously understudied dimension of the Holocaust. Although this vein of inquiry has expanded our understanding of the Holocaust in the Soviet Union by illustrating how the Third Reich layered its genocidal policies over the conquered territory’s frequently violent preexisting interethnic relationships, the Jewish experience there remains comparatively little explored. The recent revised translation of Yitzhak Arad’s 2004 two-volume *The History of the Holocaust: The Soviet Union and the Annexed Areas* from Hebrew provides a synthetic overview of the topic that underscores the Jewish perspective. Arad weaves together polyglot published historical research with an array of archival sources from American, German, Israeli, and former Soviet archives.

Arad approaches the challenge of surveying the Holocaust across the vast and diverse territory that the Soviet Union encompassed on the eve of the 1941 German invasion by dividing his monograph into ten parts. The first six sections provide a chronological reconstruction of the Holocaust in the Soviet Union and its historical background; the last four sections examine important thematic dimensions. Part I provides a compact, yet erudite, overview of the history of Jews in the Russian Empire, the Soviet Union, and the Eastern European territories that the Soviet Union acquired before 1941. Part II probes political and military developments between 1939 and 1941 vis-à-vis the position of Jews in Eastern Europe. In particular, Arad notes perceptively the differing local reactions to Soviet territorial expansion, which frequently promised protection for Jews from Nazi persecution and foreign subjugation for their gentile neighbors. Part III explores Nazi Germany’s ideological commitment to a war against “Judeo-Bolshevism” and its concrete preparations for the murder of Soviet Jewry. The monograph’s fourth through sixth sections reconstruct efforts by Nazi Germany and its allies to exterminate Soviet Jews in various geographical regions, including the Reichskommissariat Ostland, the Reichskommissariat Ukraine, areas of German military administration, and Transnistria.

A key feature of this portion of the book, and an asset to the monograph as a whole, is Arad’s dexterous contrast of the varied experiences of Jews living within pre-1939 Soviet borders with those of Jews living in territories annexed by the Soviet Union prior to June 1941. Arad aptly considers factors like the opportunities for Jewish escape, form and duration of German rule, and the attitude of local gentiles to the mass murder of Jews in this detailed comparison. In the book’s final four sections, he explores topically a number of interesting aspects of the Holo-
caust in the Soviet Union that have been the focus of recent scholarly interest, including German efforts to murder Jewish Red Army prisoners of war and how robbery lubricated the machinery of destruction in the Soviet Union.

Arad’s ambitious attempt to capture the history of the Holocaust in the Soviet Union in a single volume is a welcome contribution to the field and provides a valuable specialized introduction to the complex topic. Despite the book’s merits, two issues detract from an otherwise excellent synthetic work—one being the book’s numerous stylistic issues. For example, Bukovina is spelled “Bukovina” and then as “Bucovina” a page later (42, 43), and Volksdeutsche periodically appears as “Folksdeutsche” (100, 105). Second, and more fundamentally, the book would have been more valuable had it engaged more fully with important research about the Holocaust in the Soviet Union published during the past decade. A dedicated dialogue with such key recent works as Berkhoff’s *Harvest of Despair: Life and Death in Ukraine under Nazi Rule* might have prompted Arad to focus on local gentile–Jewish relations more systematically in his narrative.¹ Notwithstanding these limitations, Arad’s book offers an important corrective to scholarship on the Holocaust in the Soviet Union that all too frequently fails to examine adequately the Jewish perspective.

Eric C. Steinhart
Center for Advanced Holocaust Studies
United States Holocaust Memorial Museum

*Indian Alliances and the Spanish in the Southwest, 750–1750.* By William B. Carter (Norman, University of Oklahoma Press, 2009) 308 pp. $ 34.95

This account examines the historical changes to a millennium’s worth of alliances among Native American groups, both sedentary Pueblos and various foraging groups. Carter uses archaeology, anthropology, ecology, and epidemiology to build his account. His goal is to highlight the continuing importance of foraging peoples in this history.

The first chapter reviews the history of migration of Athapaskan peoples and others into the Southwest. This cogent summary of a vast and changing literature depicts a dynamic region. Next Carter examines the role of changing climatic conditions in the movement of prehistorical peoples and goods. The archaeology and climatology are juxtaposed with origin stories and accounts of the various clan systems. The more nuanced account to follow deals with the four centuries preceding the


² All views expressed in this review are those of the author and not necessarily those of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum.
arrival of Spaniards, focusing on the interactions between the peoples in the Southwest and those on the Plains. Again, Carter describes the role of climatic changes in a highly differentiated geography.

Chapter 4 discusses the Spanish conquest, beginning with an overarching view of changes in Europe, including the Black Death, and the legacy from the conquest of central Mexico. The account examines the effects of various ideologies, though not as the post-hoc rationalizations that they often were. After discussing both resistance and syncretism among various peoples, Carter turns to the early explorations of the sixteenth century, emphasizing how disruptive they were to local cultures, interactions among peoples, and general health. Among his subjects are the evidence of war among Pueblos before the Spaniards arrived, the tensions between exploration and missionizing, the Spaniards’ disappointment at the lack of wealth, and their interpretation of Pueblo ceremonies as “deviltry.”

The next and longest chapter draws on the preceding broad background to recount Spanish settlement through the first seven decades of the seventeenth century, focusing on the effects of disease, the religious sense of diabolism, and increasing church–state conflict about the administration of the colonies. The combination of climate shifts, economic exploitation, and intense missionary work gave rise to several unsuccessful revolts and significantly disrupted the balance of power in many Native alliances.

The final substantive chapter focuses on the Pueblo revolt in 1680 and the prolonged, and violent, reconquest in the 1690s as it affected the Apachean and Navajo peoples. Carter reviews and rejects the many studies that find a primary cause of the revolt; instead, he concentrates on its multiple causes, including a drought in the 1670s.

The book is a solid introduction to the history of Indian alliances. Occasionally, Carter describes “working hypotheses” of archaeologists as solid facts and imputes beliefs to people in history. These lapses mask the many changes in archaeological evidence and the ebb and flow of interpretations. That said, Carter presents a comprehensive account of foraging peoples in the history of the region that is accessible enough for non-specialists and provocative enough for specialists.

Thomas D. Hall
DePauw University

Native People of Southern New England 1650–1775. By Kathleen J. Bragdon (Norman, University of Oklahoma Press, 2009) 293 pp. $32.95

Bragdon’s description of this volume as “a continuation” of her earlier work, Native Peoples of Southern New England, 1500–1650 (Norman, 1996) is much too modest a claim for this volume, which makes an original ar-
argument while weaving together linguistic, ethnographic, and historical (or ethnohistorical) methodologies. Bragdon draws upon decades of work with the Indian languages of southern New England to argue for persistent Native cultural distinctiveness. In contrast to scholarship that employs a tragic frame saturated with loss, Bragdon depicts natives as active participants in shaping vibrant futures despite the many challenges of the colonial encounter: “Cultural distinctiveness . . . did not simply ‘happen’ but was the result of active efforts, including resistance, accommodation, and [cultural] reemphasis” (xv).

Bragdon does that which few other historians and anthropologists have been able to achieve when working with cultures that suffered three centuries of European colonization: She starts with their languages. Never mind that Massachusett and the other languages of southern New England lost their last native speakers a century ago. Bragdon’s claim is that “most scholars have . . . echoed the findings of earlier racist or triumphalist interpretations, that Indians in New England disappeared or were absorbed or were robbed of any meaningful ways of expressing themselves and their groups’ identities” (232). In contrast, Bragdon argues that study of the language opens “a way into social relationships as well” (232). Thus, two initial chapters about native linguistic communities lead to detailed discussions of marriage and kinship, which gives way to modest explorations of race, material culture, and itinerancy, as well as a more extensive examination of the unintended impact of Christian conversion—literacy. Native literacy brought subversive effects, fostering the preservation of distinctive native practices, symbol systems, and communal values. Strangely missing from the work, however, is any mention of the several efforts launched by tribes in recent years to revitalize native languages—an effort that proves Bragdon’s point about the fallacy of narratives of tragic disappearance.

This collection may be tough going for those who are unfamiliar with the narratives of colonial New England’s native history. Bragdon’s style tends toward the episodic, sometimes slighting a full narration of the trajectory of historic events. Specialists might notice that citations for key pieces of evidence mentioned in the text are missing and that citations in the text are not always properly reconciled with works in the reference list.

That said, Bragdon has mastered a wide range of historical sources. Always at the center are the native-language documents from southeastern Massachusetts, which she skillfully integrates with archaeology, colonial history, native oral texts, and other materials. Specialists in native New England anthropology or even colonial ethnohistory will find this volume indispensable, and Bragdon’s able synthesis will likely prove a model case study for those interested in placing language at the center of the lived experience of colonized peoples.

Ann Marie Plane
University of California, Santa Barbara
This short, richly illustrated book describes the historically undervalued role that natives played in providing geographical intelligence to U.S. colonizers. The author notes that Meriwether Lewis and William Clark, James Fremont, Stephen Long, and other expeditionary leaders relied heavily upon topographical information from natives in order to know the direction in which to travel and to draw their own maps. However, none of these leaders highlighted the vital role of native people in furnishing indispensable local knowledge.

In the earliest maps of the eastern Americas, native names abound. The trade-oriented Dutch created highly detailed maps of native communities, as did the fur trading French. John Smith’s famous map of Virginia also provides scores of indigenous names, perhaps to indicate the location of early military allies and enemies. Native informants implicitly played a crucial role in these drawings.

The bulk of the book, however, focuses upon exploration of the American West, based upon expeditionary narratives from leaders and other participants. Sometimes these stories named dozens of native people, whose presence was erased from the map (as with the Lewis and Clark expedition and its famous Map Track). According to a report by a lieutenant in Fremont’s party, a Kiowa native named Tah-Kai-Buhl provided extensive and accurate geographical information about the Red River area, but Fremont’s own memoirs are confused and vague about this point, mentioning only an unnamed Comanche rather than a Kiowa.

Through the accounts of the various expeditions, natives appeared to provide geographical knowledge to colonizers in three manners: first as guides by indicating the correct, or safe, direction to travel; second as informants by orally narrating the relationship between rivers, for example; and third as scene painters by drawing temporary maps (on the ground) and more permanent representations on paper or animal skins. Since cartography specifically relates to creating maps, only the second and third types of encounter fully live up to the title characterization of “cartographic” encounters.

Readers seeking a comprehensive examination of these three key roles of natives in mapping the American West will be disappointed. This book neither intensively discusses areas of specific maps where indigenous contributions were made nor analyzes the relationship between native speech or gesture and colonial writing or drawing. However, this book is intended neither as an exhaustive study nor as a scholarly treatise. Rather, it registers a significant yet often neglected Native American contribution—the importance of indigenous geographical knowledge to mapping the American West—offering examples from...
well-known expeditions. As such, it will provide a popular, accessible introduction to an often-overlooked issue.

Patricia Seed
University of California, Irvine

*In My Power: Letter Writing and Communications in Early America.* By Konstantin Dierks (Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009) 358 pp. $45.00

In recent years, the social practices and cultural forms constitutive of modern letter writing have received increasing attention from historians, who have pursued such varied subjects connected with correspondence as family and kinship, popular literacy, the development of postal communications, and international population movements. Some recent studies of historical epistolarity have profited greatly from interdisciplinary analysis, demonstrating familiarity with linguistics, communications theory, discourse theory, studies of epistolary fiction, and various schools of psychology that examine the nexus of personal identity and interpersonal relations.

Dierks’ elaborately conceived, well-documented study is a significant contribution to the contemporary literature of historical epistolarity. It departs, however, from the direction of much of this recent literature, which has generally been concerned with the liberating psychological and social effects of letter writing for ordinary people, who are thought to have entered the expanding worlds of global modernity through postal communications and authorship of their own texts. Dierks manages to carve out a unique territory within a subject matter that is, for the most part, the frequently surveyed territory of British and Anglo-American middle-class letter writing. This work’s primary inspiration derives more from a wide ranging, critical engagement with the historical literature of the British American colonies, and a profound hostility to myths of American exceptionalism, than from dialogue with other disciplines. What distinguishes Dierks in this book is his interpretation of the normalizing functions of middle-class epistolarity within an eighteenth-century colonial social system founded upon racism, imperialism, genocide, and class and gender inequalities. It is also likely to be controversial and, for many students of historical epistolarity, greatly unsatisfying from interpretive and analytical perspectives.

Dierks’s title comes from the phrase, *in my power,* which he finds repeated often in the correspondence of his middle-class letter writers, for whom the usage signifies an eagerness to use the powers given them by literacy and mastery of the letter form to satisfy their correspondents’ request for a written response. For Dierks, “in my power,” however, emerges as a metaphor for the limitations in self-determination, indeed the self-imposed powerlessness, of the emerging colonial middle class;
middle-class literacy ultimately served only the narcissistic ends of consumption and social mobility. The mastering of letter writing, which often consisted of uncritically copying the forms of contemporary cultural authorities—such as the writers of instructional manuals—made middle-class correspondents more assured of their own virtue. That women and even children could participate served to give the impression of letter writing as an activity accessible to everyone willing to cultivate it, a notion belied by class and racial inequalities, ultimately serving to brand vast parts of the population as inferior. Thus, letter writing tended to create a self-satisfied, largely depoliticized bourgeois social formation, which became the bedrock of a new American civilization, and which was characterized from its inception by an incapacity for self-reflection and a willingness to live with exceptionalist myths of its own and its nation’s moral innocence.

As becomes clear in the author’s afterword, “The Burden of Early American History,” this deeply felt and often passionately argued, if frequently digressive, book is nothing less than a moral intervention in both American historiography and national discourses of American identity. It is hardly just another effort to fill a gap in the literature. One must be grateful for the author’s seriousness of purpose. He means to set us straight as a nation about our guilt, past and present, for a wide variety of crimes, and to offer us a totalizing counter-narrative of the past, which demands, in effect, that all historical phenomena, including personal, interpersonal, and seemingly innocent ones, be conceived both as political and as directly serving functions that sustain the injustices and crimes that are not merely incidental to but constitutive of the American past. Yet it seems obvious that such phenomena as literacy and letter writing could be considered morally multifaceted activities. Moreover, that freedom and liberation in history are the product of a long, illusive and uneven societal evolution, based on dialectical processes that we must struggle mightily and patiently to understand, strikes this reviewer as a morally realistic philosophical basis for approaching the movement of modern history.

David A. Gerber
State University of New York, Buffalo


Herndon and Murray have assembled a fine collection of essays for this anthology, each complementary yet tightly focused on the subject of bound labor. Few collections offer the sense that the contributors are engaged with each other as well as with their readers. Their brief account of the anthology’s history in the acknowledgments for this volume ex-
plains that the essayists have interacted with one another for years. This mutual interest and awareness of each other’s subject matter is evident throughout.

Even the organization of the essays speaks to the book’s careful conception. The editors explain that the system of binding out can be divided into three categories: master–servant relations, parent–child relations, and family–state relations. The essays are divided accordingly, each one hewing closely to this organizing principle according to its category.

Of necessity, binding out can be studied closely only through community studies since it was, as the editors note, “a local institution” with immense variation. Hence, the authors delve deeply into court and other community records of indenture and apprenticeship in a variety of locations. Some of these communities are familiar to specialists in early American history—Maryland and New England, particularly—but this collection also includes examinations of Montreal, New Netherlands, Charleston, and New Orleans. The authors examine the regional variations and the subtle differences of experience that were determined not only by the expected categories of race and class but also by economic cycles, local mortality rates, and migration patterns. These studies are introduced by a provocative essay by the editors and a concluding one by Gloria Main that illuminate and contextualize the book’s themes.

All of the studies are clearly written, thoroughly researched, and devoid of jargon. Among the most rewarding are T. Stephen Whitman’s essay about nineteenth-century Maryland, which shows systems of apprenticeship and slavery flourishing side by side as flexible institutions adjusted to the demands of variable economic conditions, and Murray’s consideration of the children who moved in and out of the Charleston Orphan House. By studying the children in the context of their families, Murray reveals the institution’s permeability.

Caroline Cox
University of the Pacific


In his earlier work, Judd broadened our understanding of the origins of conservation in the United States by focusing on the interests and actions of the common people of rural New England, not simply those of elite sportsmen and intellectuals. In The Untilled Garden, he has opened the tent still wider. If scores of now-forgotten amateur naturalists did not start the conservation movement, Judd argues, they prepared the ground for its acceptance by creating a proto-ecological body of thought about nature and a concern for the environmental consequences of progress. George Perkins Marsh—usually the starting point in the history of
American conservation—does not appear in this volume until the last chapter.

The three parts of the book—each with three chapters—unfold the general trajectory of the argument. The first part charts the coalescence of an American tradition of natural history and scientific inquiry, a tradition unified by an emerging national identity that valued American nature for both its beauty and its commercial importance. The second section describes the natural world as these early scientists saw it. Judd pays particular attention to their view of nature as a set of interdependent parts—a surprisingly modern, almost proto-ecological perspective. In Part III, Judd explores how this view of nature changed to accommodate the ever-more-obvious transformations of the landscape wrought by settlement, allowing these early scientists to lay the groundwork for both the critique of resource use that matured into conservation and the aesthetic appreciation for nature that fueled the American Romantic movement.

To support this argument, Judd relies on the words of dozens of naturalists, crafting what he calls their “collective intellectual biography” (11). Some of these naturalists are familiar, such as John James Audubon or Alexander Von Humboldt, whereas others are relatively unknown, long ignored because of their pre-Darwinian and incomplete understanding of the world around them. Judd does an admirable job of untangling the theological, literary, and historical influences that informed early nineteenth-century science. These forgotten sources anchor the book’s strong argument and allow Judd to delve deeply into the origins of conservation and American Romantic thought. Yet Judd’s devotion to these works sometimes obscures this argument. The long passages describing the lives and labors of the naturalists could have been shortened significantly, resulting in a slimmer, more easily read volume.

The level of detail with which Judd discusses his subject earmarks this book for specialists. Nonetheless, *The Untilled Garden* is a significant contribution to the literature, of interest to those seeking to understand the historical, philosophical, and scientific roots of American environmental thought. As Judd suggests, the ideas of these nearly forgotten naturalists remain “the philosophic grounding for the spirit of conservation in America” (311).

James Feldman
University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh

*Union, Nation, or Empire: The American Debate over International Relations, 1789–1941*. By David C. Hendrickson (Lexington, University of Kentucky Press, 2008) 478 pp. $34.95

In *Union, Nation, or Empire*, Hendrickson insists that the United States is no ordinary country. Founded, in part, as a refuge from European wars
and *realpolitik*, the American colonies came to represent a new kind of international order, a society of states that chose to bind themselves—voluntarily, peacefully, and durably—for common peace and prosperity. This union was not so much a new nation at the start as it was an international system in its own right, which eventually was to develop the characteristics of a coherent nation-state. As Hendrickson explained in his earlier book, *Peace Pact: The Lost World of the American Founding* (Lawrence, 2003), this grand experiment in federation was a bold historical departure. In time, as he explains in this sequel, American federalism profoundly conditioned U.S. interactions with the larger world and became the basis for a distinctive “unionist” approach to international relations.

Hendrickson acknowledges that American debates about international relations have been complex and convoluted. From the outset, leading voices have proclaimed that the pursuit of national advantage and the reach for imperial dominion—certainly not the quest for “union”—ought to be the lodestars of American diplomacy. According to Hendrickson, three distinct and paradigmatic systems of thought—the unionist, the nationalist, and the imperial—emerged in the late eighteenth century and have vied for the soul of foreign policy ever since.

For Hendrickson, the unionist paradigm constitutes the most original and, he implies, the most distinctly American contribution to international theory and practice. Inspired by their own *novus ordo seclorum*, American unionists promoted institutional solutions for the world. Herein does Hendrickson find the deep roots of Wilsonianism. The League of Nations, he contends, did not spring fully born from Woodrow Wilson’s head; it had been in gestation for more than a century. In this context, the proponents of federal solutions ran into a paradox that Hendrickson acknowledges but does not resolve. Insofar as unionists exalted American federation as a model for emulation, they raised the implicit specter of world government. After all, the domestic trend had always run in the direction of centralization and homogenization, especially since the Civil War. But not even the most ardent proponents of institutionalized international comity ever proclaimed world government as a goal. Accordingly, they elided the implications of their analogy, which is more or less what Hendrickson does in his analysis of their thought.

Nonetheless, by offering a broad and systematic explanation of how the “internal” structures of American government have shaped a century and a half of U.S. foreign relations, Hendrickson opens new vistas for diplomatic historians. Moreover, he offers a clear warning to scholars of international relations in other disciplines who might be prone to generalize about the behavior of states in the international arena. The distinctive patterns of American history, Hendrickson insists, have durably shaped American actions in the larger world.

To its credit, *Union, Nation, or Empire* is highly detailed and informed principally by primary sources. But its strengths do not make it
an easy book to read. Although Hendrickson covers almost as much chronological terrain as George C. Herring does in From Colony to Super Power: U.S. Foreign Relations since 1776 (New York, 2008), the book is not a synthesis of existing scholarship; it offers much original research and interpretation. To be sure, Hendrickson has made an important contribution—and not only to the historiography of U.S. foreign relations. By explaining how history and ideas have mediated American diplomatic concepts and choices, Hendrickson makes a powerful case for thinking historically about international relations.

Daniel Sargent
University of California, Berkeley


In Scraping By, Rockman challenges the prevailing story of the early republic as a sanguine period of unfettered opportunity and unprecedented prosperity by charting the history of the men and women, black and white, freed and enslaved, who cleaned the city’s streets, dredged mud, sewed clothes, chopped wood, and dug ditches in early Baltimore. Scraping By is informed by a theoretical claim to apply the mantra of “race, gender, and class” to examine the lives of Baltimore’s population as a collective experience rather than studying the experiences of women, white male workers, and enslaved people as isolated experiences. In this effort, Rockman efficaciously puts into practice a theoretical conceit that has been circulating in academic circles for more than a decade; his motivation for doing so results from his understanding that the capitalistic system of early Baltimore depended on these “multiple simultaneous, and overlapping forms of inequality” (10). More to the point, Rockman emphasizes the experiences of these workers because within the broader field of labor history, their experience as chimney-sweepers, day laborers, plantation healers, and canal men, etc., has often been overshadowed by studies that focus on skilled craftsmen and artisans.

Rockman, avoids the trap of portraying these often unnamed and unacknowledged workers as having a “collective consciousness,” despite their shared socioeconomic position. At the turn of the nineteenth century, what mattered most to these people was finding a stable source of employment. Due to the harsh economic realities of living in Baltimore, the ebbs and flows of the market economy often left people “waiting every February for the harbor to thaw so that low-end jobs might resume” (11). By emphasizing labor as people’s main concern in Baltimore, Rockman circumvents the contemporary focus on questions of “agency” and “resistance” in the field of labor history. Instead, he inves-
tigates the gritty struggle to find any employment, from dredging pounds of foul-smelling muck in Baltimore’s harbor to sewing clothes into the dark hours of the night. Rockman argues that employers were less interested in making distinctions among workers based on race, ethnicity, or gender than in getting reliable workers for cheap pay. That is not say that the workers did not see differences among themselves or that the employers, at times, did not discriminate or pit one group against one another; they often did. Rockman argues, however, that these distinctions were not as fundamental to the social organization of early Baltimore as we might expect.

The creation of this undifferentiated mass of laborers resulted in large part from Baltimore’s unique geographical predicament as “the northernmost Southern city, and the southern most Northern city.” One of the major economic features that separated Baltimore from the South and the North was its peculiar stance on the subject of slavery. Whereas northern cities by the turn of the nineteenth century enacted various manumission laws to end slavery, slavery in southern states, particularly those in the Mississippi Valley and the lower South, began to expand rapidly due to the invention of the cotton gin, the War of 1812, and the forced removal of Native Americans. Baltimore seemed to encapsulate both of these impulses. Due to the rise of industry, slavery became an expensive business investment in Baltimore, and, as a result, gave way to manumission laws. Yet, the institution of slavery continued to thrive in the city, as slaves continued to be bought and sold as “term slaves,” an integral part of the city’s economy.

In general, this economic dynamic contributed to Baltimore’s unique population of workers. In addition to the immigrants, who worked on the docks; the women, who performed the grueling work of laundering clothes; and the white male denizens, who scored a day’s labor as shovelers, carters, or choppers, enslaved and free people of color joined the ranks of those who were employed in the city. The city suffered economically in its conflicting relationship with slavery and in its thorny transition from an agricultural economy to a more industrially based one, growing into the “third most populous city in the early republic” (17). Meanwhile, Baltimore’s moral compass ran amuck. On the one hand, the city strove to offer benevolent support to children, the elderly, and the sick, but, on the other, it trapped them in a growing capitalistic system that thrived on their dependence.

Rockman breaks new ground in the historiography of nineteenth-century almshouses in the penultimate chapter of the book, providing a “richer interpretative model that moves beyond the traditional narratives that characterize the history of these institutions as examples of ‘elite benevolence, social discipline, and pauper agency’” (197). He reveals that admission to an almshouse in Baltimore could depend on the disposition of the superintendent or on the persistence, will, and character of the individual applicant. According to Rockman, inhabitants were well-feed and given clean clothes; visitors from Philadelphia were surprised to
“find that the almshouses did not serve its inmates ‘shins, necks, heads, or other rough meats’” (204). Inmates were usually treated badly and vilified in other cities’ almshouses.

Rockman also contributes to the historiography in his attempt to examine the experiences of the people who suffered at the hands of their employers. In many instances, he takes scraps of evidence about the work that people performed and turned them into poignant narratives about their lives. Nonetheless, the book still raises a number of questions and areas for future research. Other scholars might further investigate the gendered dimensions of economic dependence and labor in early Baltimore, as well as questions of racial formation. Rockman’s mode of gendered analysis does not delve into ideas of femininity and masculinity in Baltimore during these years. Furthermore, he tends to treat race as a fixed category, even though his own evidence reveals the extent to which racial ideology was changing as a result of the War for Independence and of a labor market often explicitly open to either “white” or “colored” employees.

Rockman demonstrates how the experiences of Baltimore’s laboring class sharply contradicted the economic opportunity and political possibility that the War of Independence engendered. Despite the birth of the “new nation,” many in Baltimore’s next generation were, like their parents, just “scraping by.”

Jim Downs
Connecticut College


Scanning and scaling wonderfully rich operational records of charitable and reform institutions representing the range of New York City’s network of private and public poor relief from the 1840s to about 1918, SenGupta examines the social construction of pauperism after the state’s general emancipation of slaves in 1827. She tracks blacks’ scramble for the economic self-sufficiency deemed essential to republican citizenship, alongside the scramble of European immigrants who made Gotham a proverbial melting pot. Her focus falls on those who failed, whose own resources and kindred self-help proved insufficient to meet their needs; she complements that focus with a view of mostly middle-class policymakers and staff who decided who deserved to receive what relief in what forms and under what conditions.

From organizational annual reports, meeting minutes, and correspondence, as well as government census data, press clippings, and promotional literature, SenGupta excavates multilayered human stories. Reading case files, institutional promotional materials, and other records
as cultural texts, she re-creates client biographies as narratives that make relief practices personal. Her forty-nine tables offer comparative demographic profiles to substantiate her racial typology of pauperism in nineteenth-century New York. She identifies who the poor were and explains what it meant to be on relief administered amid competing conceptions that careened from benevolence to a moralism more intent on reforming recipients than on supplying charity.

SenGupta moves from antebellum New York’s “subaltern worlds” to the color of juvenile justice and lastly to black voluntarism. Throughout, she examines the institutional logic of relief offered in varying categories to the poor of various types. In her view, the discourse and dynamics of poor relief in material practices, public proclamations, and symbolic constructions created and negotiated identity for the poor as individuals and as communities. New York’s resulting welfare system perceived and processed blacks differently from whites, whom it instructed to segregate their own racial identities. Poor relief thus served during a contentious era as a means to integrate indeterminate European immigrants as whites into a unified civic community that excluded blacks.

SenGupta deploys a bevy of theories to approach the discourse on welfare as a shorthand for defining race and nation. Subaltern agency largely informs her bottom-up reading of how the poor in general and blacks in particular bent the welfare system to their needs as they confronted a cultural and racial hegemony that sought to marginalize them. The white poor learned to use the system to advance their privileges, and the black poor learned to use the system to advance a pluralism that challenged the power of whiteness. Unitng African-American history, welfare history, whiteness studies, and women’s studies, SenGupta exposes and contests the racialized nineteenth-century imagery of America as an open, competitive, individualistic, monolithic, “white Republic.”

Thomas J. Davis
Arizona State University, Tempe


Majewski’s finely written and astutely argued book should probably have been titled, Attempting to Modernize a Slave Economy. He reveals that secessionists’ ideological commitment to the idea of states’ rights and limited government did not prevent them from advocating a modern slave state that would include government activism, agricultural reform, and economic diversification. In the peculiar hybrid society that was the slave South, most of the Virginian and South Carolinian economic re-
formers whom Majewski studies were also strongly committed to the defense of slavery. Ironically, the existence of slavery hampered the development of railroads and the removal of agricultural practices that reformers deplored, like shifting cultivation. In the end, the Confederate nation discovered that neither cotton nor slavery was king and that its economic and political commitment to both doomed the Confederacy to defeat.

This book will have a strong impact beyond economic history, especially on the political history of secession. Majewski argues that “southern extremists”—like Edmund Ruffin, Muscoe R. H. Garnett, John Townsend, and Robert Barnwell Rhett—used their championship of economic reform to argue for southern independence. A southern nation, they felt, would emerge from northern economic dominance and follow economic policies that would benefit the South and slavery. Many of them were advocates of state intervention in the economy, whether it was agricultural reform, internal improvements as in the building of railroads, or a revenue tariff that would encourage direct trade with Europe. Unlike some recent southern historians, Majewski argues that secession was the result of visions of modernizing a slave economy that would include governmental direction rather than a fear of economic and political centralization. The Confederate experiment in nation building and economic development had antebellum roots.

Despite a “statistical appendix” that will probably interest only specialists, the book’s strong interdisciplinary focus will appeal to all historians of the Civil War and the South. Majewski’s individual arguments concerning agriculture, railroads, and trade are well constructed. However, he might have explored in greater depth the chilling effect of slavery on long-term economic development, to which he alludes several times but does not systematically address. Furthermore, although he convincingly illustrates that most southern “reformers,” at least those from South Carolina and Virginia, were unabashed champions of statist solutions to their economic dilemmas, he chooses not to analyze the theoretical implications of his argument. He refers to them variously as “Hamiltonian,” “capitalist,” and even, much to this reviewer’s surprise, “socialist.”

Majewski concludes that southern slaveholders failed miserably to marry their reactionary commitment to slave labor with dreams of economic modernization. But their vision of a modern “New South” and, one might add, rigid racial subordination would re-emerge in the postbellum era. This book should have an impact not only on debates about slavery and economic development but also on the coming of secession and southern political ideology.

Manisha Sinha
University of Massachusetts, Amherst
In the 1850s, cotton was king and slavery its queen dowager. More than two-thirds of the world’s supply of raw cotton was planted and harvested by African Americans in the lower South of the United States, and cotton constituted about 50 percent of American exports. “A profound statesman,” wrote Cincinnati publisher David Christy, King Cotton “knows what measures will best sustain his throne” and would do just about anything “to defeat all schemes of emancipation” (4).

According to Schoen, cotton planters and the politicians who represented their interests are not best understood as agrarian traditionalists, reacting defensively amid a “crisis of fear” against a “mighty capitalist and modernizing North” (199). Many of them, in fact, did not see free trade and manufacturing as incompatible, and endorsed a communications and transportation infrastructure, so long as it were funded by private capital and state revenues. Sustained by rising cotton prices and a growing European market, Schoen claims, their march toward secession was not motivated by a rejection of economic realism “but an overabundance of faith in it” (10). Although they miscalculated, disunionists had good reason to believe that European powers shared their faith in cotton for global trade. Hence, they cast aside their anti-slavery sentiments to support the Confederate cause.

Drawing on an impressive array of primary sources, including printed speeches, periodicals, pamphlets, newspapers, and personal correspondence, *The Fragile Fabric of Union* (despite its leaden prose) is a useful corrective to accounts that emphasize dependency and isolation in southern economics and politics. Nonetheless, Schoen’s argument is not entirely persuasive. He acknowledges, for example, that without the Panic of 1839, cotton producers might not have succeeded in diversifying the economy of the South. After all, he writes, the disproportionate investment in land and slaves that historians and economists have seen as a drag on commercial and industrial development “remained in place.” By building canals and railroads, moreover, the North already had a lock on trade with the Midwest. Thus, even if enlightened elites called them strengths, the economic institutions of the South actually posed systemic problems.

Nor does Schoen pay sufficient attention to the role—and motivation—of southerners unconnected with the cotton trade in the perpetuation of slavery and the onset of the Civil War. How did they balance interest and ideology in deciding “to end one experiment with federalism and begin another” (5)? Even if, as Schoen indicates, the cotton trade was essential at first to the re-conceptualization of “the peculiar institution” as necessary, natural, and good, did not slavery emerge as an abstract ideal—and an independent variable—by the middle of the nineteenth century?
Some southerners may not have been as “inextricably materialist” as Schoen deems them. But in this provocative book, he forces historians who have not done so already to discount “Lost Cause” lore and pay greater attention to southerners who thought they could use their monopoly in raw cotton as leverage to advance the interests of their region in the larger world.

Glenn C. Altschuler
Cornell University


This new study of John Brown, the famous abolitionist leader of the raid on Harper’s Ferry in 1859, is a major contribution to American studies. McGlone’s distinctive contribution is his use of psychological theory in both the evaluation of evidence and the interpretation of his subject. For example, he questions the reliability of the personal reminiscences on which many biographers have relied, since research has shown that such accounts often include “rescripting” of the past—that is, “gaps in memory . . . filled by ‘default’ data from ‘scripts’ or standardized expectations” (114). More broadly, McGlone draws on psychology in the quest to understand Brown’s personality and motives. After the raid, the popular assumption was that Brown was insane, or, at least, as a common diagnosis of the era put it, a “monomaniac,” unable to think or act rationally on the subject of slavery. Some historians have made similar arguments: Nevins, for one, wrote that Brown suffered from “reasoning insanity, a branch of paranoia.”¹ McGlone turns to the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders to assess such claims.² He argues, plausibly, that by using Brown’s own correspondence and other evidence, “the historian may gather data that permits” an approximation of the sort of interview that a clinician would use to diagnose mental disorder (388, n. 8). His conclusion is that in neither his writings nor his behavior did Brown exhibit symptoms that would lead today to a diagnosis of serious mental illness.

If not illness, then what was behind Brown’s actions? McGlone stresses family—not just Brown’s large immediate family but the extensive Brown “connection” headed by his father, Owen. John, Owen’s eldest surviving son, grew up with, but failed to meet, his father’s high expectations for him. He never completed schooling for the ministry and failed in many business ventures. In his most original and effective analysis, McGlone turns to the classic writings of William James to sug-

¹ Allan Nevins, The Emergence of Lincoln. II. Prologue to Civil War, 1859–1861 (New York, 1950), 77.
² American Psychiatric Association, Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (Washington, D.C., 2000).
gest that Brown, whose “imagination was essentially religious,” was a kind of “‘sick soul’ for whom the vanity of mortal things, the sense of sin, and the perception that the natural world was ‘double-faced and unhomelike’ could produce despondency” (197–198).

Brown followed his grown sons to Kansas in 1856, to help them settle and only secondarily to help to keep Kansas a free territory. Not long after he arrived, Owen died, releasing John from one burden but replacing it with a patriarchal burden. McGlone argues that the notorious murders of five unarmed pro-slavery settlers, by Brown and a few followers, was Brown’s response to perceived threats against his family from the five victims. In Kansas, Brown “found a calling that reconciled his ambitions, healed his psyche, and renewed his purpose” (198). He would become “God’s Reaper,” a destroyer of slavery. He began with plans to promote widespread escapes of slaves into Canada and then came up with the idea of a raid that would culminate in the establishment of an area of freedom in the Appalachians. Controlled by freed slaves, this area would become a magnet for runaways and eventually trigger slavery’s collapse. McGlone also speculates that Brown may have believed that the raid itself would terrorize southern slaveholders. When the raid failed, Brown “lifted his cause to the heights by embracing death as a martyr” (198).

McGlone’s study is the product of many years of research and writing. He has thought carefully about both psychology and the historian’s methods; his judgments are always reasonable and usually convincing. He has come as close to an understanding of the enigmatic figure of John Brown as anyone is likely to get in the foreseeable future.

J. William Harris
University of New Hampshire


At times, reading Jewish Immigrants and American Capitalism felt like listening to a conversation between Lederhendler and Stephen Steinberg, whose The Ethnic Myth: Race Ethnicity and Class in America (Boston, 1981) refuted the prevailing scholarly and popular assumption that culture shaped Jewish success. Steinberg recognized no cultural proclivity toward education, hard work, or middle-class lifestyle that was especially conducive to immigrant Jews’ relatively rapid movement up the economic ladder; rather, he attributed a convergence between their pre-migration urban industrial skills and their economic opportunities in the United States (primarily, the garment trades) to the ability of many Jews to leave poverty faster than other immigrant groups. If anything, traditional Jewish values hindered rather than fostered economic mobility.

Nearly three decades later, Lederhendler has revised and, in some
ways, radicalized Steinberg’s contextual analysis. Although both scholars highlight the centrality of economic conditions in the new context and discredit the importance of static cultural values, Lederhendler departs from Steinberg when he downplays all pre-migration assets, including the occupational skills that immigrant Jews transported as part of their baggage. For Lederhendler, in the same way that values changed and were not simply transplanted from East Europe to the United States, “work skills were acquired, not transferred” (47). Like the dynamic process of culture that evolves from one context to the next, skills emerged in response to the new environment. For Lederhendler, Steinberg may have debunked one powerful ethnic myth, but he proceeded to substitute it with a new one.

Lederhendler’s provocative analysis begs for comparative study. If, indeed, immigrants bring little or nothing useful with them to their new homes, why did Italians and Jews fare differently when they arrived in the United States and encountered the same “advanced commercial and industrial economy” (53)? The only answer that Lederhendler provides comes by way of a brief discussion about how East European Jewish factory workers benefited from the ethnic-based hiring practices of German Jewish manufacturers. Being critical of the skills-transfer thesis is laudable, and Lederhendler provides convincing counter-evidence about it. An alternative argument to replace the dominant framework would make Lederhendler’s book even stronger.

At a time when the interdisciplinary field of American Jewish studies is dominated by questions of race and ethnicity, Lederhendler’s refreshing book highlights the centrality of class. Since it is neither essentialist nor self-constructed, class avoids “the conceptual quagmire of Jewish ethnicity” (118). Relying on history, sociology, anthropology, and memoir, Lederhendler decisively severs the immigrant Jews’ experience of capitalism in their countries of origin from their experiences in the United States.

Shelly Tenenbaum
Clark University

Oceans of Wine: Madeira and the Emergence of American Trade and Taste. By David Hancock (New Haven, Yale University Press, 2009) 632 pp. $50.00

Hancock’s Oceans of Wine may neglect an angle from which the early modern history of Madeira wine can be studied, but readers will be challenged to locate it. In the tradition of commodities studies, launched by the exemplary Sweetness and Power: The Place of Sugar in Modern History (New York, 1985) by Sidney Mintz, Oceans of Wine considers a single product from inception to consumption. Along the way, Hancock engages a wide variety of literatures and methods, creating an interdisciplinary study of grand proportions.
Hancock opens his account of Madeira from 1640 to 1815 with the tale of his discovery of a literal mound of record books in a dilapidated storehouse on the island of Madeira. He presents eleven chapters (in addition to the introduction, coda, and conclusion) that explore the wine from many vantage points. The first substantive chapter sets up the history of Madeira as a place and as a product. Part I, entitled “Making Wine,” grants two chapters to the process of growing the grapes and processing the wine itself. Part II, “Shipping and Trading Wine,” covers moving and marketing the wine, from the firms that handled the trade in Madeira, through worldwide networks for shipping and selling the wine, to local retailers. Hancock displays his attention to detail by following the supply chain all the way down to small-scale and local vendors of Madeira in the North American backcountry. This section about the business of wine forms the heart of the book, occupying five chapters and close to half the main text. The third part, “Consuming Wine,” analyzes the habits and rituals of wine consumption. Finally, the coda and conclusion places the study into broad contexts, in terms particularly of revolutions in trade and consumption. This study exemplifies the interdisciplinary potential of Atlantic history.

By following wine everywhere it went (even into the sickroom, where it was prescribed for many ailments), Hancock illuminates wine’s many histories, from grape to sideboard. Along the way, he employs the research strategies of many different disciplines, from botany through marketing to archeology and sociology. He writes knowledgeably about viniculture, changes in shipping practices, shifting consumption patterns, and the efforts to use wine to project gentility. The book is nothing short of breathtaking in its scope, erudition, and the extent of the archival research. If Hancock privileges a theoretical framework, it is the concept of networks; in his view, people created connections and then, through their individual calculations and actions, gradually constructed an early modern Atlantic world knit together by trade and other exchanges.

The book’s sole flaw relates to its sheer scope and breadth; it may daunt the less dedicated reader. Hancock himself wryly refers to its ample extent in the conclusion, observing that a shorter book might have explored the context for Madeira’s place in the Atlantic world (which he describes as the prevailing fashion) but would have thereby omitted the significance of individual contributions to the creation of that world. The book’s heft probably precludes it from replacing Mintz’s comparatively brief *Sweetness and Power*, but its elegant and engaging presentation (replete with numerous illustrations) makes it otherwise just as approachable. It will become essential reading for those interested in numerous aspects of the early modern Atlantic world, among them histories of business, agriculture, and consumption.

Carla Gardina Pestana
Miami University

Borderline Americans takes us to a seemingly marginal location, Arizona’s Cochise County, to tell a central story about the construction of race and nation. In this border region where a uniquely diverse collection of peoples lived and labored, we discover the difficulties and fluidity of racial classification. Certainly other authors of race relations in the American West have explored the contested processes by which lines are marked among social groups, but few of them have explained the local and global events, decisions, and interactions that made southern and eastern Europeans “white” and Mexicans something other than “American.” Borderline Americans also succeeds in complicating popular myths of the Wild West and spotlighting the power of white women in a space conventionally conceived as the domain of men. All of these insights, Benton-Cohen rightfully asserts, are relevant to current notions of the U.S.–Mexico border as a fixed line between firmly established nation-states—notions made “possible only because of a long history in which government officials, corporate interests and local citizens made that border seem natural by establishing ‘Mexican’ and ‘white American’ as the region’s only relevant—and totally separate—racial categories” (6).

This account, which begins in the late nineteenth century, features four communities that negotiated distinct resolutions to the dilemma of who is an American and who is not. Although conflicts divided neighbors, Benton-Cohen makes clear that the common threat of Apache Indians, and a broad base of landownership and water rights, encouraged significant cooperation between Mexican and Euro-Americans in Tres Alamos. Selective solidarity persisted in nearby Tombstone as U.S. and Mexican officials jointly worked to deter raiding American cowboys. Although race did not dominate the discourse about border enforcement, the town’s Chinese and Apache residents “counted firmly as racial others” (50). However, this sense of “fellow-feeling,” at least among Mexican and Euro-Americans, declined as industrial capitalism and race science developed. In Bisbee, where the corporate policy of Phelps Dodge drew racial boundaries between workers, white women’s reforms worked “in tandem with a dual-wage system and white man’s camp ideology to sharpen racial difference” (115). Meanwhile in Warren, a rival mining company, Calumet and Arizona, stratified its labor force by rewarding “patriotic” workers deeply loyal to management.

As the twentieth century continued, shared worlds at the border increasingly dissolved; Anglo homesteaders without the experience of common living poured into the region because of a depleted water supply and overgrazing that challenged Mexican American landowning. Mexican Americans were also able to take advantage of local and national promoters celebrating American independence, which obscured
their presence. Again white women played actual and symbolic roles in this transition. Such emerging distinctions and inequalities became sharply evident in the Bisbee Deportation and its aftermath. The segregation of schools and the uneven distribution of New Deal benefits confirmed that “Where once diverse ideas about race had competed and coexisted, by the 1930s, the line between Mexican and white was entrenched” (265). Yet, Benton-Cohen hastens to add that the line was never stable; workers and their families continued to challenge a dual-wage system premised upon ideas of racial hierarchy through the second half of the twentieth century.

*Borderline* is an enjoyable and persuasive work, but not without flaws. The geographically driven organization makes it difficult to track changes. Even if the complex racial processes that the work depicts cannot be neatly contained between dates, a clearer explication of chronology and sequence across chapters and communities would have been helpful. Also, a fuller development of the perspectives and racial attitudes of Mexicans on both sides of the border would have enriched the analysis. Overall, *Borderline* deserves a privileged place on reading lists dedicated to histories of comparative race relations, gender, and the American West.

Allison Varzally
California State University, Fullerton


One of the striking aspects of lynching in the United States was its public nature. Lynching was spectacle. It was carried out in full public view, often attended by large and diverse crowds. As spectacle, it also became a subject for photography; lynching photographs, taken by both professionals and amateurs, circulated widely as souvenirs of the event. The public nature of lynching receives heavily researched and imaginative treatment in Wood’s readable analysis. Wood, the first historian to probe the meaning of lynching as spectacle so thoroughly, describes lynching as performative. As a public ritual, it was attended by crowds that were often mixed by age, class, and gender, and sometimes even included African Americans, even though it frequently re-enacted and re-inscribed white supremacy. Wood also links the ritual of lynching to religious practice, particularly that of evangelicals.

Members of lynch mobs often posed for photographs, usually arrayed as decorously as possible to suggest that the mob was an agent of justice rather than extra-legal vengeance. Photographic conventions governed these images; although the genitalia of African Americans were mutilated in about one-third of the lynchings, genitalia were al-
most never revealed in photographs. But if photographs seemed at first to reinforce the rectitude of lynchings for many white southern viewers, by the 1920s, they were increasingly seen as embarrassing barbarous relics. Indeed, Walter White’s National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) effectively used photographs in the 1920s and 1930s to power its anti-lynching campaign. How African Americans interpreted these pictures remains uncertain, though there is some evidence that they kept them as mementoes of martyrdom.

A similar process prevailed with motion pictures. According to Wood, D. W. Griffith’s Birth of a Nation (1915) “swept the [southern] audience . . . like a tidal wave,” bringing cathartic validation of the Lost Cause and the Ku Klux Klan in it (147). (Birth’s reception presaged the jubilant reaction Atlantans would bestow on Gone With the Wind a quarter-century later.) The film’s power and danger led the NAACP to launch a campaign to have it banned; following Ohio and Kansas’ lead, eventually as many as eighteen states prohibited its showing. Just as African Americans interpreted lynching photographs differently than did white supremacists, so too they came in later years to impose their own readings on Birth, cheering at “inappropriate” moments (172).

If Hollywood initially seemed implicitly to condone lynching, the studios pivoted by the 1930s to make films that were intended as critiques of lynching. The prime examples were Fritz Lang’s Fury (1936) and The Ox-Bow Incident (1943), which, though compromised by the strictures of the Production Code Administration (Hollywood’s in-house censor) against violence and the industry’s squeamishness about political statements, leveled indictments of lynching. Tellingly, such pictures focused more on the dangers of mob violence than on lynching’s victims and the stain of racism. That message resonated with the international political scene of the 1930s and World War II and indeed dovetailed with the emphasis of the era’s anti-lynching campaign.

Wood provides abundant evidence that responses to lynching photographs and motion pictures varied widely according to region, race, and time. The knowledge that viewers brought to photographs and motion pictures may have been as important to their reactions as what they were watching. Yet Wood seems to doubt her own findings. Adopting the position of some film historians, she argues that “the classic Hollywood style constructed a seamless visual world, a self-enclosed narrative that absorbed the viewer into it” (226). Hollywood filmmakers may well have attempted to capture audiences in this way, but there is abundant evidence, some provided by Wood, that audiences were much more active, even resistant, in interpreting pictures. As Janet Staiger demonstrated in Media Reception Studies (New York, 2005), understanding how visual evidence is received is complex and controversial. Wood’s treatment would have benefited from more careful positioning in this theoretical minefield.

Wood attempts to link lynching and spectacle to the protean construct of modernity. She sees lynching as a “revolt against modernity,”
even though one of the emblems of modernity—photography—was used to validate this ostensibly premodern practice (8). The South (the primary region that Wood studies) may well have been the least modern section of the country at the high tide of lynching, from the 1890s into the 1910s, but her modernist typology raises both temporal and geographical questions. Did the South become increasingly defensive about lynching after 1920 because it had become “modern”? Wood does not argue this point, and it seems unlikely. How do the South’s lynching practices compare with those of the West, the other region suffused by similar racially tainted lynching, as Ken Gonzales-Day’s invaluable *Lynching in the West, 1850–1935* (Durham, 2006) demonstrates? Can the decreasing incidence of lynching be equated with degrees of modernity, ranging from the Northeast to the Midwest, to the West, and the South? Unintentionally, the modernist framework threatens partially to obscure the inescapable importance of race and white supremacy.

Wood has performed an important service by interrogating the nature of lynching as spectacle, elucidating the performative nature of lynching and the changing reception of visual evidence. She also points the way toward a comparative study of lynching and mob violence, especially in comparing the ineluctably racial construction of lynching in the South and the West.

Clayton Koppes
Oberlin College

*What Virtue There Is in Fire; Cultural Memory and the Lynching of Sam Hose.* By Edwin T. Arnold (Atlanta, University of Georgia Press, 2009) 264 pp. $28.95

On April 23, 1899, Sam Hose, a black Georgia man, was lynched in the sleepy little Georgia town of Newnan. Ostensibly, Hose was lynched because he had murdered a local white man, Alfred Cranford, raped Cranford’s wife in front of her dying husband, and assaulted one of his children. While Hose admitted that he had killed Cranford, he claimed that he had a good reason, and he denied that he had assaulted anyone. At the time when Hose was lynched, the question of his innocence or guilt was debated endlessly. What was not in dispute, however, was the brutality that Hose suffered on that Sunday afternoon in 1899 when he was burned alive, and pieces of his body were eagerly snatched as souvenirs by members of the crowd who attended the bloody spectacle.

The history of the South during the last quarter of the nineteenth century—christened the nadir by Logan, the legendary African-American historian, in his seminal work, *The Betrayal of the Negro*—is replete with numerous accounts of African American lynchings.¹ How-

ever, Arnold makes the case that the lynching of Hose was particularly noteworthy not only because of the brutality involved but also because of the powerful impact that it had on the consciousness of Hose’s contemporaries. At the outset of his study, Arnold makes it clear that his purpose in writing about this brutal episode is not to determine Hose’s guilt or innocence of the crimes for which he was lynched but rather “to give a close reading of the accounts that created the narratives of Sam Hose, his crimes, and his public death” (6). Along with the author’s examination of the various narratives surrounding Hose, he also attempts “to examine how different groups did and have continued to appropriate Sam Hose for their own purposes” (8).

Arnold succeeds admirably. He begins by placing Hose’s story in the broader context of local racial unrest that had already resulted in the lynching of African Americans in a neighboring town. In the midst of this unrest, white paranoia about the possibility of a race war reached alarming levels, setting the stage for the torture and murder of Hose as well as for the birth of the various narratives about him through which white southerners sought to demonstrate their continuing control of the large black minority. In an attempt to identify the conflicting perspectives, the author uses a variety of sources, including newspapers, oral interviews, and studies of cultural memory, which Arnold deftly weaves into a fascinating account. The richness and complexity of the Hose story is told through the opinions and pronouncements of a variety of contemporaries, from Rebecca Latimer Felton, a white women’s–rights activist who viewed lynching as perfectly justifiable to protect white women’s virtue, to Robert Charles, a black laborer in New Orleans, who advised “every negro to buy a riﬂe and keep it ready” (172).

As his study ends, Arnold evaluates the impact that the Hose story continues to have on American society in the new millennium as it struggles to adjust to a reality that none of Hose’s contemporaries could have ever envisioned—a black president of the United States. Indeed, the continued power of the narratives surrounding Hose serves as a reminder that much work remains to be done before the United States can claim to be a postracial society.

Cynthia Griggs Fleming
University of Tennessee

*The Will to Believe: Woodrow Wilson, World War I, and America’s Strategy for Peace and Security.* By Ross A. Kennedy (Kent, Kent State University Press, 2009) 291 pp. $45.00

Offering a welcome addition to the Wilson literature, Kennedy examines the views of leading American policy and opinion makers about various debates concerning World War I. From August 1914 to April 1917, the month America entered the war, disputes focused upon the
proper response to the actions of the belligerents, particularly the British blockade of western Europe and Germany’s U-boat warfare against neutral trade with the Allies. Between 1917 and 1920, the year when the Senate repudiated the Versailles Treaty for the second time, contention lay in the appropriate response to the Paris peace accord. Behind such immediate issues were wider questions relating to the nature of the international system, the desirability of alliances and world organization, and the relationship between peace and democratic political systems.

In analyzing these controversies, Kennedy divides the nation’s leaders into three distinct groups. First were the “paciﬁsts” (loosely deﬁned), who abhorred standing armies and binding alliances and who were represented by such individuals as Secretary of State William Jennings Bryan, Senator Robert M. La Follette, and settlement worker Jane Addams. Second were “liberal internationalists,” who reluctantly supported armed force to create a collective security system and who listed in its ranks such ﬁgures as Woodrow Wilson and former president William Howard Taft. Third were the “Atlanticists,” believers in some sort of security relationship with Great Britain; Theodore Roosevelt and Senators Elihu Root and Henry Cabot Lodge could be found in their ranks.

More than previous works, this book stresses the degree to which fear of militarism permeated American culture, as well as the extent to which Wilson was supposedly animated by desires to contain German power. The president, Kennedy claims, confronted the paradox of “practicing power politics to end power politics” (xiii–xiv). Sources include the published papers of Wilson, Roosevelt, Root, Colonel E. M. House, and the League to Enforce Peace; the New York Times and such contemporary journals as the New Republic and the Independent; the Congressional Record; the Foreign Relations series; and a host of scholarly books and articles.

Much of the narrative has long been known to specialists, though Kennedy’s organization enables him to offer fresh insights. He is particularly stimulating in his critique of the various historical ﬁgures. Paciﬁsts increasingly isolated themselves from the national debate by ignoring the entire matter of power relations. Before the war, the Atlanticists lacked a consistent strategic vision. When the conﬂict ended, they refused to push for a national-security strategy oriented toward power politics. Such liberal internationalists as Wilson neither defended American rights against both sets of belligerents nor sought to defeat Germany through quick intervention. The president in particular fell into a blundering diplomacy that failed to achieve America’s security interests. Wilson’s League of Nations appeared to require a member state to intervene everywhere, even if no immediate interest existed, thereby leaving the United States in constant conﬂict while subverting Congress’ war powers and necessitating a massive military establishment.

Kennedy’s discussion of wider great-power relations and of the international structure is usually based upon the ﬁndings of other histori-
ans, such as Graebner, Gaddis, and Ninkovich. Although he draws upon the work of such political scientists as Nordlinger, Waltz, and Mearsheimer, international-relations theory plays a minor role in this study.

In any event, The Will to Believe is certainly provocative. One awaits the response of Wilson’s defenders.

Justus D. Doenecke
New College of Florida


Black Americans’ cultural and national identities have long been debated. Are black Americans more African than American, or vice versa? Corbould’s engaging book offers a fresh historical interpretation to this long-standing conversation. Her detailed analysis of visual art, literature, newspaper editorials, cartoons, plays, historical and anthropological scholarship, pageants, poems, and other sources uncovers ways in which black American identity was not predicated upon choosing to be either African or American but rather melding together both African and American subjectivities into a multifaceted and coherent identity rooted in the United States and the African diaspora.

Corbould argues that a distinctly black urban public life, which emerged in the interwar years, reclaimed a dynamic sense of Africa—as opposed to the timeless, primitive Africa of white supremacist lore—and forged cultural and political alliances with oppressed black people around the world. These connections beyond the U.S. border transformed black Americans from Negroes, whose past was erased by slavery, into African Americans, who had ties to specific places and histories. African Americans—no different from Italian, English, or German immigrants—claimed a proud, unique national past and celebrated their historic role in making the American nation. Corbould contends that ultimately, by becoming African American, black people made multiculturalism acceptable and “paved the way for the emerging hyphenated identities of so many Americans today” (219).

Corbould’s interdisciplinary approach and close analysis of diverse


sources gives this study remarkable breadth, tracing how numerous playwrights, political orators, intellectuals, and pageant directors imagined Africa and the African diaspora through musical motifs, literary themes, and new historical narratives that reclaimed a “usable” black past. These artists and intellectuals asserted that Africans and black Americans were not the same, despite what certain black nationalists and neo-colonialists, like Marcus Garvey, and white supremacists imagined and argued. Nonetheless, the interwar black public accentuated the historical and political connections between Black Americans, Africans, and people of the African diaspora. Central to Corbould’s interdisciplinary analysis is her belief that as blacks became African American, “culture and politics were never far apart” (215).

This process became most complete, Corbould intimates, when black Americans immersed themselves in political debates and military struggles associated with the American occupation of Haiti and the Italian invasion of Ethiopia. The Ethiopian invasion seemed to bring the black urban public to life: Political cartoons graphically depicted and openly criticized the evils of imperialism and fascism; plays and poems celebrated the African diaspora; and tens of thousands of demonstrators took to the streets of Harlem in solidarity with besieged Ethiopians.

For the most part, however, the black public appears shadowy in this book. Corbould tends to overlook intraracial class diversity and conflict in her analysis of the black public sphere. Listing the many organizational affiliations of Arthur Schomburg and John Henrik Clarke, or analyzing the works of New Negro artist-intellectuals and scholar-activists, hardly offers a thick description of an interwar black public life and its evolving cultural identity. Instead, Corbould’s black public was limited to cultural and political elites. Thus, thirty years later, in the wake of far-reaching Black political and cultural movements, the identity formation process that Corbould argues began in the interwar period finally was complete.

Brian Purnell
Bowdoin College


The case advanced in this account of American academic indulgence toward Nazi Germany is clinched. By inviting Nazi propagandists to promote their cause on campus, accepting them on faculties, participating in student exchanges with German universities that had fired their non-Aryan professors and had permitted ideological indoctrination, and scorning outraged undergraduates who protested the atrocities of the Third Reich, the presidents of the Ivy League, of the Seven Sisters, and of other colleges and universities failed until Kristallnacht to recognize
the threat that the Third Reich posed to the life of learning (and thus to the very marrow of civilization).

Norwood’s constitutes a serious indictment. Two of the most influential presidents—Columbia’s Nicholas Murray Butler and Harvard’s James Bryant Conant—look especially bad; Norwood pursues Conant into the postwar era when, as U.S. High Commissioner and then as Ambassador to the Federal Republic in the 1950s, he endorsed and justified the brief, commuted jail sentences that notorious war criminals enjoyed. Though the language adopted in this book is not explicitly moralistic, the tone is certainly—and understandably—prosecutorial. Defenders of business-as-usual relations with German academicians and officials were granted a respectful hearing until late 1938; those who challenged the slack that American higher education cut the Third Reich often had to struggle to be heard, and were sometimes punished.

The enormous research that Norwood conducted in mostly university archives, numerous newspapers (especially the campus press), and other sources is admirably ingenious and reassuring. As a diligent record of denial, misjudgment, and worse (such as apologetics for an unsheathed dictatorship), The Third Reich in the Ivory Tower is invaluable. But it is also frustratingly, unreﬂectively empiricist. Norwood’s focus on “just the facts,” like Dragnet’s Sgt. Joe Friday, is overly sedulous, disregarding what ought to be inevitable questions. What liaisons should American universities have had with counterparts operating under regimes that might be comparable to Germany’s (the Soviet Union, Fascist Italy, and military dictatorships in much of Europe during the interwar period)? How, for that matter, should American universities have behaved toward democracies that were, after all, imperialist and colonialist? Even if the special cruelty of Nazi Germany is granted, what should be the attitude of American academic institutions toward nations that are morally repugnant? Is there any difference between the pretense of normality that was adopted in 1933 and, if the policy continued, in 1936? (Norwood seems to see none.)

Though some academics quickly and forthrightly appreciated the unprecedented menace that Nazi Germany represented, a touch of anachronism mars this volume as well. The “captains of erudition” (Thorstein Veblen’s sardonic phrase) of the 1930s were simply not equipped for the sort of impassioned political action that drew some of their successors into the civil-rights and antiwar movements three decades later. The struggle to de-legitimate and isolate Nazi Germany suffered from the cramped, and even prissy, deﬁnition of civic responsibility that then inﬂuenced university administration and nearly all of the professoriate. But it is also a little unfair of Norwood to blame them for failing to act on the greater sensitivity to injustice that marked the 1960s. By then, Nazism itself had become inscribed in public discourse as the signature of evil.

Stephen J. Whitfield
Brandeis University
Historians often assume that capitalism causes racism or that corporations use white racism to “divide and conquer” the working class. Delton challenges this simplistic view of business and race by showing how pioneering corporations—and then business in general—laid the foundation for modern-day affirmative action. Delton emphasizes the importance of industrial-relations departments, tracing their roots to early work on race relations and corporate efforts to curtail labor unions. The juxtaposition of racial liberalism and business conservatism is a major theme of the book. In short, Delton offers a thought-provoking reinterpretation of civil rights that may push the field in an exciting new direction.

*Racial Integration in Corporate America* begins by offering a general overview from colorblind voluntarism (“fair employment”) to color-conscious “goals” imposed by the government. Whether pioneering fair employment or complying with later federal mandates, business established procedures quietly with the help of the National Urban League and government agencies. The genuine contribution of business to civil rights has always been obscured by the blanket justification that “it was just good business.” By digging deeply into corporate archives, Delton shows that industrial-relations personnel tended to be far more activist than their firms revealed. Moreover, the consensus eventually became corporate gospel as CEOs fought Reagan-era efforts to roll back racial preferences. After decades of building affirmative action, corporations did not want the problems that might ensue without the simplicity of filling “goals” or “quotas.”

The chapter about the National Association of Manufacturers (NAM) is most provocative. During the 1940s and 1950s, NAM promoted fair employment and attacked white racism. NAM did not fight the civil-rights bills of the 1950s or President Eisenhower’s creation of a Government Contracts Committee that pushed companies to hire more minorities. In this regard, Delton misses a chance to note the Republican bent of NAM and the strong GOP push to pass civil-rights legislation. Supporting a Republican president was natural for NAM during this era when “right-to-work” laws began to undermine unions in the South. The dual Republican commitment to civil rights and opposition to unions meshed nicely with NAM’s mission. By opening the door on NAM’s contribution to civil rights, Delton paves the way for other scholars to explore these (and other) issues.

In overcoming internal opposition from rank-and-file members, NAM resembled the CIO, the labor union that supported civil rights in the face of working-class opposition. Scholars would do well to pursue and debate this parallel. This book’s blending of business history, public-policy research, and oral history tells another side of the civil-rights
movement and black–white relations that still resonates today. Delton could have added a further chapter about how immigrants integrated into corporate America.

The road to civil rights was paved not just by left-wing labor unions, the NAACP, the Urban League, and grassroots activists but also by (and with) corporate America. This important book deserves a wide audience.

Jonathan Bean
Southern Illinois University, Carbondale

The Nation’s Largest Landlord: The Bureau of Land Management in the American West. By James R. Skillen (Lawrence, University Press of Kansas, 2009) 320 pp. $36.95

Although insider histories of the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) by Clawson, a former director (1971), and by Muhn and Stuart (1988), former employees, exist, Skillen’s is the first book-length scholarly history of the agency written by an outsider. ¹ Theoretical and analytical perspectives from political science, public policy, environmental ethics, regional planning and history—such as Heclo’s concept of issue networks—grace Skillen’s work, reflecting his interdisciplinary training.² For instance, Skillen uses Lowi’s critique of interest-group politics as a basis for evaluating tensions that arose in the 1970s between the BLM’s autonomous, bureaucratic approach to planning and calls for democratic, grassroots involvement in policy formation.³

Skillen’s book rests upon traditional archival research. The author conducted careful historical research in the papers of former directors of the BLM and in administrative files of the agency housed in the National Archives and at BLM facilities in Denver and Phoenix. Unfortunately for researchers, the agency’s history seems to be documented primarily in relatively staid Congressional hearings, press releases, public speeches, and official reports. Apparently, few pieces of interoffice correspondence, minutes of meetings, transcripts of telephone conversations and rough drafts of reports are available. Such records, if they become available, might afford an unvarnished, close-up view of interpersonal dynamics and decision making in the Bureau. Some of Skillen’s richest insights into the personalities of administrators are drawn from interviews with agency personnel. In one such interview, Orren Beaty observes

that BLM director Karl Landstrom “‘couldn’t disagree with a senator without becoming disagreeable’” (232). Many of these gems enliven the endnotes.

Skillen relates the story of the BLM chronologically. Originally, he intended to pursue a single narrative thread throughout the course of the work, but he found the agency’s history to be too diffuse. Instead, he chose to develop a series of interpretive threads. A key one involves the ambiguity of the agency’s mission, which has caused the BLM to shift directions repeatedly in response to presidential and Congressional priorities and dispositions. He concludes that “the BLM has struggled to articulate the public lands’ national value, to build a national constituency, and to think of itself as a national agency” (193). Other interpretive themes include the tension between public and private property rights, particularly as they relate to grazing rights for ranchers; tension between the federal and state governments about public-lands management; disagreement between Congress and the executive branch about the disposition of public lands; and the impact of environmentalism and environmental ethics upon policy since the 1960s.

Skillen approaches his topic with a barely detectable preference for ecosystem protection and preservation, agency goals that have often been at odds with the agency’s traditional emphasis upon resource extraction. Although he avoids polemics, words like “opportunities” and “victory” that subtly convey judgments hint at his values. For instance, Skillen writes that professionalization of the agency during the 1960s helped to “create opportunities for the BLM to evade capture by a single clientele group,” the livestock industry (39). Likewise, he writes in positive terms of the agency’s “symbolic victory” when it raised grazing fees in 1969, and he refers to the Mining Law of 1872 negatively as “archaic” (76, 197). On balance, however, Skillen deftly describes contentious management issues in fair, neutral language.

Brian Q. Cannon
Brigham Young University

Aftershocks: Earthquakes and Popular Politics in Latin America. Edited by Jürgen Buchenau and Lyman L. Johnson (Albuquerque, University of New Mexico Press, 2009) 230 pp. $29.95

Natural disasters are not particularly natural, as scholars worldwide have been suggesting for decades and as this book also demonstrates. Catastrophes are social and political because societal forces make people—and some groups more than others—vulnerable to disasters. Moreover, debates about how best to prevent disasters often have as much to do with political struggles, economic development, and social relations as they do with structural engineering or geological knowledge. Although geographers, anthropologists, and sociologists have studied these issues in
Latin America, historians have devoted relatively little attention to disasters in the region. *Aftershocks* thus fills an important niche, and, given its clarity and accessibility, it deserves to reach a broad audience.

Each chapter examines a specific earthquake in Latin America’s past: Peru (1746), Venezuela (1812), Chile (1906), Argentina (1944), Nicaragua (1972), Guatemala (1976), and Mexico (1985). The contributors start with the earthquakes, but they are primarily interested in using disasters to understand state-society interactions. Chapters tend to focus on four themes. The first theme is the explanation of earthquakes, which several chapters address but are most thoroughly analyzed for Peru and Venezuela. Many people interpreted earthquakes as divine retribution for Lima’s sinful ways or for rebellion against the Spanish Crown. Social, cultural, political, and economic forces shaped disaster explanations, which, in turn, affected relations with the Crown or state.

The second theme examines disaster-prevention building codes and urban planning, which Chileans tried to establish after the 1906 earthquake. In Argentina, experts and government officials debated with local dignitaries about architecture and structural engineering, but the regional elite wanted reconstruction both to preserve their social status and to reflect their supposed modernity.

The third theme examines how earthquakes exposed the inability of governments to ameliorate widespread social discontent. Disasters exacerbated and highlighted corruption under Somoza in Nicaragua, class conflicts in Guatemala, and middle-class suffering and economic woes in Mexico. In all three cases—and this is the fourth theme—the earthquakes mobilized social groups to challenge, sometimes violently, the existing governments. The Sandinistas rose to power in Nicaragua. Revolutionary groups and grassroots Catholic organizations increasingly emerged in Guatemala, and the middle classes fought against the Party of the Institutional Revolution (PRI) in Mexico.

This volume’s strength is its excellent on-the-ground case-study narratives of specific earthquakes. Chapters focus on fresh topics and provide new information about most of these disasters. Theoretical contributions to disaster studies are less explicit; the contributors do not engage much with historiographical debates or disaster scholarship. Nor is there a concluding chapter to underscore key themes. The chapter about Mexico stands out for explicitly arguing how the study of earthquakes can help to revise the historiography about the state in Latin America. The book’s interdisciplinary contribution is primarily its analysis of building codes, architecture, and structural engineering. Future interdisciplinary scholarship might probe earthquake science, geology, and “indigenous explanations,” which are beyond the scope of this volume and have received little attention in disaster histories of Latin America in general.

Overall, this book contains important new earthquake studies that illuminate both the conditions that led to so-called “natural” disasters and their contentious aftermath, when various social groups and state
agencies debated about how best to minimize vulnerability, how to prevent future calamities, and how to achieve greater social equality.

Mark Carey
Washington and Lee University


Getúlio Vargas, a Brazilian populist leader, is widely remembered for acclaiming “A Lei! Ora a lei!” (“The Law! What about the law?”), and, in this prize-winning book, Fischer seeks to answer him. Her study explores the ways in which the majority of the residents of Rio de Janeiro came to suffer a “poverty of rights” in the twentieth century, despite living in a nation in which republican constitutions ostensibly guaranteed their citizenship. To do so, she draws on the methodologies of legal history, public policy, and urban studies, as well as social science history, to argue that the expansion of the Brazilian state led to fewer, rather than more, formal rights for the majority of Cariocas, as residents of the city are known.

Part I of the book traces the growth of Rio de Janeiro, exploring government efforts to develop urban plans and building codes that would both assure a beautiful metropolis and provide for public health and safety. Fischer shows that such public policies never took the rights of subaltern Cariocas to live and work within the city seriously, though the limits of state power and the city’s need for labor meant that neither workers nor their shacks could be completely removed from the urban landscape.

Part II looks at Vargas’ efforts to guarantee workers’ rights and regulate the labor market, arguing that the new labor legislation marginalized the majority of Carioca workers, who did not have and could not acquire the documents necessary to prove their existence and their legal employment. Workers without documents did not enjoy the protection of the law; they became a permanent, informal social group subject to exploitation of all sorts.

Part III, which discusses crime and criminals, makes clear that Cariocas without documents suffered the highest rates of incarceration of all defendants who came before Rio’s criminal court judges. Part IV looks at slum dwellers’ successful efforts to defend their communities from land grabbers, showing how slums became a permanent feature of twentieth-century Rio. At this point, Fischer connects her research to political and sociological studies of citizenship and urban slums during the latter decades of the twentieth century.

Fischer’s study draws on many types of sources. She has delved deeply into the Carioca archives to locate urban plans, building codes,
city–council minutes, correspondence with politicians, national laws and local regulations, court cases, newspaper accounts, samba lyrics, and oral histories. She uses both quantitative and qualitative analyses to draw her conclusions, although the most gripping portion of the book—that involving Carioca slum dwellers’ struggles to protect their homes and communities—is based on qualitative arguments alone.

Brazilians often remark that “the law is for people who have no friends,” a position that Fischer’s book endorses. The Carioca poor who suffered from “rights poverty” relied upon sympathetic politicians, first ladies, newspaper editors, judges, and other individuals in positions of power for protection. These patrons manipulated the law on their clients’ behalf in exchange for votes and other favors. Thus, rights poverty meant that the Carioca poor could never escape the web of patron–client relations.

Mary Ann Mahony
Central Connecticut State University

*Jamaican Place Names.* By B. W. Higman and B. J. Hudson (Mona, Jamaica, University of the West Indies Press, 2009) 319 pp. $25.00

Jamaica is said to have a variety of interesting place names, and Higman and Hudson set out to delve into its history. The authors stress that what they have produced is not a gazetteer of Jamaica—indeed, no list of names accompanies the book—but a study of Jamaican toponymics. Nor have they produced a tourist’s book, full of stories about quaint names of this or that locality; it is intended as an academic study. After a brief introduction to their goals and a more substantive discussion of topographical study in general, the authors present thematically organized chapters dealing with different aspects of naming patterns—for example, places named after other places (transfer names, most often, as one might expect, from Europe and especially England), places named after people, places named after emotive states like harmony, names taken from functions (enterprises), topographical names, or hydrological names. Although statistical work is clearly at the root of the project, the book has only five systematic displays of these data in tabular or graphical form, to which the authors allude only as appropriate in the course of the narrative.

Jamaica is not a particularly big place, but it has a good cartographical and cadastral history. A number of detailed maps of the island have been produced since the late sixteenth century, as well as excellent cadastral surveys, and records have survived well, at least in fairly recent times. These sources make it possible to record and study a wide range of place names over time—indeed, to study a fixed and manageable political-physical entity in exceptional detail. The authors exploit
this material fully. The database that underlies the study seems to be considerable (though the raw data are not displayed in the book).

The methodological approach is bare bones. The authors provide categories, examples of these categories, and information about the distribution of place names across the island through time, including a substantial number of maps illustrating primarily distribution of categories of place names. The book is not particularly thesis-driven—for example, one that presents and defends an idea about how a centuries-long indigenous occupation, a colonial invasion by Spain, and a subsequent seizure by Britain might have shaped the naming of places over time. It does not approach, at least not directly, how the history of the island under changing agronomic regimes (gold production, cattle raising, intensive sugar production, and so on) might be reflected, or not, in names. Remarkably few names, even of geographical features, arose from the languages of the indigenous Tainos or had African origins, given the island’s demographical history. Aside from a few comments about the prevalence of personal names as a starting point for all place names—possibly because the privately owned sugar estate was the unit of settlement from the late seventeenth century onward—the authors offer little in the way of explanation for the names.

In some measure, this absence of a more detailed commentary reflects the pioneering nature of the study. One reason why Jamaican place names cannot easily be studied in relation to those of other Caribbean islands (whether English, Spanish, French, Dutch, or Danish) is because comparable studies have not appeared elsewhere. Surprisingly, not much work has been done on toponymy in most American colonial societies, including those with Spanish origins, which are likely to reflect varied patterns. The naming patterns in North America, which has been more carefully studied, or at least has had data compiled, might provide a useful comparison with those of Jamaica. Perhaps this book will stimulate scholars in other American societies to do this sort of work.

John K. Thornton
Boston University


Some books are statements in and of themselves. Smith’s book is one of them. Contrary to most politicians and observers who stress the political chaos, the abysmal poverty, and the ecological degradation of Haiti, this book demonstrates that Haiti is a “normal” country with its own political dynamics and its own ideological development. This simple, but often forgotten, message is enough by itself to make the publication of this book worthwhile.
Smith wants to show how political developments in twentieth-century Haiti were the result of a specific interaction between discourses on race and class and their concrete political implementation. Employing painstaking archival and oral-history research, he reveals the vibrancy and often original tone of the political debate by focusing on the crucial period before the brutal Duvalier dynasty took hold of the country. A proper understanding of the disastrous development of Haitian politics, as well as its promises, requires analysis of what happened after U.S. troops left the country in 1934, and the country experienced its “second independence.”

In this period, the political debate in Haiti acquired a new, and in many ways, unique urgency, particularly regarding the relationship between class and race. Race had always been a determining topic in Haiti, which was the first independent nation of South America and the Caribbean and the first one in the hemisphere to abolish slavery. Proudly carrying the banner of “Black Republic,” Haiti found its identity in the racial issue. However, by the 1930s, the colored, mulatto elite had created a firmly entrenched powerbase, distancing itself from the black masses.

During the presidency of Élie Lescot (1941–1946), the racial and social tensions that had remained under the surface came to a boiling point. The charismatic Daniel Fignolé used the support of the growing urban masses of Port-au-Prince to advance a clearly noirist agenda that was highly critical of the light-skinned elites, viewing Haitian politics as a struggle between black and mulatto. In 1946, Lescot was removed by a revolution, known as dechoukaj (uprooting). The irony was that in the elections that followed this upheaval, almost none of the radical politicians attained office.

The new government of Dumarsais Estimé adopted a double agenda. On the one hand, it supported noirist ambitions and clearly opened the public domain for black people and their culture. On the other, it promoted conservative economic policies and maintained corruption and nepotism. The tensions resulting from this ambiguity created new political space for radical political movements and trade unions. Meanwhile, the army, which had become stronger, became increasingly active in the political arena, eventually replacing Estimé with Paul Magloire in 1950. On the surface, not much changed, but military rule laid the foundations of state violence and repression that, in this period of global anti-communism, decimated the left.

Smith follows Trouillot’s interpretation of this era as the consolidation of a political system in which politics and violence were inextricably connected. The ideological debate about race gradually became a pretext for mere political bickering. Reeling from rural and urban poverty, a growing national debt, and widespread corruption, the Haitian state became the scene of political violence and repression. President Mag-

---

loire lost support after he had antagonized not only the popular classes but also the Haitian elites and, even worse for him, the United States. The country then suffered a confused and chaotic period of anarchy, in which Fignolé miraculously resurfaced. His intense struggle with former ally François Duvalier brought the country to the brink of (if not into) civil war. After the army intervened by brutally killing hundreds of Fignolé supporters, Duvalier’s road to power was paved. Abetted by an army-controlled political campaign, Duvalier was “convincingly” elected president in September 1957, inaugurating a new dark phase of Haitian politics.

The detail with which Smith describes these complex events cannot hide some of the book’s weaknesses. The interesting relationship between intellectual debate and political reality discussed in the first chapters disappears in the latter part of the book, which turns into standard political history. The book is also guilty of a slight and, to some extent, surprising neglect of social and economic context. Only when recounting the failures of Magloire’s military regime does the book explore the profound developmental problems in the country.

Finally, although Smith can hardly be taken to task for not solving the thorny historical issue about the origins of Duvalier’s long dictatorship, his conclusions are unsatisfying. How could a country that celebrated its second independence with so much enthusiasm and energy descend into political repression, violence, and anarchy just a few decades later? What was the secret of the Haitian tragedy? Smith may not have answered that question, but he has written an indispensable study for those who may venture to do so in the future.

Michiel Baud
Centre for Latin American Research and Documentation (CEDLA), Amsterdam


A practitioner of intellectual history, Najita has produced much fine research on elite philosophers of Japan during the Tokugawa (1600–1868) and modern (1868–) periods. However, in this remarkable book, Najita takes the methodologies and concerns that he has developed over the years and applies them to the study of “average” commoners in villages and towns—people confronting daily economic problems from the latter half of the Tokugawa period through the first half of the twentieth century. Najita explores their notions of the ties between morality and economic behavior as they confronted natural disasters, oppressive feudal lords in the Tokugawa period, a capitalistic developmental state in modernity, and the various personal trials that affect all families. He centers the notion of “mutual assistance” (sōgo fujo) in his analysis because
commoners did so in their rich and diverse thought about economy, often in conscious resistance to the oppressive ideologies of the authorities. Najita’s intellectual analysis benefits from his attention to their everyday social and economic contexts and activities, a method that given this book’s success, should also be employed more often to the study of elite intellectuals.

Confucian discourses favored by the elite samurai class tended to denigrate money and commerce as the realm of greed and as a bad influence on morality. In an earlier study of the philosophers of the Kaitokudō merchant academy in early modern Osaka, Najita made convincing arguments that the school’s teachers had particularly valuable and interesting insights into political economy because of their place as merchants. In the current book, he comments, “When I wrote about these merchant economists, it seemed to me that they were somehow unusual in their conceptual acumen and that they developed their ideas as elite figures without much discursive entanglement with the less scholarly writers of ‘ordinary’ texts. But this turns out not to be the case” (37).

Najita focuses his exploration on kō, the local cooperative organizations that were independent of higher authorities but that variously served local communities to provide health insurance, loans to the needy, lotteries, investments, funding for pilgrimages and large projects, and many other requirements. In the diverse commoner discourses about these cooperatives, the ethical importance of mutual aid, honesty, and the need to keep precise measurements and records affirmed the moral nature of the pursuit of wealth and personal security through economic activity. Najita discusses the various philosophical and ethical issues in the context of discourses on knowledge and virtue produced by such scholars as Ogyū Sorai and Kaihō Seiryō.

Najita also discusses the fascinating activist, and commoner, Nino-niwa Sontoku, who made it his business to restore economic viability to villages in distress, while preaching that work, planning, and mutual aid were the moral human response to the benefits of nature. Sontoku’s cooperatives and other kō continued to function in national modernity and ideologically resisted incorporation into the social-Darwinist and free-market ideologies of the modern elite, emphasizing the ethical duty of mutual aid in economic activity even as they gradually and variously evolved into savings and loan associations and insurance companies. Najita’s discussion of the debate between the cooperative leader Okada Ryōichirō and Yanagida Kunio as representative of the state is a brilliant exposition of the various stakes involved in national modernization.

Luke S. Roberts
University of California, Santa Barbara

In this probing and thoughtful volume, Rao places the Dalit, or “untouchable,” community squarely at the center of India’s modern history. Not simply a narrative account, the volume encompasses a set of reflections on what it means to be a “political subject” in a context where the downtrodden (in Hindi, dalit) castes have been marginalized both on the ground and in the conventional nationalist historiography. As Rao forthrightly asserts at the outset, her contention is that “by examining how people without rights came to possess them, and how stigmatized subjects were transformed into citizens,” it is possible to learn something about the character and contradictions of India’s political modernity (1).

Of necessity, the growth of Dalit subjectivity had to take place by a process of contestation with Brahmins and other “clean” castes, who did not relish giving up power to despised “untouchables.” Initially, Dalit activists appealed for recognition on the basis of the secular civil rights due to them in a liberal state. They also claimed rights—above all, that of entry to Hindu temples—as a subjugated community of Hindus. This contradiction between the secular and the religious they sought to reconcile, first, by claiming that Hindu temples were public spaces open to everyone, and, then, under the leadership of Bhimrao Ramji Ambedkar, by insisting that Dalits were a non-Hindu minority. Caste, by definition, in this view, involved “structural violence” against the “negated” Dalit subaltern (124, 130). Unable, like Muslims, to make good a claim to a territory of their own, Dalits made their “negative identity,” Rao argues, the basis of their struggle for collective rights (158). Mohandas K. Gandhi had vehemently determined to keep Dalits within the Hindu community as Harijans (“children of God”), but Ambedkar converted to Buddhism, along with many of his followers, and sought state protection for Dalit rights. “Untouchability” was accordingly abolished in the 1950 Constitution, of which Ambedkar was a primary author, and specific discriminatory measures were enacted in favor of “scheduled castes.”

The most powerful and original section of the book is Part Two, “Paradox of Emancipation” (161), in which Rao follows the story of Dalit struggle into the post-independence era. Dalit claims upon equal citizenship, she argues, have continued to operate through a “legal exceptionalism” of acts that define a distinct and separate community (242). Through a series of vivid, and chilling, anecdotes of sexual abuse and murder, she shows how this legislative framework enhanced not only Dalit separateness but also their vulnerability as victims. Efforts “to legislate Dalit vulnerability out of existence,” combined with new forms of Dalit militancy had the cumulative effect of establishing violence as “a public mode of recognition between upper castes and Dalits” (263). In a way not unfamiliar to Americans, the “dual impulse” of simultaneously
recognizing and eradicating caste has produced a “paradox” in which universal values are embraced within a framework of “embodied difference.” The result is what Rao calls a “corporeal politics of caste” (278; author’s italics).

Rao’s argument is occasionally obscure, with vaguely defined terms drawn from different theorists as if their meanings were obvious. Nevertheless, this richly textured, theoretically engaged work is surely destined to stand as a lasting account of the clash of caste and modernity in India. It will find a readership among legal historians and political theorists, as well as historians of India.

Thomas R. Metcalf
University of California, Berkeley