Gat’s motivation for writing this important book was his “deep dissatisfaction” with the portrayal of nations and nationalism in much scholarly literature as “recent and superficial” results of modern “processes of social integration and political mobilization, which have welded together large populations hitherto scattered among parochial and loosely connected small rural communities” (1). While acknowledging modernity’s huge impact on the political expression of ethnic and national identity, Gat begs to differ in important respects with the modernist consensus. Drawing extensively on ethnonational histories and on theories ranging from evolutionary biology to the social organization of kinship relations, Gat shows convincingly that the nation as a kin-and-culture-based unit of mass political allegiance appeared early and frequently in history, certainly well before the emergence of the economic and institutional arrangements that characterize modernity (2–3). In Gat’s view, ethnicity, defined as “a population of shared kinship (real or perceived) and culture,” played a major role in all forms of the state, including premodern city-states and multiethnic empires (3). “Desperate” popular resistance to alien rule was the norm (13–14).

Gat straddles the positions of two other important scholars who have emphasized the premodern roots of the nation and of politicized ethnicity. On one hand, Connor emphasizes the ties of descent that underpin the political solidarity of ethnic groups, modern or otherwise. But Gat points out that evolutionary biology per se cannot support a hypothesis based solely on literal kinship of a large, genetically diverse nation (5–6). On the other hand, Smith argues in a more social-constructivist vein that premodern “ethnie” often developed a sense of political solidarity based on myths of promised lands, golden ages, distinctive virtues, and great battles against perennial foes (9). But Gat also notes that solidarity was not built by cultural meanings out of thin air; such ideas were anchored in nested alliances of lineages, clans, and tribes that underpinned early states (3, 21, 44–66). Gat produces a highly plausible synthesis of these two perspectives, showing the interaction of the social organization of extended kin ties and the development of national culture in many, if not all, proto–nations. In stressing the historically dominant role of kin-based patrimonial organization, Gat echoes a broader argument in Fukuyama’s excellent, The Origins of Political Order.3

1 See Walker Connor, Ethnonationalism (Princeton, 1993).
2 See, for example, Anthony Smith, Ethno-symbolism and Nationalism: A Cultural Approach (New York, 2009).
Why does it matter whether Gat succeeds in putting what he calls the traditionalist argument on a firmer footing against the modernists? Gat says so because hypermodernist theories of nationalism tend to over-emphasize the role of elite manipulators in stimulating ethnic conflict (15), to place false hopes in the easy creation of national loyalties based on civic principles rather than ethnic roots (7), to overestimate the likelihood of weakly literate cultures assimilating to a dominant identity (12), and, in general, to disregard the staying power of political loyalties with deeply historical kin-culture roots (326).

As Fukuyama’s book reveals, however, the full victory of modern forms of social and economic organization, together with the liberal ideas that animate them, destroyed the patrimonial and tribal forms of social organization that dominated the premodern era. Countries with weak states and changing societies are nowadays in turmoil precisely because these older personalistic forms of social order and political identity are being disrupted by newer impersonal ones. In the modernists’ view, the possibility that the political units called “France,” “Germany,” and “China” harken back to anciently politicized mass identities does not matter if the political content of those identities has become thoroughly modernized. Gat disagrees. Hence, a good test of his argument is not just whether it is correct about the dynamics of identity in the past but whether it applies equally to the present legacies of long-standing identity formations.

Jack Snyder
Columbia University


Published in French more than a decade ago and now translated into English, *The Faith of Remembrance* remains one of the most insightful works ever written about the history of the Marranos (Conversos). A distinguished scholar of colonial Peru, Wachtel has accomplished the monumental task of telling the intertwined stories of eight Converso or Marrano family networks, in the process explicating the complex social, cultural, and religious worlds that these Marranos inhabited. The result is a truly Atlantic or global narrative, in which Mexico, Peru, Portugal, Brazil, and Spain serve as the vertices along which Marrano identity was defined, and continues to be redefined, for almost five centuries.

Based upon extensive research in archives throughout the early modern Iberian world, Wachtel’s book is an erudite journey through the lives of male and female Marranos, and not just those who were influential and erudite. It is also a heartbreaking and dramatic account of
the cost of maintaining an identity that was, in most cases, a bricolage of Judaic, Christian, and skeptical ideas. Written with passion but also with the decided intent to explore every possible explanation for these lives, Wachtel’s eight case studies—veritable examples of the adroit use of micro-history and the marriage of anthropological, ethnographic, and historical methodologies—function as a lens on Marrano lives and identities throughout the longue durée. Although these case studies have been carefully chosen to provide a multitude of perspectives on Marrano lives, the connections among them—geographical, economic, religious, and, sadly, persecutory—offer a comprehensive view of their liminal status between Christianity and Judaism.

Marranos prayed to Saint Moses, Saint Esther, and Jesus. They practiced Judaism in secret on Saturday, fasting during the High Holidays, but they went to Church on Sunday. Some of these Marranos held Judaism and Christianity to be of equal value, depending on circumstances, and others showed a skeptical and hostile view of religion. Despite living between two worlds, they often ended up, after long and excruciating legal processes, being executed. Some married endogamously; others married old Christian women or denied their so-called “Judiazing.” Others confessed freely to it.

Wachtel does more than present a close reading of how these people lived. He adorns his meticulous research with bold interpretations. For example, although most Spanish Conversos assimilated into Spanish society, many Portuguese Conversos, the Nação (the Nation) retained their identity in spite of the difficulties that they faced for three centuries after their forced conversion to Christianity. Because of their experience living between two cultures, Wachtel argues that the Marranos were, because of the liminality of their positions and their skeptical views, forerunners of modernity.

Wachtel also describes the Inquisition’s scrupulous, almost Orwellian, pursuit of evidence, confession, and reconciliation. His insightful subtitle, “Marrano Labyrinths,” applies as much to labyrinthine Converso mentalities as to the practices of the Inquisition. In the end, what bound most of these Marranos, whether in Lima, Mexico City, Brazil, or Lisbon, was memory—“a faith of remembrance”—about trials and tribulations that are still palpable in northeastern Brazil and elsewhere.

Wachtel’s extraordinary study uncovers a world that only years of research and insightful reflection was able to bring to life. It is heartrending, insightful, and indispensable for those who wish to grasp the complexities of the West’s leap to modernity.

Teofilo F. Ruiz
University of California, Los Angeles
Roeber has provided an interesting examination of competing Lutheran ideas about marriage during the early modern period. He has consulted a wide range of published and archival sources, concentrating on people associated with Pietism, a movement within Lutheranism that arose in the late seventeenth century and reached its peak in the mid-1700s (in fact, the title of this book is misleading, since this book is more a study of Pietists’ views on marriage than a broad examination of Protestant marriage on three continents). Roeber notes that, in regard to the formation of marriage, Protestants required parental consent and the blessing of each union in church by a clergyman. Protestants generally stressed the need for discipline, thus supporting the submission of wives to husbands, but Roeber contrasts these official views with those of certain Pietists. He looks closely, for example, at Philipp Jakob Spener (d. 1705), a Pietist who championed the idea, previously supported by Martin Luther, that marriage was a partnership “in which the couple pursued holiness together” (xi). Disregarding the importance of procreation, Spener insisted that at its core, marriage was supposed to help husbands and wives to attain salvation.

Looking at Europe and beyond, Roeber finds that Moravian missionaries, inspired by Nikolous Zinzendorf, emphasized friendship and cooperation in marriage; representing Christ’s relationship to the church, marriage purportedly provided the possibility of union with God, a belief that yielded some odd practices, such as venerating the circumcised penis of Jesus. Henry Melchior Mühlenberg (d. 1787), the Lutheran patriarch in North America, was particularly interested in how marriage promoted the interior sanctification of spouses, even though such ideas seemed to hint at righteousness attained by good works, a doctrine that was anathema to Lutherans. In India, however, the Pietist emphasis on friendship in marriage failed to gain much traction. The missionary Bartholomaeus Ziegenbalg fought against widespread concubinage there and displayed great distrust toward Tamil women, holding them responsible for illicit sexual activity and insisting that female converts to Christianity had to be subordinate to their husbands. Ultimately, Roeber finds that the attempt to promote a more companionate relationship between spouses ultimately failed in all regions.

Roeber is well grounded in theology. He effectively shows, for example, how Luther borrowed ideas from late medieval mystics. Quite surprising, though, is the fact that no mention is made of Martin Bucer, the reformer with the most radical ideas on marriage. Bucer proclaimed companionship to be the most fundamental element of the Christian marriage, and, with his emphasis on mutual love, he even supported the possibility of divorce by mutual consent. Although Roeber adroitly discusses the relevant ideas of Christian Thomasius and Samuel von
Pufendorf, both of Lutheran background, the book might have benefited from more discussion about their advocacy of Natural Law. Readers hoping for a study that borrows heavily from sociology or anthropology will be disappointed. Certain Pietist thinkers may indeed have championed conjugal companionship, but ample research has shown that the growth in wage labor helped to facilitate the companionate marriage by reducing the importance of property in the formation of marriage.

Jeffrey R. Watt
University of Mississippi

The Business of Transatlantic Migration between Europe and the United States, 1900–1914: Mass Migration as a Transnational Business in Long Distance Travel. By Drew Keeling (Zürich, Chronos Verlag, 2012) 345 pp. $44.00

Whereas container transport, legal issues, and financial services are paramount to transatlantic migration today, passage on an ocean liner was the most important component of any move to the New World at the turn of the twentieth century. Using a range of predominantly quantitative source materials, Keeling’s book focuses on the business of several passenger lines during the two decades before World War I, providing an overview of the economics behind transatlantic migration. Although he freely consults the documents of the businesses in his study, Keeling relies primarily on his own data set—constructed from various company records, government reports, and even ship plans—covering transatlantic voyages and their resulting annual migration flows. He manages to integrate the quantitative material effortlessly into the text, which is structured chronologically and thematically at the same time; the narrative effectively marshals important events of chronological sub-periods to confer a thematic structure on the delineated parts.

The initial chapters provide a general outline of the history, politics, and economics of steamship-based transatlantic migration during the nineteenth century. The main analysis begins with a description of the oligarchical market structure of the migration shipping sector in 1900, detailing the varying degrees of cooperation and coordination between the major participants, including a temporary breakdown of the system in 1904 that resulted in an escalating, destructive fare war between the companies. Keeling complements his discussion of the developing U.S. immigration and customs policies during the first decade of the twentieth century, especially the role of European shipping companies in the political process, with an emphasis on the importance of American labor-market conditions for the rise and fall of migration flows, as seen in the slump of 1907/08. Returning to the actual migration passage, Keeling links the improvement of safety and comfort with competition between the companies and the rise of return migration and tourist
travel. In most of the chapters, he compellingly examines the personal motives and actions of important personages—most notably Albert Ballin of Hapag, Bruce Ismay of White Star, American financier John Pierpont Morgan, and President Theodore Roosevelt.

Unfortunately, Keeling omits a separate discussion of the migration process before embarkation in Western European port cities. Although other chapters allude to the involvement of certain companies before that stage, ranging from their agent networks to their coordination with government agencies, this omission is especially regrettable; it would have provided a better link to the literature about the motives behind emigration decisions and revealed more clearly the role that shipping companies played in them. Nonetheless, Keeling largely succeeds in presenting an accessible account of the migration business that will be useful not only to scholars of migration but also to specialists from such tangential fields as naval and U.S.-political history.

Florian Ploeckl
University of Adelaide


In this interesting study, Wenkai He joins the small but growing list of scholars engaged in comparing trajectories of state development in Western Europe and East Asia. His specific goal in focusing on England, Japan, and China is to explain when and why a modern fiscal system appears—modern in this case referring to centralized state collection of indirect taxes that are leveraged for long-term finance. England around the time of the Glorious Revolution and Meiji-era Japan are the successes to be explained and late Qing China the contrasting failure. After rejecting several potential explanations involving the presence of industry, representative political institutions, or territorial size as an obstacle, He proposes a two-part argument to account for the variation observed in his three cases: In the first part, he suggests that the creation of modern fiscal states was a consequence of crises in which governments made excessive use of short-term liabilities or issues of paper currency. Since not all such crises can be expected to give birth to modern state finance, He adds, in the second part of his argument, that only crises that occur in the presence of “appropriate socioeconomic circumstances” lead to this outcome (22). These circumstances can vary in form.

After an initial theoretical excursion, He briefly discusses the United Kingdom before offering a much more substantial treatment of the Chinese and Japanese cases, for which he employs a much broader range of sources. The presentation of the argument is clear, but the conclusions are frustrating. The role of “appropriate socioeconomic circum-
stances” turns out to be a vague theoretical category on behalf of which certain previously dismissed alternative explanations reappear in a new guise when needed. For example, He states, “The unique position of London in the English economy facilitated government attempts to centralize the collection of taxes” (53), attributing London’s advantage to England’s relatively small size compared to China’s. Size, however, was dismissed earlier as a causal explanation. Similarly, territorial size may well have been one of the socioeconomic circumstances that permitted the extensive development of private financial networks in Japan. In the case of China, He suggests that appropriate socioeconomic circumstances for reform were absent because internal violence and rebellion during the nineteenth century led to severe disruption of the private economy.

In the end, the most important lesson of this book may be to remind scholars of a simple fact that is frequently overlooked: Successful state building depends heavily on the stability of the private economy. In an era showing considerable renewed interest in the subject of state capacity, this point is well worth remembering. This accessible book will interest scholars from multiple academic disciplines, including history, sociology, economics, and political science.

David Stasavage
New York University

_A History of Prejudice: Race, Caste and Difference in India and the United States._ By Gyanendra Pandey (New York, Cambridge University Press, 2013) 243 pp. $85.00 cloth $29.99 paper

Prejudice is preconceived opinion, the tacit foundation on which other judgments and courses of action rest; it exists as socially shared, but implicit, common sense. Pandey’s subject is this archive of the unsaid, expressed in the forms of affect and the habits of speech and behavior that authorize and sustain “othering” based on race (in the United States) and on caste (in India). He aims to account for the effects of prejudice understood in two senses—(1) “vernacular” forms, expressed in the stigmatization of particular categories of people, and (2) the “universalist” prejudice of post-Enlightenment modernity, expressed in terms of a rational human subject, which, although represented as unencumbered by specificities of gender, class, caste, or race, occupies a white, masculine positionality.

Pandey’s book examines this dual character of prejudice as it has shaped both Dalits’ (India’s ex-Untouchables) and African Americans’ twentieth-century histories. Both groups are obvious targets of vernacular prejudice; they are also subjected to universalist prejudice, both as it differentiates them from the unmarked modern self and as internalized. Vernacular prejudice is readily identifiable and often (but not always)
deplored, whereas universalist prejudice often remains unrecognized in modernist common sense. Moreover, universalist prejudice may work to sustain prejudice within communities victimized by vernacular prejudice, often doubly stigmatizing women.

Pandey joins a growing body of scholars interested in the comparative and transnational circulation of racialized subjects and of race as a category, as well as scholars and activists interested in the specific convergences of African-American and Dalit histories. Pandey’s distinctive contribution rests on his effort to trace the history of how people experienced and resisted prejudice. Although superficially comparative, the work does not aim for the sort of controlled comparison that may be found, for example, in sociology or political science; nor does it offer a conventional chronological narrative. Instead, it proceeds from the recognition of certain commonalities (for example, embodied stigma) in the everyday lives of African Americans and Dalits, as well as the shared expectations about citizenship, equality, progress, and modernity that galvanized both civil-rights struggles in the United States and post-colonial nation-building in India from the 1940s forward.

Characterizing his method as one of juxtaposition, Pandey probes the lived experiences of African Americans and Dalits, drawing principally from personal narratives, memoirs, essays, speeches, works of fiction and expressive culture, sermons, and popular media accounts. Chapters 3 and 4 alternate between African-American and Dalit efforts to escape oppression through direct action and other forms of public, often explicitly political, mobilization. Pandey argues that since these movements are founded on universalist prejudice, they unintentionally reproduce vernacular prejudices in new guises, by, say, consigning them to an entrenched tradition or by implying the uniformity of African-American or Dalit identity. Chapters 5 and 6 move to the more intimate realms of the body and domesticity, showing how the production of personal narratives can help to create a contradictory, multivocal, and embodied identity that contrasts with the unencumbered self reified by universalist prejudice.

Pandey’s arguments rest on the work of feminist and critical race theorists, of scholars of embodiment and affect, and of sociologists and anthropologists schooled in Goffmann’s interactionist approach. This interdisciplinarity, moreover, is aligned with critical historiography. As a distinguished contributor to India’s Subaltern Studies Collective, Pandey has long advocated a historiography of subjugated populations that relies on ephemeral and unofficial source materials. The value of such sources—as also demonstrated during the past four decades by historians of labor, gender and race, public historians, and scholars of popular culture and memory—has prompted the rethinking of the aims and analytical categories of historical research. Accordingly, the defiant note

1 See, for example, Erving Goffmann, *Interaction Ritual—Essays on Face-to-Face Behavior* (New York, 1967).
that Pandey strikes regarding his use of personal narratives, folk songs, poetry, and fiction—as opposed to “records and documents emanating from the state”—comes as a surprise (31). Regardless of whether such justification is still needed, it is uncontestable that Pandey has extended our understanding of how prejudice, as both embodied practice and discourse, can be studied comparatively.

Mary Hancock
University of California, Santa Barbara

The Roman Market Economy. By Peter Temin (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2013) 299 pp. $35.00

In 1973, Finley argued famously that ancient and modern economies had little in common and that modern economics was all but useless for understanding the ancient world. After thirty-five years, however, new evidence, new methodologies, and alternative approaches have changed the landscape of ancient economic history. Finley’s argument seems out of date. Ancient historians have moved away from the question of how modern or nonmodern the ancient economy was, debating instead how scattered and complicated evidence can contribute to economic modeling, and how it might help to explicate economic development.1

Temin’s book boldly re-states the modernist perspective: Modern economics can help to show that the Roman Empire had a genuine market economy. Grain prices, submitted to regression analysis in his first main chapter, reveal a relationship between local prices and those in the city of Rome, permitting traders to calculate their margins. Moreover, since price data from Hellenistic Babylonia, where the astronomical diaries contained a much greater and more condensed set of prices, also seem to have moved randomly in response to changing extraneous conditions, they must have recorded changes in market prices.

In Chapter 4, Temin employs regression analysis to confirm that the combined causes of recurrent plague and political instability in the Roman Empire were possible reasons for the instability of prices during the third century C.E. Turning to markets, he investigates how Roman grain merchants dealt with asymmetric and incomplete information, suggesting that certain businesses and governmental offices protected them against moral hazard and functioned as clearing houses for information.

In Chapter 6, Temin presents two arguments against the much-debated notion that slavery blocked the labor market. First, slaves worked alongside free seasonal and wage laborers in every occupation, and they sometimes were hired out. Second, Rome had an open slave system, meaning that the chance of manumission within one generation was high. This policy created competition for the quality of slave and wage labor.

Landownership, the subject of Chapter 7, entailed a complex set of

restrictions concerning property rights, but, on the whole, a free land market and freehold appeared to be dominant. In the following chapter, Temin uses financial intermediation in Roman business relationships as an index for the Roman economic system’s level of sophistication. Although the sources do not hold much information about credit intermediation through equity ownership (the sign of an advanced economy), the societates publicanorum of the Roman Republic were joint stock companies similar to modern corporations, and a substantial pooling of funds by private banks, together with variable interest rates, made the Roman financial market highly accessible.

In the final part of the book, Temin turns to economic growth. In Malthusian economies, growth was normally thought to be checked by the demographic burden that it generated. But this view neglected the time factor; the Roman Empire had considerable potential for development despite its eventual collapse. The rise of real wages, the abundance of ordinary tableware imported from Africa, and other factors indicate that the first two centuries C.E. witnessed increasing living standards and general economic well-being. Temin uses an estimated Roman GDP to develop a simple model of income swing to prove that the Roman and early modern Western European economies were equally advanced.

This book invites historians to re-think their presuppositions, and to take advantage of statistical methods. Its findings will encourage ancient historians, as well as historians of later periods, to appreciate the importance of economic models. To his credit, Temin makes his economic study of the Roman Empire fully accessible to scholars who are not familiar with economic methods. A classicist (like this reviewer), however, might have concerns about the method and mode of argument adopted throughout the book. One of the reasons why historians favor qualitative methods over quantitative ones is the fact that the data involved are both sparse and complex. Nor do we always know the conditions under which they were compiled and recorded, or even ultimately what they mean. Temin takes prices, wages, population figures, inflation rates, and so on completely for granted, as if they were pure data. Many of his figures come from a single scholarly authority without considering the controversies that might surround it. Furthermore, sometimes the mathematically illiterate reader has to struggle through some heavy calculating only to re-discover what classical scholars have known for a long time.

The Roman Market Economy effectively demonstrates the elegance and simplicity of economic demonstration. But Temin’s methodological point would have been more persuasive had it shown that an economic methodology can lead to new, or challenge old, understandings of the ancient economy. That the Roman economy was not simple—that it set market prices, sustained development, and had room for growth—is old news.

Sitta von Reden
University of Freiburg

Environment, Society and Landscape in Early Medieval England argues that “patterns of regional variation in early medieval England were largely a function of environmental factors” (234). According to Williamson, detailed understanding of climate, topography, geology, and soil is key for understanding patterns of settlement and even, tentatively, some aspects of cultural development. Williamson draws on a range of disciplines, addressing his conclusions to “landscape historians, historical geographers, archaeologists and others” (234). He purposefully works within a multidisciplinary framework, and the material that he produces is intended to enrich a variety of disciplines.

The first two chapters feature broad descriptions of the archaeological and environmental histories of early medieval England. Williamson engages with important archaeological debates, such as patterns of settlement and population growth, and provides a clear and concise overview of soil and climate. The opening chapter, “Settlement and Society,” reviews the archaeological evidence for large-scale post-Roman migration, patterns of settlement, population growth, and social change. The second chapter presents a convincing argument about the relevance of geology to the understanding of human culture, emphasizing that “past societies were not merely passive respondents to environmental circumstances, but actively sought to change them, through drainage, marling, and other improvements” (52). This sense of collaboration between human and environment is developed in the third chapter, which examines the environmental contexts of English and Danish settlement during the early medieval period.

Throughout, Williamson thickens his analysis with reference to literary, legal, and historical documents. What emerges from these opening chapters is an understanding of the important role that topography and environment plays within human cultural development. Chapter 3, however, also stakes a claim for the key role that landscape history can play in historical and cultural analysis. Williamson develops it further in the fourth chapter, “Small Shires, Deep Routes,” which explores how landscapes can “inform us about changing forms of social and economic organisations in the Saxon period” (105). The fifth chapter develops Williamson’s nonanthropocentric approach by investigating how climatic variations determined long-term social development in different regions of England.

The later chapters of the book look at crucial issues in landscape history—regional variations in settlement patterns and field systems, the relationships between “champion landscapes” and early medieval settlement, and the role of woodlands in people’s lives. Williamson’s evidence in this thoughtful, provocative, and compelling book is drawn mostly from eastern and midland England, but his conclusions are not restricted to particular geographical locations. Rather, his strongest argument is for
the reassessment of the role of the so-called “natural” world (mainly, soil, climate, and water supplies) within human culture, for seeing culture and history as the result of a collaboration between human and non-human beings.

Joshua Davies
King’s College London


In recent years, Sowerby has published an important series of articles dealing with England’s efforts to advance toleration during the later seventeenth century. In _Making Toleration_, he has now produced a full-scale study focused upon the attempts of James II and VII (1685–1688) to promote this cause and the disastrous consequences for Britain’s Stuart monarchy. His monograph rests upon an exceptional knowledge of the sources and, in particular, an exemplary investigation of local archives: He visited no fewer than 136 repositories in the course of his research. Hence, the book has a welcome local dimension that some recent scholarship on later Stuart England has lacked, supplementing the conventional dominance of London. Clear, attractive writing and a notably effective chapter structure combine to make this a model monograph, particularly for a first book.

By April 1687, King James’ attempt to promote toleration for English Roman Catholics through co-operation with Anglicans had clearly failed. Therefore, he decided to extend the proposed toleration to Protestant nonconformists (“dissenters”) and even to Quakers and Baptists. Sowerby demonstrates how this strategy was his main preoccupation during the remaining months of his reign, adding many new touches to the established account. He demonstrates how the king, with more than a nod to the emerging “public sphere,” sponsored and assisted a group of advocates for religious freedom. His study explores how James’ desire to elect a compliant parliament in the election of 1688—which never took place—led to a large-scale campaign to drive out recalcitrant officeholders from England’s parliamentary boroughs, which controlled urban elections to the House of Commons. Thus did he manage to have 2,342 individuals evicted, affecting around 41 percent of seats.

In Sowerby’s book, James’ determination to champion the cause of toleration, and his support for the “repealers” (those who wished to remove most of the restrictions upon non-Anglicans) during the critical final phase of his reign, emerge as never before. One strength of his crisp narrative is its confirmation of the absolute centrality of religion, and the complex issues that it posed, in the Revolution of 1688.
Behind this detailed account is a clear purpose—to advance recent efforts to rehabilitate the last Stuart king. Sowerby makes a good case for the genuineness of James’ wish to promote religious toleration, much in the spirit of the early Enlightenment. However, he does not fully face the question of why James came to consider Protestants worthy of religious freedom only after his failure to free Catholics from restrictions on worship and participation in public life. Many other scholars interpret James’ inclusion of the Protestants at this point as more of a tactical move than a principled one.

Even more problematical is Sowerby’s consistent underplaying of the king’s lack of political wisdom at key points. He acknowledges it, but he does not give it sufficient emphasis. Sowerby’s evidence discovers that only around 20 percent of James’ subjects could be induced to support his program. To persist with his campaign in the face of such opposition, and with news of heightened religious tension reaching England from the continent, might have been laudable ethically, but it was also risky politically, as the events of 1688 were to demonstrate. The main obstacle to a revisionist view of James II and VII will always be the king himself.

Specialists will be grateful for Sowerby’s detailed and original account of the repealer movement and his demonstration of its important role in 1687/88, which confers genuine significance on his monograph. They will also appreciate his valuable emphasis upon the Revolution’s provincial dimension, but they are likely to regard some of his broader arguments with a degree of skepticism.

Hamish Scott
University of Glasgow

*The Last Blank Spaces: Exploring Africa and Australia.* By Dane Kennedy (Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 2013) 353 pp. $35.00

Like many of the explorers about whom he writes, Kennedy does not open entirely unknown vistas in his study of nineteenth-century British exploration in Africa and Australia. Others have been there before. Although Kennedy’s comparative approach is novel, and several of the insights that he presents are fresh and revealing, what makes his book particularly important is its engagement with two developments in contemporary historical treatments of exploration.

One of these developments is a recent tendency to rehabilitate the reputations of nineteenth-century explorers in something like the heroic terms in which they portrayed themselves. Kennedy counters this tendency in part by noting, as others have, the links between exploration and aggressive imperialism and by emphasizing the brutal use of force by such later figures as Henry Morton Stanley. Much more interestingly, he describes his subjects’ private awareness of their own weakness within
the physical and human environments that they faced, and he demonstrates their comprehensive dependence on indigenous peoples. Until late in the century, European explorers in Africa avoided violent conflict and sought accommodation with African authorities because they had no other choice. Even after the revolution in firepower that made violence more feasible, dependence on Africans for voluntary labor, local knowledge, political protection, and sustenance continued. Australia was significantly different in many respects, but explorers clearly depended on Aboriginal peoples for specialized knowledge and skills. Moreover, they could readily be stopped in their tracks by a hostile local population.

The other development to which Kennedy responds is the current academic interest in the history of public geographical imaginaries. He argues that, in the nineteenth century, exploration was consciously organized and presented to the public as a “modern” and “scientific” activity, modeled on the maritime mapping of the previous century. Explorers and their sponsors conceptually deconstructed previous geographical and ethnographic knowledge on the grounds that it was unscientific, thereby essentially creating many of the blank spaces on the map to which the book’s title refers. The importance of presenting a scientific image often caused explorers to bring with them more instruments than they could use or safely transport. When they published their narratives, they disguised their incorporation of information obtained from local people. This self-presentation often belied a reality in which local knowledge was essential to the success, and often the survival, of even the most “scientific” of explorers.

Kennedy’s decision to focus exclusively on British exploration is puzzling, since many of the factors that he emphasizes were clearly transnational. He acknowledges the frequent presence of Germans among the “British” explorers whom he discusses, but he limits his consideration of the phenomenon to a brief, conventional explanation of why they were there: The Germans had better training in technical fields but more opportunities under British auspices. He pays little attention to the growing centrality of Germany in geographical publishing and the manufacture of instruments and that of France and Germany in academic geography. He does not use (or even note) the scholarship that has been available since the work of Essner about the backgrounds and careers of German explorers. Comparisons based on such work might have allowed him to distinguish what was peculiarly British about the aspects of exploration that he analyzes from traits that were more general or more characteristic of certain other nations.

Woodruff D. Smith
University of Massachusetts, Boston

1 Cornelia Essner, Deutsche Afrikareisende im neunzehnten Jahrhundert: Zur Sozialgeschichte des Reisens (Stuttgart, 1985).
The Flower of Empire: An Amazonian Water Lily, the Quest to Make It Bloom, and the World It Created. By Tatiana Holway (New York, Oxford University Press, 2013) 306 pp. $29.95

Organizing a research project around the cultural history of a single species of plant is inherently interdisciplinary. By tracing European, especially British, interest in the tropical water lily now known to science as *Victoria amazonica*, Holway integrates nineteenth-century botany with geography, horticulture, architecture, and politics, beginning with the first British discovery of the plant in Guiana (1837), and culminating in the Great Exhibition of 1851 in the Crystal Palace, Hyde Park, London. As Holway weaves multiple disciplines into the lily’s story, various rivalries in England take center stage. The natural history of *Victoria* is equally remarkable, but for that subject, one should turn to Anisko’s *Victoria The Seductress: A Cultural and Natural History of the World’s Greatest Water Lily*, also published in 2013.¹ Neither author cites the other. Both subtitles taken together convey the fascination that Western observers have shown for *Victoria* from their first awareness of it.

Holway controls her narrative by pursuing it steadily from a British point of view. For example, she treats earlier Europeans’ sightings of the lily in its native rivers briefly and only in relation to England’s “first” and, to some extent, mendacious claim. Holway is compelling, as well as entertaining, in her analysis of intra-British rivalries between the Royal Geographical Society and the Horticultural Society, or between botanists John Lindley and William J. Hooker.

Holway’s discussion of the British politics surrounding *Victoria* is the strongest part of her book; she has made good use of primary materials, especially letters preserved by the institutions that sponsored their authors. For the early history of the exploration and first mapping of the lily’s native habitat in South America, Holway largely relies on Riviere’s *The Guiana Travels of Robert Schomburgk.*² For the period beginning with Joseph Paxton’s arrival at Chatsworth as the head gardener of William Cavendish, the sixth Duke of Devonshire, in 1826, Holway appropriately relies on the largely unpublished primary materials housed at Chatsworth, especially the duke’s diaries and letters, as well as the correspondence of Paxton and his wife. These primary sources undergird her use of Colquhoun’s recent biography of Paxton.³

Holway’s style is comfortably balanced between the academic and the popular, well documented but also attentive to readers, and sometimes delightfully humorous. Although her disparate threads are

---

smoothly interwoven, Holway’s storytelling sometimes relies too much on what “must have” happened when her factual information runs thin, forcing her to resort to such general cultural background material as Charles Dickens’ novels. Fortunately, Dickens also wrote a detailed account of the Crystal Palace for his magazine *Household Words*—a text that supports Holway’s thesis directly: When *Victoria amazonica* became an emblem of the queen’s empire, claiming, naming, and bringing it into flower ahead of all rival gardeners became worth the concentrated effort of a number of Britain’s most distinguished men and the institutions, both private and public, that supported them.4

Margaret Flanders Darby
Colgate University

*Financing the Raj: The City of London and Colonial India, 1858–1940.* By David Sutherland (Rochester, Boydell Press, 2013) 240 pp. $130.00

This monograph’s subtitle is misleading. *Financing the Raj* is not about the city of London but about the India office’s management of the colony’s external finances through city institutions in London. For about nine decades until the late 1940s, the India office in London, which was a separate department of state headed by a member of the British cabinet with the title of “secretary of state for India,” managed the colony’s external debt and its currency and exchange rates. It was a major presence in London financial markets, investing India’s working balances and reserves, managing its currency, and issuing, managing, and collecting the colony’s debts with an eye mainly toward promoting the stability of these markets, and the stability or effective management of the pound sterling. By the early 1900s, the India office seemed briefly to offer an unsurpassed career at the intersection of high finance and high politics that attracted bright minds, such as the young civil servant John Maynard Keynes. Overseeing the India office’s management of Indian financial affairs was a finance committee made up of rising city figures and the odd retired bureaucrat. In India itself, finances were entrusted to a finance member, a position to which, by the crisis-prone interwar years, leading but locally unsuited Whitehall figures with political ambitions were exiled.

Much has been written about India, the India office, and the city of London starting with Keynes’ *Indian Currency and Finance* (London, 1913). Keynes wrote his book practically at the request of Lionel Abrahams, his former India office boss. *Indian Currency and Finance* put the best possible spin on Whitehall’s management of the colony’s currency affairs, offering in the process an elegant if anodyne account of bureaucratic intervention in financial markets to advance a liberal, metropolitan conception of the public interest. Keynes’ reward for his efforts

was a seat on the 1914 royal commission on Indian currency and finance.

Sunderland claims to have been “utterly appalled” at the start of his research by the picture of “ineptitude and dishonesty” in the India Office that witnesses before this commission painted, and he determined to expose this “depraved” institution. By the last year of his research, however, the India Office had transformed into an “efficient institution staffed and advised by committed and highly knowledgeable individuals” successfully protecting India from “City exploitation” (vii).

Sunderland need not have bothered to write a redemption. As the virtual author of the report of the 1914 commission, Keynes was quick to prick most of the criticisms that the India office faced before and during the commission’s proceedings. Keynes’s century-old apologia for his former department’s late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century rigging of the colony’s monetary system (which led to a period of prolonged instability through the interwar years) has also rarely been bettered.

Nevertheless, while offering few fresh insights, Financing the Raj undertakes an extensive reading of primary sources to reconstruct in considerable detail the India Office’s debt and monetary operations in London. That the former has been less well covered than the latter in the monographic literature provides one reason for readers to turn to this book. It also retells a known, if not altogether familiar, story in a simple and accessible manner.

This accessibility, however, comes at a price. Even where it seems informed of recent secondary research in its areas of interest, the monograph remains curiously disengaged from it. Colonial India was the site of numerous failed and successful experiments that have a bearing on a substantial body of our theoretical and practical knowledge of currency and exchange rates and central banking, but Sunderland makes no attempt to examine this side of the story. In taking economic knowledge and orthodoxies for granted as somehow *sui generis*, Financing the Raj misses an opportunity to add to our understanding of the constitutive role of Indian and other colonial institutions in Britain’s financial history.

G. Balachandran

Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies, Geneva


In *Gusto for Things*, Ago turns her considerable acumen and archival expertise to the household possessions of “the middling sort” of Romans, contributing to a now-considerable literature on material culture. Ba-
roque Rome pulsed with luxury consumption, and Ago shows how the evolving taste for fine things pervaded many levels of society, not only the nobility. Using 200 wills, inventories, and account books, she argues that seventeenth-century Rome’s economy was prosperous, not stagnant, particularly if consumption rather than production is used as a measure.

Her work draws both on anthropological discussions of material objects that emphasize their cultural construction and on the importance of a cash economy in “liberating” objects from their role as a medium of exchange (15–16). This shift was still incomplete in Baroque Rome. How, then, did a given possession—a book, say, or a bedstand—change from a simple holder of exchange value to a holder of symbolic value, worthy of being recorded, named, and transmitted independent of its monetary worth? What drives an owner to initiate this transformation? These questions lead Ago to extended studies of such items as artwork, books, jewels, and dresses, the ones most commonly named in wills. Thirty-three black and white plates of genre paintings by Annibale Carracci, Michelangelo Merisi (Caravaggio), and others evoke the objects discussed, including dishes, furniture, musical instruments, and work tools.

Fine-grained statistical analysis allows Ago to distinguish trends by age, wealth, and gender. One of her many trenchant conclusions concerns the universality of a drive for immortality through unique possessions. An ever-broader swath of Romans sought to preserve family name and reputation by making some of their things inalienable, often real estate but sometimes moveable goods. Testators ordered heirs to liquidate other resources mainly to protect the main investment: “The movement of some goods was only the means for guaranteeing the stability and prospective inalienability of others” (61).

The women in the sample, unsurprisingly, were poorer than the men, owning fewer paintings and almost no books. Yet, overall, they owned more things, and their homes were more crowded with objects. In this context, however, the limits of the documentation sharpen, as Ago duly notes: The law strictly separated the property of husbands and wives, though in practice they mingled in the home. Inventories of personal possessions therefore often give an incomplete account of a home’s contents; a woman might have had ready access to her husband’s plethora of books, paintings, and jewels. Such methodological insights are among the book’s highlights.

Of value to historians of art, economy, gender, and material culture, Gusto for Things enriches our sense of the material world and the values of ordinary Romans in the time of Caravaggio and Gian Lorenzo Bernini, contextualizing that age’s great art collections and museums in a broader social milieu.

P. Renée Baernstein
Miami University
Crime and Culture in Early Modern Germany. By Joy Wiltenburg (Charlottesville, University of Virginia Press, 2012) 268 pp. $45.00

In Crime and Culture in Early Modern Germany, Wiltenburg explores the representation of crime in early modern Germany, seeking to understand how the meaning of crime changed as it was depicted in print and imagined by readers. According to Wiltenburg, the early years of print history show a growing concern with criminal activity, fostered by fundamental changes in early modern society. Along the way, she demonstrates that crime stories, a prominent genre in early modern print culture, are a “reflection of the distinctive values, fears, and experience of its time and place” (2). For Wiltenburg, the “distinctive dynamics of crime discourse reveal interplays among fact, fiction, public power, familial tensions, emotional resonance, and personal identity,” dimensions of early modern culture that she examines in her perceptive analysis of printed texts (9).

Wiltenburg’s source base is a sample of more than 200 printed crime accounts, which she buttresses with a variety of complementary sources—legal texts, archival records, and fictional crime stories. Her source material presents several potential problems, including the limited literacy of the era, the notorious difficulty of gauging reception and impact, and the role of early modern authorities in shaping these crime accounts. In her analysis, Wiltenburg ably confronts these thorny issues, and her thoughtful approach to her sources serves to mitigate their limitations.

In her first chapter, Wiltenburg outlines the parameters of her sources, explaining what sorts of crimes, criminals, and victims that they highlighted. Murder featured most prominently in printed crime accounts, which, by the sixteenth century, had begun to focus on the threat posed by vagrant outsiders and desperate family members. It reflected growing concerns about the landless poor and the imperiled family in an age of want.

The second chapter concerns the relationship between official legal documents and popular crime accounts. Wiltenburg argues that both of these genres sought to create a “unified public response” to crime, the former through reason and the latter through sensation (64).

In Chapter 3, Wiltenburg evaluates how her printed crime accounts—constructed texts—compare with the reality of early modern crime, analyzing how authors used early forms of sensationalism to shape public attitudes. The next chapter covers the relationship between crime and Christianity in early modern crime accounts; authors encouraged readers to view these stories as “living sermons” (102). In a particularly riveting chapter entitled “Family Murders,” Wiltenburg shows how the pressures on families engendered by the depredations of the Little Ice Age and the moral rigors of the Reformation fueled concerns about violence within the household.

Chapter Six examines the role of sensationalism in the texts—how
authors of crime pamphlets deployed “techniques of depiction that heightened the demand for audience imagination, identification, and feeling” in response to the bloody deeds that they related (147). In Chapter 7, Wiltenburg examines changes in crime literature during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, after the genre had peaked in popularity. In her conclusion, she argues for the larger significance of her topic: “By connecting the personal (violation of bodily boundaries and core values, probing of guilt, death and the soul) with the political (enforcement of order and legitimation of power) . . . [crime narratives] speak to central matters of social existence” (192).

Wiltenburg’s book is a valuable contribution to the scholarship on print culture and crime during the early modern period. With its focus on the interplay between reality and representation, text and reception, and authorship and audience, it should interest a wide variety of scholars from history, literature, and media studies.

Jason Coy
College of Charleston


This solidly researched history of tourism concerns rest and recreation for the masses as well as outings by more privileged groups. As a labor historian, Koenker stresses links with work, including tourism as recuperation and self-improvement for the proletariat. Her big themes include the shift to a consumer society, tourism as part of a “good life,” and the late Soviet authoritarian state’s seemingly paradoxical promotion of individual touring (2). The book should interest historians and social scientists of the Soviet Union, as well as specialists of tourism elsewhere since she compares Soviet programs with Western tourism.

Koenker tracks the government’s determination to promote “a life of useful leisure” and “rational leisure” (89). She explains how the Bolsheviks’ initial emphasis on easing the lot of the proletariat paved the way to tourism as a reward for shock workers and technical personnel during the 1930s. She finds that the government during the 1920s and 1930s, however, condemned “travel by an individual for romantic glory or self-satisfaction” (90). She notes the introduction of culture as a priority after World War II, along with the promotion of films, music, theater, and other educational entertainment at sites such as Yalta and Sochi. This development paralleled the Cold War cultural competition, though the author does not explore this issue in detail. She mentions, however, that the press contrasted Soviet vacations with expensive capitalist holidays.

During the 1960s, a middle class began to replace workers as prime consumers; accommodations improved, with an eye toward Eastern Europe’s prewar experience; tourists gained more choice; and the press
started to promote tourism as “romance.” Nonetheless, medical tourism remained important. Overall, tourism increasingly became a consumer good after Joseph Stalin’s death. Oddly, despite this turnabout, family accommodations remained in short supply. During the last Soviet decades, tourism by car grew more popular, as did the search for adventure and pleasure. Nevertheless, Koenker argues, Soviet tourism retained much of its original purposiveness.

Koenker’s focus in this fine book comes at a price, since she largely ignores the semi-dissident quality of the intelligentsia’s experience. Under Leonid Brezhnev, for example, venturesome intelligentsia visited sites of genuine ethnic and folk culture, returning home not with official badges (znachki) but with bits of peasant costumes, clay toys, icons from Siberia, and other artifacts. Arkady and Boris Strugatsky prefigure this phenomenon in their 1964 novel Monday Begins on Saturday (Moscow, 1966). Their narrator, driving through Karelia out of Leningrad, picks up two hitchhikers who take him to a crazy world of actual living folk characters. He identifies himself as a “tourist” at the outset, downplaying the workaday world as do the authors in the novel’s title. Similarly disaffected would-be tourists considering foreign travel might also dream of fantastical freer worlds. The old Soviet joke, “A chicken is not a bird and Bulgaria is not abroad,” captures the expectation that in a bloc, travel to a loyal satellite would disappoint.

Jeffrey Brooks
Johns Hopkins University

Native and Spanish New Worlds: Sixteenth-Century Entradas in the American Southwest and Southeast. Edited by Clay Mathers, Jeffrey M. Mitchem, and Charles M. Haecker (Tucson, University of Arizona Press, 2013) 382 pp. $60.00

This work comprises fifteen chapters by twenty-six authors—an introduction; a chapter on “Native Perspectives”; paired chapters on “Historiography,” “Climatic Influences and Impacts,” and “Disease”; and three chapters on “Political Organization” (two of them treating the Southeast), “Conflict,” and “Discussion.” Entrada is a new buzzword in borderland studies, used to connote the numerous and sometimes substantial raids launched by the Spaniards into the present U.S. Southwest and Southeast during the sixteenth century, almost always assisted by Native Americans, who outnumbered them.

The principal characteristic of these entradas was their failure to achieve territorial domination or settlement, serving instead as reconnaissance missions and softening-up exercises. Altogether, the Spaniards completed ten expeditions to the Southwest and nearly as many to the Southeast. The simultaneous forays of Francisco Vázquez de Coronado (Southwest) and Hernán de Soto (Southeast) are by far the best chronicled. They are similar in character, scope, and purpose to the ghazawât
and razzias practiced by Islamic expansionist states (as well as the attacks by the Mongols) during the late Middle Ages, or those by the Turkic peoples north of China proper. All of the contributors argue that these expeditions (de Soto’s excepted) comprised not professional mini-armies but multicultural and multi-ethnic crowds that spent more time assimilating and sharing than fighting. When they did fight, the Spaniards were often defeated or rebuffed.

The chapters on climate are the most enlightening and innovative (81–120). Advances in dendrochronology and historical weather patterns allow the authors to apply more granulation to the historical record than previously possible. This fruitful collaboration confirms and explains much of the written and archaeological record, permitting more thoroughgoing hypotheses about pre-contact conditions. As Dennis B. Blanton insightfully points out, “None of the newcomers had sufficient firsthand knowledge to know which of the [climatic] conditions were anomalous; consequently, they had a weak basis for making comparative judgments” (108). This observation would have been true about other aspects of these newly found lands—a point easily clouded by hindsight.

A prominent theme throughout these chapters is that, rather than top-down hierarchies, the Spaniards and Indians tended to co-exist on the ground, the former becoming entrants into existing sociopolitical arrangements. For instance, David Hurst Thomas describes St. Augustine, the only permanent Spanish settlement in the sixteenth century, as having been “transformed into another powerful Mississippian chiefdom, both competing and allied with neighborhood Native American groups” (261).

In an intriguing volte face, the contributors all seem to have silently jettisoned the disease model of protohistorical American demographic change, which dominated discussion from the 1970s until recently. This notion ascribed implausibly high and implausibly rapid hemispheric death tolls due almost entirely to numerous “virgin soil” epidemics. The orthodoxy now seems to be that disease became a primary cause of depopulation only toward the end of the sixteenth century. Regrettably, the reasons for this turnabout are not explicitly given.

The studies in this book are both true to the evidence and successful in emphasizing both the banality and the tragedy of this particular New World encounter. For the Spaniards, the entradas often became the stuff of epic; for the Indians, they marked the prelude to privation, subjugation, and disease. In the interim, however, they occasioned a high degree of interaction and even assimilation. Nonetheless, the process was neither inexorable nor uniform.

Inevitably, perhaps, the book evinces considerable redundancy; readers will find themselves tracing the steps of de Soto’s and Coronado’s expeditions more than once, if from different perspectives. Withal, it is good to have the latest developments in borderland scholarship (plus a sixty-page bibliography) conveniently collected in one place.

David Henige
University of Wisconsin, Madison
As Thompson points out, between Henry Hudson’s 1609 voyage to the Delaware Bay and William Penn’s arrival in 1682, “No less than ten different colonial regimes sought to assert their authority in the Delaware Valley” (5). Some people may have sworn their allegiance to as many as eight different political masters. This rapid-fire sequence of Dutch, English, and Swedish colonization makes the seventeenth-century Delaware Valley an exceptionally good laboratory for understanding the complex interplay between “nationalism,” “allegiance,” “subjects,” “race,” and other dimensions of collective identity in the early modern Atlantic world.

Many scholars, impressed by the fluidity and multiplicity of identities in the early modern era, have argued that nationalism is a relatively recent phenomenon. Thompson, however, insists that “the early modern sense of what constituted a nation differed from the modern, but it was not so different as many have supposed” (6). Nor, Thompson continues, were cosmopolitanism (Delaware Valley residents often served multiple rulers and spoke numerous languages) and nationalism necessarily opposing forces. On the contrary, “Cosmopolitan forms of interaction and communication” actually “reinforced . . . national identities” (13).

Relegating theory primarily to a brief introduction, Thompson allows his argument to emerge out of a meticulous narrative of the successive attempts to conquer the Delaware Valley by one nation or another (though not, usually, Indian nations, which enter the picture primarily as a counterpoint to colonists’ national identities). By “showing” more than “telling” how identities shifted and formed on the ground level, Thompson captures the ambiguity and multiplicity of personal identities in the polyglot Delaware Valley, while also making a compelling case that nationality mattered a great deal. Colonists of all descriptions ultimately insisted on the privileges that came with being part of a nation, invoking their Swedish, Dutch, or English allegiance to claim a certain civil status or to advance their economic fortunes. After 1682, however, large-scale immigration to the new colony of Pennsylvania overwhelmed the small communities remaining from earlier colonization efforts. The emerging notion of “Britishness,” with its insistence on civil equality and its inherent mechanisms for accommodating ethnic and confessional diversity, helped Swedes, Finns, and others to convert their nationalities into ethnic identities under the British umbrella.

Thompson’s theoretical and narrative chapters do not always correspond: The central theme sometimes wanders from the course outlined in the introduction, which could also be more smoothly integrated with the final chapter and epilog. Yet this disjunction has its virtues; Thompson’s narrative reveals things that his analysis does not. Most notably, the heart of the book focuses more heavily on New Sweden than the
theoretical agenda in Thompson’s introduction might indicate. These absorbing narrative passages establish that Sweden was a far more important player in seventeenth-century America than most historians have recognized. *The Contest for the Delaware Valley*, in short, is an important scholarly contribution on more than one level.

James D. Rice  
State University of New York, Plattsburgh


While visiting Sierra Leone in 1811, African-American evangelist Paul Cuffee witnessed the public reading of a letter from a Christian Oneida community in upstate New York. He was impressed by the attentive response that it received from a Baptist congregational audience. Despite thousands of miles of ocean and centuries of distinct historical and cultural experiences, these disparate Christian communities appeared to share a kinship and camaraderie. The spark of this hard-to-define commonality provides much of the impetus behind Andrews’ *Native Apostles*, a study of how early modern European missionary societies used indigenous Africans and Native Americans as evangelists across the Atlantic world.

With the maturation of British Atlantic world studies during the past decade, scholars like Andrews have come to realize that in addition to maritime commerce and martial conquest, missionary evangelization was integral to both the expansion of European empires and to the formation of unique, often hybrid cultural spaces across the region. Laura Stevens, *The Poor Indians: British Missionaries, Native Americans and Colonial Sensibility* (Philadelphia, 2004), for example, demonstrated that Britons’ financial support of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel was based in large part on their shared sense of sentimental attachment to the plight of non-European, non-Christian peoples. This collective feeling, in turn, fueled a renewed sense of pride of membership in the British Empire.

*Native Apostles* thus arrives at a propitious moment in the development of the historiography of the Atlantic world, with its promise of bringing together the often-separate fields of Black and Native Atlantic studies under the rubric of Christian evangelization. As a six-chapter, chronological study that offers the “untold story” of how colonized peoples in the Atlantic world responded to and re-shaped Christianity in their own images, Andrews’ work brings to light heretofore neglected Native American and African participants in the construction of the early modern Atlantic: for example, Philip Quaque, the first African ordained in the English church; Good Peter, Isaac Dakayenenserte, and
Deacon Thomas—leaders of the Oneida and later Protestant evangelists; and the Afro-Moravian missionaries Jacob Protten and James Capitein.

In his opening pages, Andrews usefully reasserts the centrality of Martha’s Vineyard in New England as a locus of Indian preaching efforts that actually eclipsed those of English missionaries; he also fruitfully uncovers the efforts of two Native women (known only as Rebecca and Esther) at nearby Manomet Ponds who ran a school for Indian children. In subsequent chapters, Andrews considers the role of Native peoples in the establishment and running of the “Charleston Negro School” of the 1740s, the West African Moravian and Anglican missions, and the education and conversion of the Iroquois.

Even as Andrews admits to a “paucity of records” about such native missionary activities, he manages to tease out fascinating case studies from the recovery of such persons and events. Especially important in this regard are the structural similarities that he finds between African and Native American Christian communities. Recruited for their skills in the dialects of Native peoples, as well as their access to indigenous kinship networks, Blacks and Indians were often nearly destitute compared to their white missionary peers; the missionary societies regarded them as a cheap and hardy source of labor, able to endure harsher conditions and to subsist on fewer luxuries than their European counterparts. Nor was comfort to be found in their own communities; both groups of native ministers often found themselves isolated and lonely, driven to itinerancy and identity crises in the face of marginalization by Europeans and non-Europeans alike.

In this respect, Andrews’ conceptualization of “native” as including both Indian and Black represents an especially useful innovation; it renders the plight and the agency of these African and Native American subjects as singularly coherent within the logics of European Atlantic empires, as well as their world-wide systems of evangelization. In one of the book’s most successful case studies, Andrews describes the social and political contexts for the separatist ordination of the alphabetically illiterate Narragansett minister Samuel Niles. Like many of the most interesting passages in Native Apostles, this section explores how native evangelists became lightning rods for doctrinal debates between the various Protestant denominations that sought to convert them.

Other case studies, however, expose one of the book’s major weaknesses. Andrews tends to resist interpretation of such events as Niles’ distinctive and “indigenous” ordination, apparently content with the act of recovery alone. Religious-studies scholars and students of Native American history will rightly be puzzled by Andrews’ assertion of a general “Native American identity” at play in Oneida, Mohegan, and Delaware missionaries’ self-fashioning (53). His assertions that Native American cosmologies had much in common with Moravian worldviews are also likely to cause some consternation, especially his claim that “ritual indigenous practices of torture and bloodletting fit easily with Moravianism” (103). One need only to recall the pervasive medicinal bloodletting and penal torture current in early modern European societies to question the
veracity of such statements. It was, in fact, English barbarity that led Mohegan cleric Samson Occom to lament “the Melancholy sight . . . [of] So many Malefactors Hung up in Irons” during his 1766 visit to London.

When Andrews embraces a more nuanced, interpretive approach, however, the study can be revealing. Such is the case when he explores the theological roots of the missionary societies’ choice of native evangelists. To this end, Andrews invokes a phenomenon in the early modern Christian church that he calls “sacred genealogy,” the ideological inscription of native missionaries (both African and Indian) in Church history as “fellow heirs” of an apostolic tradition that reached back to the time of Christ. Native Apostles also effectively details the differences between the Congregationalist, Anglican, and Moravian models of native missionary work.

The book’s fullest and most persuasive moments come when Andrews describes how the enslaved African convert John Quamine mobilized the social networks of Newport, Rhode Island, gaining the patronage of Presbyterian Princeton president John Witherspoon, Connecticut Old Light Congregationalism scion Ezra Stiles, and enthusiastic exponent of the New Light evangelism Samuel Hopkins to promote a mission to Africa. He failed, as Andrews rightly points out, largely because of Newport’s dependence on the slave trade. In this case study, Native Apostles makes explicit the structural tension between idealistic assertions of the “spiritual genealogy” of non-European converts and a rival “spiritual geography” in which their homelands remain irredeemably “dark” and “pagan” in deference to the mercantilist imperatives of the trade.

If Native Apostles is sometimes disappointing for its lack of analytical reach, it remains a useful addition to the scholarship, particularly in regard to its laudable conjoining of the African and Native American experiences, its recovery of native social actors to the historical record, and its Appendix, which lists most of the native missionaries who played a part in the construction of the spiritual genealogies and geographies that the book describes. Future scholars will certainly build on Andrews’ work to provide more culturally textured accounts of the kinds of community formation and self-fashioning that Native Americans and Africans performed in the early modern Atlantic world.

Phillip H. Round
University of Iowa


Kett’s dense and detailed history argues that the ideal of merit was vital to the founding and development of the United States, Kett defines merit
strictly as a “quality deserving reward.” Yet he well appreciates—and indeed his entire study is concerned to show—that the term is necessarily multivalent, shaped not only by the prevailing understanding of its principal elements and features in any given period but also by those practices deemed incompatible with it, such as advancement by bloodlines, quotas, nepotism, or political spoil. Following the fortunes and tensions of merit from the eighteenth century to the present day, Kett seeks to ascertain the main shifts in the usage and reception of the concept. At the same time, he grounds his cultural and intellectual history in a discussion of how merit has been treated in a number of key institutional settings—the military (where the “merit system” at West Point was born), government bureaucracies and the civil service, universities, and corporations. Thus, his study is at once a long-term conceptual history and an effort to track the social and political practices associated with it in a number of different domains.

Although the ideal of merit was integral to the origins of the United States, the founding fathers who helped to shepherd it into being also elicited a suspicion of it as potentially inimical to the republican notion of equal rights. Styling themselves (and widely hailed) as “men of merit,” the founders were confident in what Kett describes as their “essential merit,” which, like honor, was considered a personal quality worthy of public note. But they were also confident that American society—with its lack of a hereditary nobility and comparative social mobility—would continue to foster men of worth. Others disagreed, concerned that the revolutionary generation might exploit its position, leading to despotism, nepotism, or a new aristocracy (witness the furor over the Society of Cincinnati). Although few doubted that the revolutionary men of merit were deserving of public respect, they wondered how new men with the requisite qualities were to be discovered. This new difficulty of knowing and evaluating merit was further complicated by the paradox that in a society based on equal rights, claims to merit would be subject to suspicion and even skepticism.

Kett follows the rise of what he styles “institutional merit,” discovered and conferred by schools, corporations, armed forces, and the like, often via a battery of exams, as one means to resolve this central problem. But he also notes how the founding paradox re-emerges again and again in American history, most recently with the New Left and the vicissitudes of a relativistic and celebrity-driven culture.

Kett is at his best when comparing American practices with those of other societies—the competitiveness of British examination systems at Oxbridge, the prestige and professionalism of the Prussian civil service, or the “careers open to talents” initiated by Napoleon—which allows him to detect American peculiarities. Too often, however, readers must work to extricate larger themes, continuities, and departures from chapters steeped in copious detail. Nonetheless, merit must be acknowledged where merit is due. This ambitious and wide-ranging book is an apt complement to such indispensable studies of the subject as John Carson’s *The Measure of Merit: Talents, Intelligence, and Inequality in the French and

Darrin M. McMahon
Florida State University


McMahon and Allgor are both working within two of the oldest interpretive frames that construct the field of United States Women’s History—the nineteenth-century concept of “separate spheres” and the idea of “republican motherhood.” Reading the American Revolution as the capstone of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, historians have posited that political changes combined with Enlightenment ideals to convince political leaders that support for women’s education would produce the next generation’s enlightened citizens. Kerber found that the promise of republican motherhood for the political advancement of middling and elite white women was, in the end, unfulfilled.¹ Yet within this relegation of women to the domestic world, historians such as Cott, Smith-Rosenberg, and Ryan have argued that women’s agency and significant influence can be found within this separate sphere.²

Mere Equals and Dolley Madison insert themselves into both discussions, connecting the eighteenth with the nineteenth centuries as they facilitate a conversation about women at this transformative moment in political history. The years of the early republic have become the focus among historians of revolutionary America, with emphases upon the rise of popular democracy, the meaning of citizenship, and the development of a national identity. Since citizenship was necessarily white and male, historians have both celebrated the extension of it across class divisions and examined emancipation and the meaning of freedom for African Americans. In this scholarship, women have often been little more than an audience, but were women as silent and uninvolved as their invisibility implies?

McMahon examines the experiences and responses of bourgeois white women, mostly in the northern states, within the heady world of the new nation. She begins her explorations with the female academies that were established not so much to provide ornamental “finishing” as academic education. She argues that the goal of these academies, of the parents who sent their daughters to them, and of the girls who attended them was a rational education that turned out women who were neither coquettes nor pedantic intellectuals. This interplay between public representation, personal experience, and societal response framed women’s acquisition of education as an individual as well as a social enterprise (19). McMahon argues that the concept of “mere equality” served to provide both encouragement to women as well as reassurance to men that educated women would be intelligent, engaging companions to husbands.

McMahon analyzes women’s experiences in terms of life-cycle stages marked by relationships—friendships with peers, networks with sisters and mothers, courtship, companionate marriage, and motherhood. Through the use of an extraordinary body of personal correspondence and journals, McMahon follows the enhanced joys and unsettling challenges that learning brought to women’s lives. Each chapter is built around a particularly rich body of personal materials that reveals the thoughts and actions of a pair of correspondents. Although historians have long understood the deep emotional and intellectual relationships between women, readers might be surprised by the engaging exchanges between seeming equals during courtship, as well as the promise and disappointments of early efforts at companionate marriage.

Augmented with an illuminating use of print culture—from stories to novels, newspapers, and polemical literature—Mere Equality delineates stunning portraits of bourgeois women in terms of their hopes, enriched relationships, and ultimate inability to maintain their intellectual focus in the face of the emotional demands of motherhood. McMahon has provided an exceptionally developed picture of women’s agency during this time of social, cultural, and political development. Hers is historical research and textual analysis at its best, persuasively argued and elegantly written.

My only quibble is her use of the term patriarchy as a descriptor of basic social hierarchy. Patriarchy is a historically situated power structure, changing according to economic and social conditions as well as the surrounding cultural framework. An uncontextualized use of this term implies that simplistic expectations of male control over women trumped women’s efforts to establish equality with their male counterparts. McMahon’s scholarship is sophisticated enough to avoid such an error. Since most of these chapters counter such a facile analysis, McMahon would have strengthened her argument if she had detailed when and how male authority was exercised, whether and how women acknowledged that authority, and whether men adapted their strategies to women’s expectations. From my reading, her subjects were not
complicit in any loss of agency; they recognized and accommodated themselves to the empirical realities of their domestic lives.

Allgor’s study of Dolley Madison fits smoothly into the world that McMahon laid out. Ostensibly a brief, readable text for undergraduates, the book, in Allgor’s hands, provides an illuminating window on the political culture of the first two decades of the nineteenth century. Her narrative, which is grounded in an extensive body of documentary sources, presents an educated woman’s response to the political machinations, triumphs, and challenges of the young nation. More important, however, is Allgor’s ability to engage the reader in Madison’s influential career as a political hostess. The world of friendships, families, and marriages that McMahon outlined becomes in Allgor’s book the frame within which Madison operated as a social leader, strengthening her husband’s political party, the Democrat-Republicans, uniting a nation fragmented by region and experience, and smoothing problems among American politicians and representatives of foreign governments. Allgor provides an impressive picture of the exhausting labor of women running households and providing hospitality, the very image of a woman active in her separate sphere. Yet within the atmosphere of elite American politics, the influence of this hostess extended outward into the conversations of male leaders and the problems of governments.

Like many books in this genre, *Dolley Madison* is lucidly written and carefully crafted. Although readers cannot track the sources via notes, Allgor has provided a clear pathway through the materials. Far less common for books of this nature is the insightful analysis that Allgor manages to incorporate into the text. Any reader who simply rejoices to find another woman added to the narrative is, frankly, missing the point. In her compelling discussion of the nascent government developing within a decidedly undeveloped capital city, Allgor outlines the central importance of one woman’s contributions, demonstrating that women’s potential, as depicted in McMahon’s world of *Mere Equals*, was, in this case, realized.

Marilyn J. Westerkamp
University of California, Santa Cruz

*Free Trade and Sailors’ Rights in the War of 1812*. By Paul A. Gilje (New York, Cambridge University Press, 2013) 437 pp. $85.00 cloth $29.99 paper

On July 2, 1812, in the first weeks of the War of 1812, Captain David Porter sailed the United States Frigate *Essex* out of New York harbor and raised a banner proclaiming “A free trade and sailors’ rights.” Porter’s vessel had a distinguished history in the war, taking America’s first British warship (HMS *Alert*) and wreaking havoc on Britain’s Pacific whaling fleet before finally being captured off the coast of Valparaiso,
Chile, in March 1814. Yet, Porter’s exploits paled in comparison to the influence of his banner. In this fresh work on the causes and meaning of the War of 1812, Gilje argues that Porter’s motto—“Free Trade and Sailors’ Rights”—became the leading political slogan for the war. The phrase neatly encapsulated the two primary causes of the war for the United States—predatory British commercial regulations, known as the Orders in Council (the free-trade issue), and the impressment of American citizens as sailors on British naval vessels (the sailors’-rights issue). Furthermore, the motto appealed across the social strata by joining the high culture of Enlightenment political economy with a concern for the equal status and treatment of common people.

Gilje’s work similarly brings together several subfields of history—cultural, intellectual, social, political, and diplomatic. The narrative succeeds most when it focuses on the fascinating career of Porter’s phrase. The slogan soon appeared on the flags of other American ships and on tavern signs; in public and private toasts and congressional speeches; and, especially, in poems, songs, and headlines adorning political pamphlets and newspapers. Indeed, Gilje depends heavily on early American newspapers for sources; it is hard to fathom how this study could exist without digital databases. A generous number of illustrations (twenty-four) complement the digital newspaper research by showing “Free Trade and Sailors’ Rights” on such material objects as prints, cartoons, pottery, and pieces of scrimshaw (etched whalebone or tooth).

The use of digital newspaper databases yields some genuine breakthroughs. Gilje discovered that use of the word impressment, as opposed to impress, to describe the forced service of sailors did not become common until the mid-1790s. Although he is wrong that Americans coined the more menacing term—impressment—dates to at least the 1690s—he correctly links its expanded usage to U.S. resistance against British maritime depredations. In addition, by counting the number of times impressment appeared in American newspapers in the years leading up to the War of 1812, Gilje proves what historians have long suspected based on anecdotal evidence: After waxing and waning for years, interest in the issue exploded in 1812.

Gilje is less successful when he veers from the subject of his title. Given the absence of new archival manuscript sources, his chapters on Native Americans, western expansion, and peace negotiations repeat material commonly found in other works on the War of 1812. Nonetheless, Gilje’s ambition is admirable. He has rescued the forgotten phrase that gave meaning to America’s original forgotten war.

Denver Brunsman
George Washington University
Signposts: New Directions in Southern Legal History. Edited by Sally E. Hadden and Patricia Hagler Minter (Athens, University of Georgia Press, 2013) 473 pp $26.95

The legal history of the American South has always had a distinctive flavor. The region maintained a separate body of laws for slaves and free people decades after (usually gradual) emancipation schemes had ended legal bondage in the northern states, and it had always exhibited a greater tolerance for extralegal violence—dueling and lynching being critical examples—than other parts of the nation.

The subject of this fine collection—eighteen chapters by important contemporary legal scholars and an editors’ introduction—is the legal history of the South as a distinctive region. Divided into three parts—“Colonial and Early National Legal Regimes,” “Law and Society in the Long Nineteenth Century,” and “Constitutionalism, Civil Rights and Civil Liberties”—Signposts begins with eighteenth-century Florida and New Orleans, the South as outpost of the eighteenth century Spanish Empire, and ends with the South of the 1960s, the most dramatic battlefield in the fight for civil rights. The chapters cover a complex range of issues—slavery, race, crime and punishment, married women’s control of property, the role of the grand jury, the importance of the Homestead Exemption in southern history, the secessionist constitutional perspective, etc.

A few of the chapters illustrate the quality of the volume as a whole. The introduction by Hadden and Minter skillfully frames the historiographical canvas against which many modern historians paint their portraits of the law’s role in the region’s development. Its detailed footnotes provide a valuable overview of the field. Two of the chapters in the first section deal with the colonial and early national periods—Thomas Ingersoll’s “The Law and Order Campaign in New Orleans, 1763–1765: A Comparative View” and Jennifer M. Spear’s “Using the Faculties Conceded to Her by Law: Slavery, Law and Agency in Spanish New Orleans, 1763–1803.” Together they contribute to the ongoing debate about differing legal regimes and their impact on the brutalities and the prospects for freedom inherent in the various slave systems.

Other chapters examine the importance of the legal regime for the economic well-being of free people. Laura Edwards’ “The Material Conditions of Dependency: The Hidden History of Free Women’s Control of Property in the Early Nineteenth Century South” views women’s control of home-made textile products as a challenge to traditional notions that married women had no legally recognized property rights in the early nineteenth century. James W. Ély’s “Homestead Exemption and Southern Legal Culture” studies how the South’s history as a debtor region played a part in the region’s development of homestead legislation during the nineteenth century. Homestead exemptions protected homes and other core familial property from creditors. Ély is especially helpful in his discussion of the tensions between homestead
exemptions and the larger American tendency to treat land as a commodity, capable of easy purchase and sale.

Regarding the pivotal theme of race, Minter’s “Race, Property, and Negotiated Space in the American South: A Reconsideration of Buchanan v. Warley” explores how lawyers for the fledgling NAACP were able to convince the U.S. Supreme Court to rule unanimously in 1917 that a Louisville Kentucky ordinance prohibiting white homeowners from selling to blacks was unconstitutional. Historians have long recognized Buchanan as an important stepping stone to the Supreme Court’s desegregation ruling in Brown v. Board of Education, but Minter shows further that Buchanan was critical in blocking any constitutional justification for an officially sanctioned system of apartheid in the United States.

Not all of the chapters in Signpost present so dire an alternative course of history as does Minter’s discussion of Buchanan, but all of them are well-crafted examples of scholarship that advance the field of southern legal history.

Robert J. Cottrol
George Washington University


Can a book about self-denial be a pleasure to read? Viet’s Modern Food, Moral Food is certainly such a book; it is beautifully written, a monument to good historical research that is accessible to the average reader. It is much in the mode of Levenstein’s food books, telling great stories about the average eater as well as about the experts giving dietary advice.¹ For every point, Veit has a telling quotation hewn from a newspaper, diary, or letter. She makes good use of each piece of evidence to advance her case that World War I changed Americans into modern eaters.

Veit argues that, before the war, Americans preferred to be plump, as a way to show status and to “stock up” for potentially lean years. War officials, however, hoping to send as much food as possible to a starving Europe, campaigned for citizens to join the war effort by eating less—particularly, less wheat, sugar, butter, and meat. Laws passed during the war allowed more stringent rationing controls, but, for the most part, officials appealed to citizens’ patriotism rather than coercing them. The public responded, making plumpness a sign of selfishness and thinness a sign of patriotism.

Veit argues that dietary advice became popular with the mass public because of this new connection to patriotism. Veit shows how Ameri-

¹ See, for example, Harvey Levenstein, Paradox of Plenty: A Social History of Eating in Modern America (Berkeley, 2003; orig. pub. 1993).
cans began to listen to expert ideas about calories and nutrition in their choice of foods. Previously, the nutritional content of food was important only to small societies of food faddists, but it became a national concern when associated with the war effort. Once this link was established, Veit argues, ideas about eating efficiently and carefully became the definition of a “modern” American eater. Accordingly, Progressive-era reformers championed the promise of science and industry to make the world better through nutritional research, and industrial food processors began to advertise their products along such lines. In fact, new discoveries in food-preservation technology eliminated such problems as ptomaine in canned foods and made the public confident about including canned and other processed foods in their new modern diet. But behind all of these developments was the spur of patriotism, urging Americans to care about what they ate and how they looked.

This many-layered history examines some layers more than others. For example, Veit might have had said more about the discovery of the first vitamin in 1912, as well as about the scientists—Harvey Wiley, Elmer McCollum, Ellen Richards, and others—who made vital contributions to food and diet at the time. But given her interest in the ethics of eating, and in what consumers said and thought, her choice not to linger in areas that others have already covered is understandable.

Food study is an inherently interdisciplinary pursuit, but little of the work in the field, including Veit’s, strays from traditional disciplinary models. A social scientist might like to see more threads in the argument leading to a larger meta-story about morality, modernity, and science. Nonetheless, Veit has delved deeply into the archives on this topic, emerging with one of the best works of its kind. It may well be the “crossover” book that many food scholars have tried to write for the last few years.

Melanie DuPuis
University of California, Santa Cruz


What is “liberal religion”? Because the term conjures diverse beliefs, practices, and sensibilities, this question looms over Hedstrom’s The Rise of Liberal Religion. Distilling both colloquial and scholarly conceptions of religious liberalism, Hedstrom identifies intellectual openness, mystical spirituality, personal religious experience, psychological curiosity, and cosmopolitan ethics as some of its priorities. Describing this liberal religion as nothing less than “popular religion and spirituality in modern America,” Hedstrom argues compellingly that the “popularization of religious liberalism happened largely in and through books” (4).
Taking up such varied themes as print culture, class, secularism, consumer culture, and pluralism, Hedstrom’s six chapters begin in the wake of World War I, as liberal Protestant leaders “grappled with their declining social influence, the increasing sway of consumer culture, and a pervasive postwar spiritual malaise” (22). Convinced that “a common set of widely accepted religious ideas, practices, and presuppositions would hold together a fragmenting culture,” Protestant leaders and publishing executives began building an “industry of cultural expertise” dedicated to promoting the buying and reading of religious books (7). In dialogue with Rubin and Radway, Hedstrom describes this framework for generating meaning as “religious middlebrow culture.”

Religious leaders, consumers, and publishers all found security in the “mediation of middlebrow culture” (83). While leaders secured their “privileged status in American religious discourse,” consumers embraced “the marketplace without trepidation,” transforming reading into a “fundamental middle-class religious practice” (7, 23). Assured that middlebrow mediation licensed them to pursue profit “with both entrepreneurial intent and clean consciences,” publishers pushed the boundaries of “religious” publishing (84). Increasingly printing books on such popular issues as psychology, mysticism, and self-improvement, publishers cultivated audiences outside faltering Depression-era churches.

With the advent of World War II, the war’s material, psychic, and spiritual demands compelled Americans to unite against “the existential threat posed by fascism abroad” (115). Casting “middlebrow reading values” as essential to “the American way of life,” book initiatives both during and after the war cultivated “the notion of a shared Judeo-Christian national identity” (142–143). By encouraging interaction and exchange between Protestants, Catholics, and Jews, the discourse of Judeo-Christianity ultimately blossomed into the cosmopolitan spirituality that led subsequent generations to appropriate religious practices and insights from Asian religious traditions.

Engaging theories of culture and religion with sophistication and judiciousness, Hedstrom’s complex narrative makes three key interventions. First, by devoting sustained attention to the history of religious books and reading in the twentieth century, Hedstrom not only augments a historiography of religious print culture that has focused on the nineteenth century but also invites complementary and comparative research. Complementary research might devote closer attention to the texture of religious readers’ experience; comparative research might explore how book culture has helped to circulate other popular religious sensibilities. Second, by demonstrating that “religious and spiritual life happens through commodities” and by ranking books among “the most significant of these religious commodities,” Hedstrom urges scholars to

situate material and intellectual practice within contexts of consumption (4–5).

Finally, joining such historians as Hollinger, Hedstrom simultaneously illustrates how liberal religion flourished in the postwar period and explains why its success has escaped notice. Habituated to seeking inclusive, psychological, and mystical spiritualities in the marketplace, postwar Americans increasingly bestowed spiritual authority not on liberal Protestant leaders but rather on the objects of their literary consumption. Allied with consumer capitalism, liberal religion lost institutional strength but saturated American culture. Although Hedstrom’s emphasis on redressing American evangelicalism’s historiographical dominance keeps him from exploring how liberal religion’s ostensible opponents have served both as cultural critics and collaborators, Hedstrom’s answer to the opening question is clear. What is “liberal religion”? It is American religion.  

Daniel Vaca
Brown University


Humanitarian interventions are a recent and still-controversial phenomenon in international politics and historiography. In 1919, the victors of World War I, acknowledging the volatility of the peace settlement, agreed to spread a mantle of protection over vulnerable foreign citizens, including religious and national minorities, refugees, and colonial subjects. However, national interests on the one side and a generalized acceptance of the claims of national sovereignty on the other repeatedly obstructed any attempts at enforcement by the League of Nations. After World War II, in which 28 million civilians died and several million others became refugees, the United Nations assumed responsibility for the world’s endangered populations, but its efforts were stymied for forty-five years by the Cold War.

Under the shadow of the past failures of international human-rights protection, scholars began during the 1960s to investigate the role of bystanders in the Holocaust. While continuing to weigh the role of Adolf Hitler and Nazi ideology against the institutional and the contingent factors involved in the Third Reich’s murderous wartime deeds, they also focused on the responses of outside leaders to the Third Reich’s atrocities. Among the major objects of their scrutiny was the towering figure


1 Among these works are Saul Friedlander, Pius XII and the Third Reich: A Documentation (New York, 1966); Bernard Wasserstein, Britain and the Jews of Europe, 1939–1945 (New York, 1979).
of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt—mainly the discrepancy between the president’s sympathetic words and his restricted efforts to aid European Jewry—and the notion that the United States could have done more to help.\(^2\) Congress’ vote in 1980 to establish the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum on the Mall in Washington and the spread of Holocaust education and monuments throughout the country were widely interpreted as an acknowledgment that world’s largest democracy bore a measure of responsibility for neither preventing nor halting Hitler’s crimes.

*FDR and the Jews* represents an attempt to establish a balance between the president’s accusers and defenders. Through meticulous research (hampered, to be sure, by the absence of Roosevelt’s diaries, cabinet transcripts, and records of key conversations), Breitman and Lichtman have analyzed an immensely talented and complex political figure who had to face a debilitating illness while dealing with an economic depression and a world at war. Theirs, however, is not a work of interdisciplinary scholarship. They draw no insights from psychology, sociology, political theory, or linguistic analysis to explain the creation and longevity of the clashing Roosevelt myths.

Breitman and Lichtman depict four Roosevelts—(1) highly reluctant during his first term to respond to the Nazis’ anti-Jewish policy by relaxing visa restrictions because of America’s economic woes and a feared antisemitic backlash; (2) more willing after his 1936 re-election to condemn Nazi brutality, to ease immigration rules, and to promote Jewish settlement in Palestine and Latin America; (3) again restrained after 1939, giving precedence to preparing for war; and (3), as victory neared in 1943, creating the War Refugee Board to rescue the remnants of European Jewry. Acknowledging the president’s constraints—especially opposition from the State Department, Congress, and his wartime allies—Breitman and Lichtman deftly contextualize several key episodes—the defeat of the Wagner bill, the St. Louis Affair (the refusal to accept German Jewish refugees from the MS *St. Louis*), and the failure to bomb Auschwitz. But they ultimately credit Roosevelt for doing more than other contemporary statesmen and setting a high standard for U.S. humanitarian diplomacy that compares well with the record of his successors. While citing moments when Roosevelt might have been

---

Return from the Natives: How Margaret Mead Won the Second World War and Lost the Cold War. By Peter Mandler (New Haven, Yale University Press, 2013) 384 pp. $40.00

Return from the Natives explores Margaret Mead’s awakening to the possibilities of using anthropological knowledge and research techniques to reduce cultural friction between the Allies during World War II, as well as her postwar efforts to use anthropology as a means of improving international relations. As his subtitle indicates, Mandler finds that Mead succeeded in her first task but failed in her second.

Mead’s wartime “white” propaganda work (spreading positive messages about Americans) is contrasted with the “black” propaganda (undermining the Japanese) of Gregory Bateson, Geoffrey Gorer, and others. Mead’s most significant wartime contribution was to use her exceptional writing and analytical skills to decrease intercultural conflicts by plainly explaining American cultural mannerisms to the British as American troops amassed in Great Britain before D Day. In Mandler’s view, Bateson was less brilliant and Gorer considerably less daft than commonly supposed. Gorer’s war work stressed, at times, imagined cultural differences between enemies, whereas Mead’s work strove to build positive intercultural relations between allies. Mead emerged from the war with hopes of adapting her wartime successes to broaden Americans’ acceptance of other cultures and to build peace in the postwar world—a project that became increasingly mired in Cold War politics. After the war, Mead and Ruth Benedict founded the Research in Contemporary Cultures program, for which a steady flow of Cold War funds produced a series of national character studies that Mead hoped would improve Americans’ acceptance of other cultures. Yet these studies largely failed to break free of the Cold War era in which they were immersed.

This clever, well-researched, and well-written book has much to teach specialists and generalists interested in mid-century social-science history. Mandler’s command of the archival material supporting this book is impressive. He presents a wealth of new information about Mead and her circle during the war years, helping us to understand her transformation from a disengaged intellectual into a tireless public advocate devising projects aimed at shaping behaviors and altering governmental stances. Mandler’s deep command of the details of this history is clear; his chapters about Mead’s intellectual and personal involvement
with Gorer during and after the war provide significant new information.

Yet, others may not share Mandler’s interpretations of this narrative. Although he portrays Mead’s 1953 decision to forgo her national-character research and “return to the field” as a move away from public-policy initiatives, she continued to do considerable Cold War political and military work during this period. Her national-character studies, however, left her increasingly isolated. To Mandler, Mead’s acceptance of military-linked funds was justified by her attempt to promote a shared world; others might not be so willing to dismiss materialist motivations. Mandler tends to ignore the dissenting minority, radical, views of the time; this narrowing of discursive borders creates a universe in which choices sometimes appear to be too circumscribed. Yet, despite this fluidity of interpretation, Mandler’s new study of American anthropology’s most iconic character is both rich and important.

David H. Price
Saint Martin’s University

_Industry & Revolution: Social and Economic Change in the Orizaba Valley, Mexico_. By Aurora Gomez-Galvarriato (Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 2013) 351 pp. $49.95

This book is an example of interdisciplinary history at its best. Gomez-Galvarriato’s social, industrial, and economic study of Mexico between 1890 and 1920—when the country was in the midst of large-scale industrial and social revolutions—focuses on the Orizaba region of south central Mexico in the state of Veracruz. This area was the site of a textile industry that grew exponentially from the mid-nineteenth until the mid-twentieth century. Using a unique data set of company records—including production numbers from the factories, minutes from board meetings, reports of labor unions and arbitration offices, and an extremely detailed analysis of the legal developments that first enabled the industrial revolution and then eased the social and labor revolution—Gomez-Galvarriato paints an intricate picture of the relationship between labor, capital, and government. In the process, she demonstrates that none of the people involved played the role traditionally ascribed to them.

The labor reforms for which the Mexican Revolution has received credit were in fact the product of consistent labor activity and commitment that were in place well before the Revolution; many of the transformations that improved working conditions after the revolution were designed and enforced by the factories, not the government. Local governments were significantly weaker than many of the hagiographic histories of the Mexican Revolution have made them out to be. When factory owners appealed to governors to exercise pressure on the labor
unions, the governors often responded that they did not have the political capital, or the military troops, to temper union zeal.

In writing a history of the Mexican Revolution from a business standpoint, Gomez-Galvarriato shines a new light on the nature of that revolution. Bypassing analyses of individual heroes and activists and concentrating instead on the collective actions of unions, factory managers, workers, and suppliers, Gomez-Galvarriato draws an intricate picture of the scale and scope of a revolution that owes much to the work of Chandler. Gomez-Galvarriato’s broad reading of the contribution of the textile industry to the global industrial revolution help to place the accelerated development of Mexico’s late-blooming industry in perspective, and her deft articulation of the industrial organization and labor economics that ruled the industry locally shows how they related to labor unions, capital, governments, and revolutions in the broader twentieth-century world. Left in the hands of a historian without quantitative skills, or an economist without historical training, the exploration of the textile industry in Mexico during this time period would have been significantly weakened; much of the this book’s strength lies in its detailed reading and examination of company records that had never before been analyzed, let alone archived.

Today, Veracruz’s textile industry is moribund. Textile manufacturing mainly survives in foreign factories on the border between the United States and Mexico. Gomez-Galvarriato’s book explains the genesis of that industry during the nineteenth century as well as its slow demise, in the wake of the extraordinary labor victories of the revolutionary period.

Juliette Levy
University of California, Riverside

The Culture of Colonialism: The Cultural Subjection of Ukaguru. By T. O. Beidelman (Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 2012) 414 pp. $85.00 cloth $30.00 paper

The Kaguru are agriculturalists who live in what is today east-central Tanzania. They are an almost canonical example of a stateless society. They became so prosperous from the caravan trade of the late nineteenth century that the first Europeans who passed through their country assumed that hierarchy and centralized power lay behind the newfound wealth. Firm in the belief that all African societies had chiefs and kings, missionaries and explorers treated up-and-coming warlords as if they were representatives of a centralized authority. Under German rule, Europeans who were willfully ignorant of the qualities of leadership valued by the Kaguru promoted men who could most reliably supply labor for transport and plantations.

1 See, for example, Alfred Chandler, The Visible Hand (Cambridge, Mass., 1977); idem, Scale and Scope: The Dynamics of Industrial Capitalism (Cambridge, Mass., 1990).
When Britain assumed control of the territory by mandate of the League of Nations after World War I, the idea of indirect rule—governing through indigenous local authorities—had gained an unsteady prominence. The families and clans that had curried favor with German administrators were now in a perfect position to produce traditional claims to authority. They were reinforced not only by their subjects but also by colonial governors, who by 1925 had begun to recommend that chiefs be appointed for the Kaguru and every other stateless people whom colonial officials mentored and trained in the ways of good governance and just tax collection. To be safe, Sir Donald Cameron advised the appointment of a range of native authorities who would, in the absence of customary constraints, counter some of the worst excesses of appointed chiefs. The result was a complicated and cumbersome bureaucracy that quickly created new forms of authority and local politics among the Kaguru. Beidelman describes them with great care.

Beidelman did extensive anthropological research among the Kaguru during the mid-1950s, basing numerous monographs and articles about Kaguru society on it. In 1986, he revisited his ethnographic material to write *Moral Imagination in Kaguru Modes of Thought* (Washington, D.C., 1993), which argued persuasively that a mature scholar steeped in comparative material might be capable of a breadth and depth that a young graduate student might not. In the same vein, *The Culture of Colonialism* revisits his fieldwork from another point of view: How do we understand Kaguru politics and society as the result of colonial policies and practices, most especially indirect rule? Beidelman knows his way around colonial studies, but his long-term engagement with people and place has taught him that no policy or scholarly analysis thereof can be removed from the context of specific, local practice. Thus, tribes were neither a primordial identity nor a colonial invention; they were an extremely useful way of articulating claims for the allocation of resources, utilized by both British officials and Kaguru native authorities. Native authorities did not outlast the colonial era, or even the years before the country’s independence, not because they represented colonial despotism but because they had been continually weakened by the colonial failure to provide, or even promote, higher education for them.

Luise White
University of Florida


*Mabiki,* the Japanese title of this book, literally means *thinning* or *pruning.* It is a euphemism for abortion and infanticide, the implication being that if a family does not have too many children, it can provide better care for those that it raises. Infanticide immediately after birth was surpris-
ingly common practice in large parts of Japan during most of the period under study, but it aroused a powerful moral debate. After a period of slow decline beginning at the end of the eighteenth century, it underwent a rapid decline during the early twentieth century, resulting in increased family sizes in those regions.

This book looks at the statistical realities and cultures of infanticide within Japan from the mid-seventeenth century to the mid-twentieth century. In addition to a geographically and temporally precise statistical analysis of the evidence available from Japan’s extraordinary surviving population records, Drixler also studies the beliefs and economic factors that made the practice common in parts of Japan. In subsequent chapters, he also looks at the beliefs and activities of people opposed to infanticide and abortion, the activities of certain feudal governments to prevent infanticide, the rapid changes in the terms of debate following the revolution of 1868, and the surprising persistence of infanticide in some areas well into the twentieth century. Drixler primarily uses the statistical approaches of historical demography (in particular, the own-children method) to infer trends in infanticide, skillfully integrating a sensitive and perceptive cultural history of ideas and debates. Each method sheds light on the facts of the other; together, they enable discoveries of great import not only to Japanese history but also to demographic history in general.

One surprising finding challenges prevailing demographic transition theory by showing how an increase in state capacity, literacy, and regional integration went hand in hand with an increase in family size rather than the predicted decrease. This reverse fertility transition is best understood by changes in beliefs about family and society that occurred in Japan, indicating that population theorists need to take culture into account. Conversely, Drixler’s statistical approach reveals a surprising persistence of infanticide into the early twentieth century in some parts of Japan despite the fact that the topic almost disappeared from public discourse. The culture of silence led to the impression that infanticide was a phenomenon of the feudal world but not one of the modern national period. Drixler shows that vocal and active movements against the practice in certain jurisdictions of the feudal premodern period helped to lower infanticide rates locally, but other areas were largely unaffected. The early twentieth-century decline happened for reasons other than concerted government or social intervention.

This complex and immensely valuable book is certainly essential reading for historians of Japan. However, because Drixler presents many of his statistical conclusions in numerous useful maps, tables, and diagrams, with extensive documentation of his sources and methodology, historical demographers of other places and times will find the book informative as well.

Luke S. Roberts
University of California, Santa Barbara
Schumpeter has more to teach us than his well-known idea of creative destruction. Metzler argues that Schumpeter’s emphasis on the value of government-provided financing to initiate and sustain a long-term growth trend is also an important part of the Schumpeter legacy. While maintaining a theoretical emphasis on these Schumpeterian principles of economic growth, Metzler also gives us a rich description of how one economy, that of early post-war Japan, executed the Schumpeter principles.¹

The first three chapters are a conceptual discussion of the importance of government-supplied financing for growth. Schumpeter argues that in order to generate growth, a country has to redistribute the wealth-creating capital from the already established population to those who share the vision of future growth. Consumers also have to sacrifice. If a government uses monetary policy to direct capital to those who share the growth vision, inflation is the inevitable result. But inflation penalizes the owners of wealth and forces consumers to save due to the destruction of purchasing power not compensated by increased nominal wages. Paraphrasing Schumpeter’s main thesis, Metzler writes, “The redistribution of purchasing power is thus the start of the developmental process” (40).

In the second portion of the book, Metzler documents the tension between conventional ideas of growth and the Schumpeterian alternative in the Japanese context, showing the interaction of the players, both domestic and international. In the process, he shows the importance of the prior experience as well as the ideology of the key players. A shared vision of growth, which cuts across political and functional boundaries, leads to successful government policy. In this analysis, Metzler displays a careful, thorough examination of sources.

Much of the earlier work on growth—Johnson’s, for one—has emphasized the role of the Ministry of International Trade and Industry (MITI).² It is refreshing to see a book that emphasizes the role of the Ministry of Finance (MOF) and the Economic Planning units. However, just as the earlier MITI work attracted criticism for giving too much wisdom to bureaucrats, Metzler’s version is also vulnerable. Research in economic history by Acemoglu and Robinson, among others, has increasingly considered the potential for new players merely to replicate the same extractive activity as the previous wealth owners.³ Earlier work on

Japanese policy, such as that of Yamamura, showed a concern for cartel operations when firms shared government largesse. Furthermore, Metzler’s book would have benefited from the kind of attention that Anchordoguy and Samuels paid to the operation of government/bank/growth-firm interaction in their examination of the MITI. How did the MOF encourage firms to work for the good of economic growth and not redirect the benefit of growth to a narrow group? Had Metzler described bank operations and execution more explicitly (in the manner of Aoki and Patrick) and addressed the skepticism of other writers (notably, Miwa and Ramseyer), his case would have been strengthened substantially.

Metzler’s book is important for its insights about the Japanese fast-growth era and for its emphasis on appropriate allocation of capital for growth. It would be even better if it included “the rest of the story.”

Tom Roehl
Western Washington University