War, States, and Contention: A Comparative Historical Study. By Sidney Tarrow (Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 2015) 328 pp. $79.00 cloth $27.95 paper

Tarrow follows in the footsteps of Tilly, Mann, and his own prior research to develop the connection between war, state-building, and domestic contentious politics. In this book, Tarrow highlights the theoretical links between contentious politics and war. Dissension may occur during the mobilization phase as the state mobilizes soldiers, requisitions supplies, or marshals public opinion to support the war. Protest may also erupt during the war, if citizens rebel against conscription, as in the French Revolution and the U.S. Vietnam war, or if a citizenry seizes the opportunity to overthrow the state.

Contentious politics can also shape the aftermath of a war, when a state extends or constricts civil rights. Tarrow usefully considers the complex relationship between war and civil rights. In this context, the comparative scope of his argument bears the most fruit, as he shows that the relationship between war and civil rights is mediated by contentious politics and the structure of the state. Case examples include both the progressive expansion of rights that followed the French Revolution and the U.S. Civil War, and the repression of rights in the case of Italy following World War I.

In Tarrow’s view, contentious politics encompass the full range of protest activities, including and surpassing social-movement activism. Drawing on his prior work with McAdam and Tilly, he understands contentious politics as any collective political protest involving domestic civil society—“strikes, protest waves, nationalism, democratization and revolution” (xiii). This focus creates a larger scope for the book beyond the interaction between revolution and interstate war, an area that has already received substantial scholarly attention from Skocpol, Walt, and others.

The book provides a broad framework for placing contentious politics within the context of war and state-building. Tarrow develops comparative analyses of both historical and contemporary cases to illustrate and add complexity to the theoretical arguments. The first section of the book examines the historical cases of the French Revolution, the U.S. Civil War, and the rise of fascism in Italy following World War I. The book then shifts toward contemporary episodes, considering the

3 Theda Skocpol, States and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia and China (New York, 1979); Stephen M. Walt, Revolution and War (Ithaca, 1997).
shifting role of contentious politics in the United States throughout the twentieth century. The final section of the book treats the American state and its war on terror after 2001.

The analysis of contemporary U.S. political events will be of interest to those concerned about the recent abuses perpetrated by the U.S. government in the name of democracy and freedom. However, comparative-historical scholars everywhere will appreciate the breadth of Tarrow’s theoretical vision and applaud his illumination of the knotty relationship between war, contentious politics, and civil rights.

Ann Hironaka
University of California, Irvine


Bessel’s Violence: A Modern Obsession is a comprehensive work about Western attitudes toward violence during the twentieth century. His book can be considered a meta-study of the humanities and the sciences in its description of how, for the last thirty years, scientific enquiry has become increasingly interested in studying violent behavior. Indeed, ever more books on this topic populate the shelf space of scientific libraries, alongside new journals and research institutes devoted to the subject. This awareness is also observable in politics and the media. Yet, all of this activity is taking place at a time when those theorizing about violence “live lives remarkably free of the phenomenon about which they write” (18). Violence, Bessel argues, has become an “obsession” in the West, and attitudes toward it have changed significantly during the course of the last 150 years.

In his exploration of perceptions and attitudes, Bessel takes care not to assert that violence has been declining throughout the course of history, as Steven Pinker recently argued in his influential (yet often criticized) The Better Angels of Our Nature (London, 2011). While maintaining distance from the crux of Pinker’s argument, Bessel sometimes comes close to admitting that violence has indeed become less common in the West. However, far from writing a teleological history of the decline of violence in the civilized world, he repeatedly underscores that this decline must be regarded as a highly fragile and likely reversible process.

According to Bessel, the replacement of violence with a greater appreciation for empathy in social relations is reflected by researchers’ change in focus from the perpetrators to the victims of violence. This shift is a result of seven broad changes: (1) the violent experiences of the first half of the twentieth century, (2) growing economic prosperity, (3) legitimate and

1 See Benjamin Ziemann’s review and Pinker’s response in Reviews in History, available at http://www.history.ac.uk/reviews/review/1232 (accessed August 11, 2015).
secure political structures, (4) enhanced life expectancy and appreciation of life, (5) the greater participation of women in the public realm, (6) the diminished importance of military institutions and values, and (7) the media’s increasingly critical discourse and agenda. Bessel examines these developments, which led to a peculiarly Western model of society and thinking that Münkler dubbed the “post-heroic society,” in dedicated chapters of the book that discuss violence from various perspectives—for example, entertainment, religion, politics, war, and the private sphere. In these sections, Bessel describes the role that violence has played in each case, pointing out how, what, when, and why it altered.

Such a wide-ranging topic necessitates a broad approach. Bessel brings the findings of various disciplines, such as gender studies, law, psychology, and the social sciences, into his thesis. This tactic proves particularly helpful when it includes empirical data or imports information to issues about which historical sources remain largely silent, such as marital rape or child beating. Nonetheless, Bessel stays within the established framework of modern historiography, not venturing too far beyond it, notwithstanding the interdisciplinary work mentioned above. Given his background and training as a historian, traditional narrative unsurprisingly constitutes the core of his methodology, providing the template that weaves together the various threads throughout the book. However, evolutionary theory and biology—on which Pinker relies heavily—are virtually absent in his analysis, as are cognitive and social psychology, disciplines that have contributed substantially to research about the causes and effects of violent behavior. Moreover, the debate about the media’s influence of violent behavior is longer and more complex than Bessel suggests.

Admittedly, however, the inclusion of scientific findings in historical research is hardly commonplace; the utilization of such data usually presents a challenge to historians hailing from an altogether different intellectual tradition. Although Bessel has not written a truly interdisciplinary book, his systematic approach contains many starting points for further research. It offers a masterful and sophisticated overview of the complex shifts in the understanding of violence in the Western world.

Christoph Nübel
Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin

3 Cognitive psychology has clearly shown that threats have a crucial impact on human perception and attention—a point that is certainly relevant to Bessel’s argument. See, for example, Randall Collins, Violence: A Micro-Sociological Theory (Princeton, 2008); Oliver J. Robinson et al., “The Impact of Anxiety upon Cognition: Perspectives from Human Threat of Shock Studies,” Frontiers in Human Neuroscience, VII (2013), 203.
Ogle’s *The Global Transformation of Time, 1870–1950* relies on the empirical historical method in its research design and interpretation of sources. Most of the book follows a model of comparative history, whereby different regional and national histories are contrasted, but at times the narrative addresses transnational histories, such as the League of Nations’ attempt at calendar reform. Ogle examines the role of time measurement in globalization, seeking information in the newspapers of Germany, Mumbai, and Beirut; in the published papers of scientific and international organizations; in the works of Muslim scholars and Indian nationalists; and, most importantly, in the administrative and official papers of Germany and its colonies, Great Britain and its empire, and Ottoman Syria. She argues that after 1870, the various proposals and fiats that were meant to unify clock and calendar time ironically tended instead to underscore the difference between here and there—for instance, between Mumbai’s local (solar) time and London’s mean time. Temporal comparisons did not stop with mechanical clocks and calendars; they extended to prevailing uses and understandings of time, generally known as “social time,” which also served to draw attention to heterogeneous temporal practices and assumptions.

Even with global time ascendant, localities retained complex and idiosyncratic temporal affiliations and sensibilities. They did not always wish to live by the same time as distant powers. By drawing on Barak’s investigation into the operations of “temporal commensurability” in Egypt, Ogle argues that resistance against temporal commensurability undergirded a process of globalization that resulted in heightened senses of local, regional, and national differences. Ogle is not so much interested in the qualities of temporal regimes past or present as in globalization. Near the end of the book, she explains, “Time in its different guises was an underlying discursive, institutional, and technological metric that produced and permitted the emergence of global consciousness” (212). She demonstrates the multidirectional process of globalization in chapters about “nationwide mean times” (17), daylight saving time, “colonial and anti-colonial time” (17), time management, the Islamic calendar, and calendar reform.

Ogle does not pay consistent attention to the scholarly necessity of attribution in *The Global Transformation of Time*. First, she criticizes scholars without actually citing them: She includes no citations for a paragraph about assumptions in “extant scholarship” about time zones “[o]utside of Europe and North America” (14–15); none for a lengthy paragraph about the nomenclature associated with “Greenwich time” (27); none pointing toward “a host of older works” that lack “nuance” in their interpretation of daylight saving time (48); and none for the extensive historical scholarship about the persistence of natural time “even in an age of cheapened pocket

1 On Barak, *On Time: Technology and Temporality in Modern Egypt* (Berkeley, 2013)
watches, proliferating public clocks, and clearly delineated (and contested) working hours” (49). Second, Ogle does not adequately acknowledge the research findings and conceptual innovations of other scholars. For instance, Ogle’s description of time and time zones as “abstract conventions” invokes Galison’s “convention of simultaneity” without attribution (36).² Ogle’s argument that Arabs in Beirut may have been more aware of multiple times than European and American contemporaries does not refer to the rich and important scholarship about the history of multiple temporalities (122).³

Nevertheless, original research and synthesis also characterize Ogle’s intervention in global history. Hopefully, global historians and scholars of globalization will be gracious enough to acknowledge its contributions to the field.

Alexis McCrossen
Southern Methodist University


Watson has written a carefully argued book that explores how accusations of indigenous cannibalism were essential to the justifications of conquest embedded in the process of European colonialism from its earliest moments to the middle of the eighteenth century. The book’s first chapter examines the place of cannibals in the intellectual history of Europe. Watson describes how, long before Europeans interacted with peoples of the Americas, “new lands and strange peoples were quite often already believed to be savage and cannibalistic” (48). Central to Watson’s analysis is her assertion that a binary that opposed “civilization” to “savagery” was at the core of European thought and action. Europeans clearly considered themselves to be firmly civilized, while placing the indigenous peoples whom they encountered on a sliding scale on the “savagery” side of the ledger.

In order to “uncover the imperial context . . . [and how it] affected the discourse of cannibalism . . . as well as ways discourse . . . changed the dynamics of imperial power,” Watson’s book is expansive in its chronological as well as its geographical scope (2). The text covers the period from 1492 to c.1800 (which might be termed the first age of empires), placing North America in the frame together with the Caribbean and Central

² Peter Galison, Einstein’s Clocks, Poincaré’s Maps: Empires of Time (New York, 2003), 34.
and South America, the more typical loci of interest for books about this topic.

Watson focuses on the importance of local social and historical circumstances to explore the particular manner in which indigenous behavior was interpreted as savage by Europeans. The images of indigenous cannibalism, however, underwent a necessary transformation when the Spaniards spread from the Caribbean to the mainland of Central and South America, conquering Nahua and Maya peoples whose customs and polities differed from those of the Caribbean. This insight serves as a structuring element for the book. The text’s broadened chronology and comparative frame allow Watson to analyze how those Europeans who competed with the Spaniards for empire in the Americas refined the Spanish images of indigenous cannibalism according to the distinct circumstances that they confronted outside the core zones of the Spanish system. For example, the savagery that they ascribed to their indigenous partners in trade was different from the savagery that they ascribed to their indigenous allies in warfare.

Watson brings a nuanced gender analysis to bear upon the topic, exploring how European (mis)perceptions of marital relations and gendered labor practices contributed to negative judgments regarding Amerindian societies. Europeans coded entire peoples as “feminine” (and therefore as inferior) because of what they deemed to be “unnatural” marital or sexual practices. Moreover, in their forced and consensual sex with indigenous women, “the body became a permeable border through which an early form of biopower was enacted” (7).

Insatiable Appetites provides an engaging comparative study of how a complex, long-standing trope, emerging out of the earliest encounters between Europeans and Amerindians, became a mainstay of European imperial thought for hundreds of years.

Ignacio Gallup-Diaz  
Bryn Mawr College


The new century has wrought a major shift in the historiography of revolution as national studies favoring America or France cede to the triangulation that embraces Haiti and broader Atlantic projects that challenge proprietary claims to “liberty.” Polasky’s riveting new book gives a quantum leap to the Atlantic imperative as it tracks the movements of people and texts across four continents. She builds her history literally from the ground up, tracing revolutionary circulation to and from countries as far-flung as Poland, Guadeloupe, and Sierra Leone, without selecting for the success of a revolutionary project or favoring a specific ideology. By placing “calls to liberty” on a single plane, Polasky gives voice to the myriad
The result is a history as interdisciplinary in its sources as it is international and multilingual in its reach. Each chapter emphasizes a specific medium of revolution—political pamphlets, letters, and novels as well as social clubs and oral rumors—even as the chapters progress from the hopeful echoes of Thomas Paine’s *Common Sense* to the ironies of Napoleonic “revolution at the point of a bayonet” (259). Some chapters juggle the dual focus on time and form more effectively than others, and a couple of them turn slightly aslant of revolution “proper.” Nonetheless, the rich blend of well-known and little-known players and their “documents with legs” powerfully illuminates the ways in which late eighteenth-century social media could embrace constituencies from Genevan clerics to Jamaican merchants to English poets and African loyalists. Polasky’s sources are as encompassing as her *dramatis personae*; her ability to plumb Dutch, Flemish, and Polish archives, for example, yields materials that few Anglophone scholars can tap. If the book does not (and arguably should not) slow down long enough to become the “extended essay on sources” that Polasky envisions, it models a stunningly holistic approach, creating at once a collective biography and a revolutionary word cloud (283).

For all its exuberant mélange of people and paper and its lively tracking of their movements, *Revolutions Without Borders* is by no means a triumphalist account. As it charts the fits and starts of change and counter-change, it offers an exceptionally measured panorama of the age. In its final, moving chapter on “revolutionary dislocation,” Polasky steps back from genre to explore the wages of movement for some of her major characters as nationalist and traditionalist impulses overtake cosmopolitan liberalities, and the once-borderless revolution firms up its territorial lines. Thus, Paine, whose writings galvanized the reading world, returns from France only to be denied the right to vote in America. “Few of the pamphleteers, journal writers, editors, or even diplomats who strayed from their homelands ever fit comfortably back into the politics they had left behind” (269). But in tracing their struggles for liberty, *Revolutions Without Borders* brilliantly captures the spirit of an age.

Susan S. Lanser

Brandeis University


This book discusses attitudes toward the medieval new, refuting the traditional contention that newness was not a value cherished in the Middle
Ages. According to Ingham, this failure to understand the medieval appreciation of novelty stems from the difference between medieval and modern significations of “old” and “new.” Whereas modern innovation most often, but not always, implicates a break from, and even a destruction of, tradition, repetition and innovation were closely related in the Middle Ages. Furthermore, Ingham shows that the medieval new was the source for various ethical discussions—the distinction between useful and whimsical cleverness, a sense of wonder tending toward understanding versus excessive or ‘blind’ curiosity, or innovation as opposed to error or fraud. The flexibility and ethical dynamics of the category of the new is thus crucial for how knowledge systems function, both in the Middle Ages and today.

Ingham discusses three key categories of newness. First, she studies views about divine creation ex nihilo vis-à-vis human creation in the work of various scholastics, and the link between art and nature, natural philosophy, and magic in the work of Roger Bacon. Second, she analyses the concept of ingenium (nature, character, or intelligence)—linguistic, textual, and mechanical—and traces its various uses in the French and Middle English versions of the medieval romance Floire and Blancheflor, as well as in Geoffrey Chaucer’s Squire’s Tale and Guillaume de Machaut’s Tale of the Alerion, one of Chaucer’s sources. The third concept that Ingham discusses is curiositas. She reads Christopher Columbus’ letters about the discovery of the New World as part of a centuries-long tradition of apocalyptic writings, tracking their reception and transformation as texts in print. The new is once again shown to be based on repetition; it signifies not only the created but also the interpreted.

The main argument of the book—that the medieval new differs from the modern new in its relationship with repetition and variation rather than a total break from tradition—is strengthened by the study of a great variety of textual sources in theology, philosophy, alchemy, and romance and travel literature. The book is thus a valuable contribution to the history of ideas. Ingham also emphasizes the connection between ideational discussions of the new and the very nature of medieval textual culture, such as translations and prints. This link would have been even stronger if Ingham had noted developments in the field of philology during the past twenty-five years. The so-called “new” or “material” philologists explicitly foreground variance, based on repetition, as the prime characteristic of medieval manuscript culture, stressing medieval materiality and textuality as interrelated aspects of medieval culture. Such interdisciplinary cross-fertilization would have bolstered the main argument of the book and highlighted its relevance for a wider range of disciplines.

Stefka G. Eriksen
Norwegian Institute for Cultural Heritage Research
As James’ condition dramatically worsened in the days before his death on March 27, 1625, there were rumors that the Duke of Buckingham’s attempted ministrations had poisoned the aging king. Yet rumors of poisoning regularly stalked elite deaths, and those concerning James faded within a couple of months, only to revive dramatically in the spring of 1626 following the appearance of a pamphlet—*The Forerunner of Revenge upon the Duke of Buckingham*, by the Scots physician George Eglisham—detailing the duke’s poisoning of a half-dozen noblemen, and his king. *The Murder of King James I* is the gripping and splendidly researched narrative of how Eglisham’s accusations shaped British history for the next thirty-five years.

The pamphlet proved a key factor in the failure of the 1626 Parliament, opening “a rift between the king and the House of Commons, that, to a significant extent, never healed” (192). The House of Commons refused to vote a subsidy to support the ongoing war effort, sparking a fiscal crisis, which in turn led the Crown to adopt novel funding measures, sparking a constitutional crisis. Moreover, there were the lingering suspicions about why Charles (allegedly) dissolved the Parliament just as it was investigating Buckingham’s complicity in his father’s death. Between 1626 and Buckingham’s assassination in 1628, a spate of libels painted the duke as part of an international popish plot to destroy true religion, and Charles’ court as a den of lust, excess, and tyranny. In 1642, the Parliamentary hard-liners deployed the Eglisham tract, printing thousands of copies, to sway public opinion against the king. In the run-up to the regicide—after radicals in the Army and Parliament had reshaped the original charges to implicate Charles—the (alleged) murder of King James, recast as parricide, came to “dominate political discourse” as the centerpiece of the case for killing the king (415), and it remained part of the “foundational mythology of the English Republic” thereafter (xxvi).

This material retained some potency into the nineteenth century, but Gardiner’s magisterial history barely mentions it because in 1856, Norman Chevers, a British physician, assessed the medical evidence and found nothing to indicate foul play. Since, in the old days, history was supposed to treat what really happened, the fact that James was not poisoned meant that Eglisham’s tract was of no historical value, and hence of no historical interest.

Unlike Gardiner, however, Chevers realized the fallacy; what matters historically, Bellany and Cogswell observe, is not whether certain claims are true but why contemporaries believed them to be true and what the consequences of their belief were. Historians cannot “understand either the calamitous breach between Charles I and his Parliament in 1626, or

---

the emergence of regicidal politics in 1648, without appreciating the centrality to both crises of stories about the murder of James I”—without, that is, understanding the “perceptions that underpinned action and discourse” (xxx–xxxi).

But how did these perceptions arise? The answer is the book’s major discovery—namely, that Eglisham was a Habsburg client, his tract part of a “major propaganda and disinformation campaign” to exacerbate English political divisions and discredit Buckingham “in hopes of undermining the [English] war effort from within” (144, 162). The campaign was a success; the English were dis-informed, and although at moments the book refers to Stuart political culture as a “public sphere,” its final assessment seems closer to the mark—a “sensational and often lurid dreamscape . . . in which exaggerated fears and anxieties shaped the perceptions of political actors and destroyed the reputations of powerful men” (534).

Debora Shuger
University of California, Los Angeles


The exponential rise of food poisoning during the past century has received less attention from historians than have bigger killers like cancer or heart disease. In Salmonella Infections, Networks of Knowledge, and Public Health in Britain, Hardy helps to rectify this lacuna in public-health history via a journey through many of the grubbier facets of British life—filthy knackers’ yards, poultry-packing plants, and greasy canteens. As a pathogen, salmonella was a product of increasingly complicated, globalized networks of food production, preparation, and consumption. As a concept, salmonella, and its many serotypes, was a product of equally complex scientific networks.

Hardy’s study is broken into three sections. The first one explores the ways in which the pathways of salmonella transmission were unraveled between around 1880 and 1940. Faced with an increasing incidence of the disease, public-health officials began the painstaking exploration of the spaces and highways along which the pathogen proliferated and circulated—oyster beds, egg farms, and slaughterhouses. The second section reveals how immunology and phage-typing gradually produced a stable classification of the many serotypes of salmonella. The final section examines attempts to control the spread of the pathogen after 1940.

Understanding salmonella clearly involves attention not merely to epidemiology but also to scientific networks, ecologies, human–animal interactions, technologies, globalization, and bodily hygiene—all of which Hardy explores in her richly nuanced and empirically satisfying
study. Salmonella arose at a historical moment when the production of milk, eggs, and meat was industrializing and globalizing, providing new opportunities for pathogens to leap from animal to human ecologies. The development of mass catering and processed convenience food transformed the material nature of British food as well as its conditions of consumption. These transformations then combined with erratic hygiene to produce an avalanche of food poisoning. The persistently blasé British attitude toward basic hygiene is one of the subtexts of this book: Edwin Chadwick, a nineteenth-century champion of British sanitation—would turn in his grave if forced to read *Salmonella Infections*. The rise of food poisoning, as Hardy chronicles it, suggests that any teleological conception of the civilizing process requires serious rethinking.

Hardy also mobilizes techniques drawn from the history of science. Unraveling the ontology and epidemiology of this complex (and evolving) pathogen is no mean feat. Ecologies mattered, but so did pathogens. This complicated, nonlinear history has many actors and many dead ends. Hardy recounts the vital, unspectacular laboratory work of such unsung scientists as Frederick Griffith and William M. Scott while recreating the slow, uneasy process that eventually resulted in a global network of salmonella centers, punctuated by squabbles about exact classifications and strained friendships.

*Salmonella Infections* is an elegant book retelling a remarkably messy and jumbled history. By staying close to her historical actors, with their lo–tech laboratories and tenuous networks, Hardy reveals the laborious way in which stable scientific knowledge is often produced. Moreover, by revealing the shabby and squalid world of salmonella, she describes not only the ecology of a particularly persistent illness but also diagnoses it as symptomatic of a world that exhibits a profound disconnection between the giant ecotechnologies of food production and the everyday world of food consumption.

Chris Otter
Ohio State University


More books should be like Miller’s *Peiresc’s Mediterranean World*. Self-reflexive, experimental, ambitious, and meticulous, it confronts the question of how historians might understand the early modern Mediterranean—Fernand Braudel’s Mediterranean—if instead of *annaliste* social science they emphasized an empirical investigation of seventeenth–century antiquarian Nicolas Fabri de Peiresc’s massive archive. The result might not be to the taste of every reader, given the extraordinary detail and the attention to epistemological issues over historical narrative. But Miller’s achievement is powerful and provocative.
Much of the book consists of penetrating descriptions of how Peiresc acquired his enormous collection of correspondence, memoires, objects, images, and more. Peiresc might seem an odd candidate to exemplify Europe’s intellectual community. He was based in Aix near commercial Marseille, with no connection to a patron or a university. Moreover, he was little concerned with theology, philosophy, and rhetoric, and he published only one work. But Miller shows how his network of interlocutors embodied what was so distinctive about seventeenth-century polymathic culture. Peiresc and his like were as fascinated with contemporary Cairo as with ancient Rome, with music history as with Plato, and with material culture as with ideas; they expanded the ambit of scholarship. To meet their aspirations, Miller shows, they collaborated with craftsmen, traders, and sailors; operated in courts, wharves and customs houses; mapped sailing schedules and cargo loads; managed courts and credit systems; and galvanized brokers and fixers to enable the exchanges of objects and texts.

This sensitivity to the practicalities of early modern scholarly activity emerges from Miller’s own antiquarianism, though it should be stressed that Miller does not fetishize his objects, and that his unusual attentiveness to antiquarianism’s theoretical stakes emerges in his discussions of its advocates and critics. As he rightly notes, too often historians exalt abstract ideas while ignoring material culture and denying significance to the types of negotiations that brought crocodile skins, polyglot psalters, and coins into Peiresc’s study. This tendency has misleadingly denied the role of merchants, artisans, and ambassadors in the production of knowledge, while also occluding European engagement with societies far afield. Furthermore, the quest for big causal narratives has led historians to ignore threads that they could not fully unravel. Miller’s strategy is instead to draw attention to the limits of Peiresc’s archive, exploring how figures and objects that briefly surface and disappear without resolution adumbrate both historians’ possibilities and limitations. For him, attention to empirical detail, no matter how fleeting, is the heart of historical research.

Accordingly, most of the chapters investigate cryptic clues regarding subjects like Ottoman politics, couriers’ reliance on mules, the depredations of corsairs, or the ambiguity of names. The resulting illumination persuades that a mimetic account of the past, like one of the present and even of historical research, should trace the messy movement of material through space along myriad channels and according to diverse tempos. Antiquarianism, past and present, reveals the world as a vortex of unsmoothed detail unsteadily navigated.

The book is thus, self-consciously, a prismatic exploration of the early modern world. But it is also a connected history tracing Peiresc’s extension through the broader Mediterranean, where, unlike in Braudel’s relentless structuralism, objects in flux dominate. There are flaws here and there, but they are good flaws borne of experimentation and creativity. Anyone interested in the welter of historical knowledge, in antiquarianism,
in early modern intellectual history, or in the Mediterranean itself will gain much insight from this book.

Nicholas S. Popper
College of William and Mary


In her latest reading of French revolutionary events, Ross decenters the story of the Paris Commune. For her, the Commune represents neither a stage in French national history located in 1871 Paris nor an anticipation of the Bolshevik revolution. Instead, the meaning of the Commune lies in the political imaginary that followed. It is less important as an event than as a generator of theory. “Actions produce dreams and ideas,” she claims, “not the reverse” (7).

For Ross, the ideas that spun out in the decades after 1871 can be distilled into the phrase “communal luxury.” For the Communards and their fellow travelers, including Élisée Reclus, William Morris, Peter Kropotkin, and Karl Marx, “The world [was] divided between those who can and those who cannot afford the luxury of playing with words and images” (50). The Paris Commune sought to dismantle this division and establish an alternative to nation-state and capital—the free association of autonomous regions, united by a solidarity built not on love or obligation but on liberty. Of paramount importance was the development of an educational philosophy and program worthy of citizens of the universal republic. Following philosopher Joseph Jacotot, they argued, “emancipation is not the result but the condition for instruction” (49). One does not learn in order to become a citizen; only after liberation can one become educated.

Ross loosely knits the notion of communal luxury to present concerns, notably the global Occupy movement and the search for environmental wholeness. But hers is not a work of comparison between the era after the Commune and the present; readers seeking nuanced engagement with contemporary political discourse regarding wholeness, holistic education, accessible art, or regionalism will be disappointed. This book does not flaunt its methods, interdisciplinary or otherwise. It is not—and does not claim to be—a reading of art and design itself so much as a reading of the place of art in society. Ross might have probed further into the philosophical underpinnings of the claim that solidarity arises not out of love or obligation but out of true liberty.

Despite its brevity, Communal Luxury is a ponderous, elliptical read. The last five pages are the finest in the book; they should have come earlier. Along the way, however, Ross leaves a series of gems. She critiques the self-isolation of worker cooperatives, “pin-prick operations content to eddy in the pool of their own marginalization” (121). She
introduces interdisciplinary protagonists, such as poet, fabric designer, and Communard activist Eugène Pottier, and she includes a marvelous (anti-Communard) description of shoemaker Napoléon Gaillard photographed in front of his finest work of art, a barricade.

Rachel Chrastil
Xavier University


This important study begins with an insight that might seem obvious had it not largely eluded generations of historians: The territorial formation of Spain and Portugal, on the one hand, and Spanish and Portuguese America, on the other, have connected histories. Throughout the early modern period, a diverse cast of Iberian characters on both sides of the Atlantic settled contested spaces and put them to varied use. Farmers, ranchers, nobles, clergy, settlers, soldiers, and Crown and local officials asserted claims to those spaces that left rivals either excluded, subordinated, or, less frequently, united in common interest. Rather than following a royal design, the resulting confrontations tended to be spontaneous, unplanned, and often violent. In the process, the New World’s native peoples suffered more than others, but conflicts also pit Spaniards against Portuguese, settlers against missionaries, hamlet against hamlet, and nobles against peasants.

Gradually, modern borders in Iberia and South America emerged from these multifarious interactions over the longue durée, but not in the way that scholars conventionally propose. Boundaries were neither merely the product of intervention by consolidating states nor the product of local imperviousness to such intervention. Herzog stresses a more dynamic process, involving an “accumulation of actors, interests, activities, and justifications” focused on individual and communal efforts to use specific lands for farming, grazing, hunting, building, missionary work, and commerce. “Far from mechanical, artificial, or imposed from above or below, the border that resulted was a living organism” (248–249). Rather than resolving or superseding these multiple vying interests, early modern treaty making and border legislation are best understood as their imperfect reflection.

An authoritative melding of history and law undergirds Herzog’s approach. Prodigious research in dozens of archives lends substance to her refrain that in this interdisciplinary realm, too, “things were more complicated than they appear” (267). The wide variety of sources consulted testifies to law’s influence far beyond texts written by jurists, philosophers, and royal councilors. From settlers to soldiers, those who occupied the outer edges of Iberian territory demonstrated a remarkable familiarity with
the relevant principles of Roman and canon law, the basis of Spanish and Portuguese legal codes and territorial claims. Such actors may not have articulated these principles perfectly in writing, but their actions demonstrated surprisingly sophisticated understandings of judicial practice, justice, equity, possession, entitlement, and rights, which they presumed common to other Iberians and even to all humanity.

Herzog challenges expectations and teleologies by devoting the first half of the study to South America and the second half to the Iberian Peninsula. In South America, by Herzog’s account, the consolidation of Spanish and Portuguese territory required the full three centuries of colonial rule. In Europe, the process took more than six centuries, from about 1300 to 1950, when the final border stones were set, thus both preceding and outlasting the American counterpart, though territorial contests continued to play themselves out in South America long after Spain and Portugal departed. Ending the first story around 1800 serves Herzog’s focus on Iberian kingdoms and empires but simultaneously undercuts her argument that individuals and political communities, not states or nations, were what mattered most. Many of the actors that Herzog identifies as decisive in territorial confrontations continued to pursue their interests well into the nineteenth century as new nations and their borders took shape only gradually despite achieving formal independence in the 1820s. For native peoples, the story was far from over in 1800, given that great swathes of South America remained under the control of independent Indians. That said, the vastness of the book’s scope justifies restricting coverage to the early modern period. Readers will be rewarded with a pioneering approach not only to Iberian but also to, more broadly, imperial and transatlantic history that will likely influence these fields for many years.

Hal Langfur
State University of New York, Buffalo


This new study intends an analysis of the Overseas Council, the principal metropolitan administrative body of the Portuguese Empire in the early modern period, as understood through the prism of social-network analysis. Myrup includes chapters about events in continental Portugal, colonial Brazil, and Macau. But Power and Corruption in the Early Modern Portuguese World is not simply an exercise in institutional history; rather, it is a collection of short biographies of figures from the mid-seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries whose activities intersected with the Council’s deliberations. The figures analyzed include Jorge de Mascarenhas, a sometime president of the council; António Raposo Tavares, an explorer of the Amazon basin; Rodrigo César de Meneses, a colonial governor in Brazil;
and Zhang Rulin, a Chinese magistrate charged by the Qing state with investigating a crime in Macau. Myrup situates each of these men within their specific local contexts as well as within broader institutional frameworks, showing how their individual career trajectories linked to the vast structures that were articulated to hold the Portuguese Empire together. The end result is a fragmented picture of a fragmented entity, of individuals loosely connected to institutions that only loosely bound a massive political and economic construct.

The workings of the Overseas Council are undoubtedly crucial for an institutional understanding of the Portuguese Empire. But in the end, Myrup’s book offers a disjointed perspective: His stories about the Brazilian *sertão* (hinterlands) sit uncomfortably beside an episode from Macau. He offers little substantial discussion of other, undeniably important, parts of the empire, such as Angola, Mozambique, and India (areas, it should be noted, that are discussed in the same archives that Myrup consulted). Troublingly, *Power and Corruption* contains only a brief analysis of the highly problematical term *corruption* (11), despite its heavy moral implications. This lacuna is symptomatic of a larger issue regarding the tone in the book, which generally reads as an attempt to imitate those works of early twentieth-century imperial history that contrasted the imputed virtues of the English or the Dutch with the venality and inefficiency of the Portuguese.

Set within these echoes of a dated register are a few fashionable notes: Myrup’s use of social-network theory adds little more to his analysis than a few schematic depictions of a layered imperial administration (25, 48, 61)—and the uncontroversial assertion that “human relationships played multifaceted roles in the history of the Portuguese state, magnifying and diminishing the authority and reach of a colonial bureaucracy that stretched from South America to East Asia” (6). A fuller discussion of these networks would have necessitated an examination of the intersection between the Church and the Inquisition, both of which were integral to the early modern Portuguese state, frequently supplying members for the Overseas Council.

Liam Matthew Brockey
Michigan State University

*Rome, Season Two: Trial and Triumph*. Edited by Monica S. Cyrino (Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 2015) 272 pp. $120.00

This collection, a companion piece to the editor’s *Rome, Season One: History Makes Television* (Malden, 2008), belongs to the burgeoning subfield of “reception studies,” which allows classical scholars to explore the ways in which Greco-Roman antiquity has shaped—and been shaped by—postclassical engagement with the ancients. The book presents reflections on the second season of the popular and lavishly produced
HBO–BBC series *Rome* (2005–2007), a species of historical fiction focused on the demise of the Roman republic and the emergence of the empire. In its preface, Cyrino and Llewellyn-Jones boast that the collection is part of “the first academic series . . . to promote interdisciplinary research in the fields of Cinema Studies, Media Studies, Classics, and Ancient History” (viii). Despite this contention, only two of the book’s contributors are non-classicists, and only one has her primary training in film.

Clearly aimed, in part, at university courses that deal with Greece and Rome in popular culture, the book’s introduction and seventeen chapters are all admirably clear and straightforward. Nods to critical theory appear now and again, but scholars of media and gender studies would deem the collection light in this regard. Contributors focus on various aspects of *Rome*’s final season—for example, its depiction of social class, Judaism, the female body, sadomasochism, and masculinity. The authors typically compare and contrast *Rome*’s treatment of such matters with the ancient evidence and other movies and television programs about the time period. Most chapters seem indebted to demonstrating that the series—though maligned in some quarters for its gratuitous sex and nudity—rewards critical attention. Lee L. Brice, for instance, highlights the accuracy and seriousness of the show’s depiction of Roman veterans. Rachael Kelly contends that *Rome*’s creators tweaked and enriched standard elements of the famous stories surrounding Mark Antony. In venturing such points, the authors succeed in elucidating the carefulness with which the series was produced. After finishing this collection, readers would be hard pressed to argue that *Rome* is nothing but an adult-themed ancient soap opera.

But the contributors’ enthusiasm for the series can cause problems. With the notable exception of John J. Johnston’s “The Rattle of the Sistrum: ‘Othering’ Cleopatra and Egypt in *Rome*”—which politely chides the series for its stereotypical portrayal of ancient Egypt—many chapters do not advance much further than an explication of the show’s complexities. Alex McAuley demonstrates that *Rome*’s ahistorical depiction of ancient drug abuse fits modern filmic paradigms. Yet he does not make much of this insight, save to link the series to contemporary portrayals of classical antiquity as decadent. Amanda Potter’s focus on online fanfiction surrounding the series is heavy on description but light on argument. The short length of the chapters does not help on this score; expanded essays would have allowed for more analysis.

Nonetheless, Cyrino’s collection presents an accessible introduction to the ways in which classical scholars have approached the study of popular culture. Hopefully, it will lead to more genuinely interdisciplinary engagements with the sword-and-sandals genre.

Eric Adler
University of Maryland
It is difficult to put down this rich and insightful examination of pardon letters from the Burgundian Netherlands. Readers will learn of tavern brawls, of noble quarrels, and of domestic disputes. People young and old across the entire social spectrum are documented in these letters—men and women, individuals, and collectivities. The authors provide rich detail and gripping narration within a nuanced methodological framework, including translations of the main letters discussed at the end of each chapter. The introduction references, most notably, Davis’ Fiction in the Archives. The authors are clear about how their work contributes to hers: Whereas Davis, with brilliant literary-inflected insight, uncovered the narrative and legally conditioned strategies that shaped the presentation of events in pardon letters, Arnade and Prevenier bring this same attentiveness to a broader tapestry of social life. The stories told by the supplicants in their book are influenced not only by the requirements of a legal system but also by the social networks that enveloped it.

The authors accordingly show how each letter writer attempted to create an “effet de réel,” and what these effects of realism can reveal about wider social patterns. The letters allow those who are traditionally voiceless in the historical record to speak their piece—among them a street musician, who played the rebec (47), and a prostitute, who, according to a supplicant, had been rescued from a life of sin by a traveling actor who invited her to join his troupe (173–221). The letters are also rich sources for those interested in the history of emotions. From the perspective of Rosenwein’s interest in emotional communities and emotional repertoires, the very constructedness of these letters is telling. Arnade and Prevenier comment on the repeated reference to “hot anger” as a mitigating factor in the appeal, and provide insights into topics that have traditionally alarmed historians—for example, romantic love, which the letters deploy to elicit sympathy and to justify an elopement (193–194). Although women were rarely supplicants, the letters also afford insights into gendered relations, which Arnade and Prevenier convincingly interweave with literary sources, such as the Cent nouvelles nouvelles, or pictorial sources, such as Hans Memling’s depiction of an abducted widow named Anna Willemszoon, treating similar motifs.

The authors uncover the rich layering of aims and voices in these letters. Unsurprisingly, rulers often resorted to pardon letters as political tools. More striking is the fact that sometimes this gambit worked not in favor of the socially elite but the supposedly weaker party: Strategies were complex; the interweaving of political tensions, social unease, and interpersonal

1 Natalie Zemon Davis, Fiction in the Archives: Pardon Tales and their Tellers in Sixteenth-Century France (Stanford, 1987).
2 Barbara Rosenwein, Emotional Communities in the Early Middle Ages (Ithaca, 2006).
conflict could lead to unpredictable results. Moreover, these strategies sometimes involved contradictions, underscoring just how malleable narrative can be. In the case of his abduction of a young woman who formed part of his acting troupe, Mathieu Cricke pleaded for pardon on the grounds that he had rescued her from a life of prostitution and later claimed that his actions could not be construed as rape since she was a prostitute (190). Cricke’s story, complex and contradictory, epitomizes the structural, narrative, and legal constraints that some extremely resourceful individuals were able to manipulate.

Hannah Skoda
St John’s College, Oxford


For decades, historians, legal scholars, and political scientists have debated the extent to which James Madison’s “Notes to the Constitutional Convention” are a reliable guide to the proceedings that took place behind closed doors in Philadelphia during the summer of 1787. It has long been recognized that, because of their length, the Notes could contain only a small fraction of the words spoken at the Convention. The contents of other contemporary records also suggest that the Notes were not meant to be exhaustive and that Madison revised them long after the event. Until this book, which uses standard historical methods and comparative literary analysis, and brings to bear the evidence of other surviving documents, the full extent of the editorial changes and revisions was a matter of conjecture. Thanks to Bilder’s close interdisciplinary study, now we know more about Madison’s Notes than we did before, but still less than we might wish to know.

Bilder begins with a few assumptions. Based largely on the tradition of legislative diaries in an era before official transcripts as well as on Madison’s past relationship to Thomas Jefferson, she argues that Madison initially took notes for his own use during the Convention, intending to share them with Jefferson later. These purposes naturally would have skewed his choices toward speeches that would have had value to Jefferson. In contrast, many historians have accepted the later statement, purportedly by Madison, that he wanted to record the proceedings for posterity, which would favor comprehensive note taking. Bilder shows Madison trying to make the Notes more thorough years later by adding material from other sources and revising the text. By comparing various iterations of his legislative diary and other unofficial writings, Bilder tracks Madison’s substantial revisions, additions, and deletions to what Madison increasingly came to see as the definitive account of the proceedings. Nevertheless, even though Bilder’s tracking is thorough, the purpose of the Notes remains murky; she repeatedly concedes that her conclusions are ambiguous and speculative.

Bilder also claims that Madison sought to cover his tracks and revise the Notes for political reasons as he morphed from a Washingtonian (or
Hamiltonian) nationalist into a Jeffersonian republican in the years following the Convention. Her analysis of obliterations, insertions, and added pages supports her claim, at least to some degree, but Madison’s commitment to nationalism and his opposition to state’s rights remains unmistakable in the final product. Neither his frustration at failing to obtain a national veto over state laws and proportional representation in both houses of Congress, for example, nor his role in erecting safeguards for slavery, is whitewashed. If he was trying to cover all of his tracks, he failed. To the extent that he succeeded, however, the framers’ original intent was less favorable to states’ rights and more supportive of an imperial presidency than Madison’s Notes suggests.

By drawing on diverse sources and examining both the text and texture of documents, Bilder promotes a better understanding of Madison’s Notes. Although those Notes remain the best primary source material about the Convention, Bilder’s research makes Madison’s Hand required reading for scholars. She has also produced a focused study of Madison’s role at the Convention and his growing frustration with the document that it produced. He emerges less as the architect of the Constitution than (through his Notes) of its interpretation.

Edward J. Larson
Pepperdine University

Lynched: The Victims of Southern Mob Violence. By Amy Kate Bailey and Stewart E. Tolnay (Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 2015) 276 pp. $29.95

Bailey and Tolnay’s book is a landmark contribution to the literature about lynching. The authors’ goal is to address the “almost total ignorance of the personal characteristics . . . of the thousands of victims of southern mob violence” (xii), which they accomplish through meticulous work matching known lynching victims to their individual archival records.

The book begins with a concise and useful review of previous research, both sociological and historical. The authors’ summary of major theoretical perspectives allows them to situate their study within the existing literature and to highlight their new approach. One of the book’s strengths is its extensive explanation of the record-linkage process by which the authors matched the victims of lynching to personal and household census records—supplemented, when possible, by other documents. Bailey and Tolnay note that this “comprehensive account” allows readers to assess the strength of their evidence (33), provides a guide for future researchers, and highlights the intrinsic interest of the research process, which they describe as “forensic social science” (34). This chapter is a model of clarity, displaying the authors’ reasoning at each critical juncture, describing sources and decisions, and providing detailed descriptions of various difficulties and their resolution. Bailey and Tolnay successfully matched 42.3 percent of the 2,164 victims for
whom they searched (56), thus creating the first database to have extensive demographic information about numerous lynching victims. This detailed and time-consuming research lays the foundation for the analysis to follow.

Bailey and Tolnay begin their analysis with a chapter providing a detailed profile of the characteristics of African-American males who were and those who were not victims of lynching in the counties and years under study. The authors used Public Use Microdata Samples from the census to construct a comparison sample of African-American men who were not victims of lynching, thus allowing them to “describe simple differences between the characteristics of victims and non-victims,” as well as to “model the likelihood of being lynched as a function of various combinations of individual, household, and contextual characteristics” (59).

Building on this chapter, Bailey and Tolnay use statistical analysis to test two principal theoretical explanations of lynching. First, they examine whether lynching victims were more likely to be marginal in some way than non-victims, and thus more vulnerable to mob attack. They next test the opposing theoretical perspective that victims were targeted due to their success. In the following chapter, the authors refine and expand this analysis by testing the effects of local economic, political, and religious context on the likelihood of becoming a victim of lynching. Their findings are not easy to summarize succinctly, because the influence of local context forces any conclusions about the influence of “social marginality and social standing on the likelihood of victimization” to be “nuanced rather than simple” (210). Bailey and Tolnay did find that African-American men whose characteristics made them stand out from the local African-American population were at higher risk of becoming victims of lynching.

The overwhelming majority of victims of lynching in the ten southern states covered by this study were African-American men. Only this category of victims was numerous enough to allow for extensive statistical analysis, although the book includes an interesting chapter profiling lynching victims who were women or white men. The final chapter, which reviews the findings of the book, suggests lines of inquiry for future research. The book is supplemented with a website that makes the authors’ data available upon registration (the URL has changed since publication to http://lynching.csde.washington.edu/#/home). Access to these data will be highly useful for historians and for social scientists.

Bailey and Tolnay make creative use of data that have become more accessible recently because of technological advances, offering valuable new insights about mob violence. Their book certainly moves the state of research on lynching to a new level. All future scholars in the field will be indebted to their work.

Margaret Vandiver
University of Memphis
Manganiello’s *Southern Water, Southern Power* is a competent, workmanlike treatment of a timely topic. It provides a good overview of the importance of water (lakes, rivers, dams, reservoirs, et al.) in southern regional history. The book examines its subject in admirable detail, giving the lion’s share of its attention to matters in Georgia and then, in declining fashion, Florida, Alabama, and North Carolina—mostly as concerns their interactions with Georgia. Although readers will find the book to be a useful source of information about the role of private industries, utilities, and government agencies in water disputes, *Southern Water, Southern Power* ultimately falls short of achieving its more ambitious goals.

The book divides southern water history into three distinct periods—New South, New Deal, and Sunbelt. Chapters explore such issues as recent periods of drought followed by record flooding; New South boosterism; federal attempts, principally through the Tennessee Valley Administration (TVA), to provide cheap power to previously unlit hinterlands; post–World War II Sunbelt developments to manipulate and manage regional water resources for economic development and, to a lesser extent, to provide cities like Atlanta with drinking water; and the strategies of environmentalists. In all of these areas, the book is thorough and well organized, although its findings usually fall short of remarkable. For instance, it comes as no surprise that boosters, corporations, and private interests manipulated water resources for their own gain, thereby creating artificial shortages and circumstances that exacerbated flooding and other periodic disasters. Readers of this journal will be disappointed that the methodological approach is traditionally narrative rather than notably innovative or interdisciplinary.

The book suffers from notable weaknesses. It says almost nothing about climate change or the demands of golf-course irrigation. Nor does it seek to make parallels with water problems on an international level. At times, Manganiello makes puzzling assertions about the South. For example, his statement, “The region has historically lacked abundant coal, natural gas, and other forms of energy” (6), is curious at best given the well-known motherlodes of coal in Alabama, Kentucky, and Tennessee and the oil and gas native to Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, and Arkansas. Moreover, the book’s writing is often, ironically, dry.

The largest failure is Manganiello’s disappointing and unimaginative submission to the historiographical vogue of Sunbelt (and suburban school) studies in an explicit rejection of (without any real critical analysis) the established “myth of southern exceptionalism” (17). This tack leads him to a multitude of problems, not the least of which is a direct contradiction of his stated position by forcing him to admit that the “artificiality” and “private management” of many of “the Southeast’s

DeVore’s narrative of the black freedom struggle in New Orleans opens with the first shots of the Civil War and closes with the election of the city’s first black mayor, Ernest Nathan Morial, in 1977. Defying Jim Crow presents a long civil-rights movement, including an earlier fight for racial justice that was crucial to the success of the classic civil-rights movement in the 1950s and 1960s. This increasingly popular approach challenges historians to expand not just their chronology but also their definitions of activism. DeVore does so in his effective study of African-American resistance to Jim Crow by dismantling dichotomies between liberation and accommodation, group and individual, and nation and locality.

Glenn Feldman
University of Alabama, Birmingham

major lakes” “sets the Southeast’s history of water and power . . . apart from other regions of the United States” (5). Yet, despite such self-contradictions—as well as his lack of any deep understanding of the South’s distinctive (even desperate) regional boosterism, as dictated by the destruction of its modest industrial works during the Civil War—Manganiello remains determined at all costs to join the current fashionable movement to deny the South’s exceptionalism. He even goes so far as to cast the humid South’s water problems as essentially the same as the arid West’s—an example of overreach that goes far beyond the factors that these two regions share.

Lest too much be made of this foible, the book is a useful addition to the burgeoning literature on southern environmental history. Although it does not achieve all of its goals, including its most lofty, it makes a solid contribution to an area of inquiry that will undoubtedly gain in importance as the years pass. The book’s most noteworthy strength is actually one of which the author seems unaware. At a certain level, the book is a direct, even literal, assault on—if not the “myth” of southern exceptionalism—the economically fundamentalist platitude, “A rising tide lifts all boats.” If nothing else, Manganiello’s book underscores that this simplistic maxim, often tied to supply-side economics, tax cuts, and alleged job creation, is dependent on whether rising tides are allowed to flow naturally and equally into all harbors, lakes, and rivers rather than being—as is so often the case—diverted into the private inlets and exclusive channels where the big yachts are moored and the well-heeled corporations and utilities are based.

Glenn Feldman
University of Alabama, Birmingham


DeVore’s narrative of the black freedom struggle in New Orleans opens with the first shots of the Civil War and closes with the election of the city’s first black mayor, Ernest Nathan Morial, in 1977. Defying Jim Crow presents a long civil-rights movement, including an earlier fight for racial justice that was crucial to the success of the classic civil-rights movement in the 1950s and 1960s. This increasingly popular approach challenges historians to expand not just their chronology but also their definitions of activism. DeVore does so in his effective study of African-American resistance to Jim Crow by dismantling dichotomies between liberation and accommodation, group and individual, and nation and locality.

Glenn Feldman
University of Alabama, Birmingham
Defying Jim Crow devotes its first chapter to the Reconstruction era when African Americans attained civil and political rights and, in New Orleans, integrated public schools. The swift decline of these remarkable accomplishments with the Supreme Court’s 1896 Plessy v. Ferguson decision, which infamously upheld the constitutionality of segregation in New Orleans’ railway cars and thus across the South, set in motion the struggle that animates most of the book. Black people in New Orleans pursued three principal goals of “racial equality and justice, community development, and individual achievement.” One of DeVore’s major accomplishments is to illustrate the broad range of strategies that activists employed to improve their lives and communities under white supremacy (viii).

Individual thematic chapters focus on higher education, churches, civic organizations, public education, and businesses and professions. In examining each of these themes, DeVore reconstructs networks of activists, including local leaders and national figures alike, tracing how these networks evolved according to different issues and changing times. The result is a coherent narrative of creative adaptation to the challenges of white supremacy in early twentieth-century New Orleans. Each chapter demonstrates African Americans’ efforts to maximize potential within oppressive constraints. Local schools, for instance, lacked funding and facilities, as well as proper training and compensation for teachers. Other groups in the city, from churches to hospitals to businesses, faced similar challenges, all of which DeVore explores through smaller case studies of institutions, organizations, and individuals throughout the book. The last two chapters shift focus to the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), emphasizing how local and national leadership worked together to dismantle inequalities, especially in education. By the 1950s and 1960s, black people in New Orleans had successfully added direct action to earlier strategies of investigation, litigation, and negotiation—further evidence of the wide net of activism that DeVore recreates.

Although DeVore’s archival work is prodigious, some elements of the study remain underexplored, including the role of women in building and maintaining local networks and the significance of the international context in this Caribbean-infl ected city. Another component of the long civil–rights–movement framework is how the black freedom struggle continued after the 1960s. An afterword following these themes through the present day would have been a welcome addition, especially because many of these issues remain of dire concern in post–Katrina New Orleans. Defying Jim Crow may not be explicitly designed for an interdisciplinary audience, but it should have broad appeal to audiences eager to learn more about activism, the long civil–rights movement, and race in the urban South.

Elizabeth Parish Smith
University of Arkansas
Sensing Chicago: Noisemakers, Strikebreakers, and Muckrakers. By Adam Mack (Urbana, University of Illinois Press, 2015) 161 pp. $85.00 cloth $25.00 paper

Urban historians and other social scientists fascinated with the growth and development of U. S. cities during the industrial age have made Chicago, reputedly the nation’s first “shock city,” one of the prime locations for investigation. Indeed, these scholars have found much in Chicago’s past that was “shocking.” Contemporaries described the Windy City of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries as dirty, loud, smelly, unsightly, unsafe, vulgar, and generally repugnant. A thriving community bustling with commerce and a magnet for enterprising men and women on the make, Chicago attracted immigrants from foreign nations, New England, and the rural Midwest at a remarkable pace; the dynamic city became widely renowned as a perfect site for raw, unbridled capitalism, as well as a place desperately in need of culture and refinement. Detailed accounts of the urban environment on the shores of Lake Michigan abounded, but authors of books and articles about Chicago traditionally examined the city’s dramatic growth through the lenses of race, ethnicity, politics, and labor turmoil; recently, historians have written more often about gender, planning, environmentalism, and deindustrialization. In Sensing Chicago, Mack tells the familiar story of Chicago’s rise to preeminence from a different perspective. Asking the questions and employing the methods common to sensory history, Mack presents an alternative vision of life in the industrial metropolis.

Following a brief introduction that discusses the seminal works in the relatively new discipline of sensory history, Mack presents five concise chapters that describe the lives of Chicagoans during the industrial era with special attention to the role played by their sensory perceptions. The first four chapters consider well-known topics in the city’s history—the offensiveness and unhealthiness of the Chicago River, the Great Fire of 1871, George M. Pullman’s model town, and the meatpacking industry as portrayed in Upton Sinclair’s The Jungle. The final chapter deals with a comparatively lesser-known topic, the White City amusement park. Although much of the material presented in the text is familiar to students of Chicago’s past, Mack’s discussion of noises, smells, and other sensate phenomena yields a number of original insights.

Mack suggests that in addition to providing a better understanding of conditions in an industrial city like Chicago, the sensory-history approach can also illuminate sources of class conflict. The notion of social distinction as sensory politics is underscored by the perceptions of a large, heterogeneous population thrown together and forced to interact on a daily basis. Control of bodily odor, carefully modulated speech, and appropriate touching became markers for middle-class behavior, whereas the reputedly coarse senses of workers and the urban poor set them apart, showing a palpable lack of refinement. Much of the impulse to reform the cities, ascendant by the first decades of the twentieth century,
emanated from such sensory distinctions. Articles and exposés in religious pamphlets, daily newspapers, and other muckraking tracts betrayed elitist calls for reform, and critical discourses about dirty, odoriferous, and pushy immigrants revealed the nativism inherent in middle-class judgments.

Roger Biles
Illinois State University

*Classroom Wars: Language, Sex and the Making of Political Culture.* By Natalia Mehlman Petrzella (New York, Oxford University Press, 2015) 320 pp. $35.00

This well-written and revealing book documents political conflict about schooling in California during the 1960s and 1970s, focusing on sex education and bilingual programs. Much of this ground has been traversed in other studies, but Petrzella illuminates the shifting political terrain that made these issues so potent. Hers is a telling account of how schooling became a partisan enterprise, especially as educators widened the purview of their curricular and extracurricular aims.

From the standpoint of methodology and perspective, Petrzella offers a predominantly conventional account. Much of the narrative concerns the views and activities of organizations and political figures in the educational system. Despite its title, the book features scant attention to actual classrooms. It contains engaging discussions of particular communities, and chapters devoted to San Mateo, San Jose, and Anaheim, but this material is also concerned primarily with key organizations and activists. Petrzella shows little interest in any relevant theoretical perspective.

Petrzella begins with the mid-sixties when bilingual education was intended to bring Mexican heritage students into the educational mainstream, with support from both sides of the political divide. This situation began to change after passage of the federal Bilingual Education Act, which focused largely on language acquisition and coincided with dramatic student protests that began to polarize public opinion. Petrzella directs much of her attention to the top of the political system, discussing such figures as Eugene Gonzales, the state’s first Hispanic Deputy Secretary of Education, and Max Rafferty, Gonzales’ boss, but she also covers activists—the bilingual/bicultural advocate Ernesto Galarza, for one. But her account of popular opposition to bilingual and bicultural education is sometimes opaque or superficial.

The book’s treatment of the political conflict that surrounded sex education is more successful. Resistance to the expansion of sex education from an emphasis on venereal disease to a broad survey of human sexuality made the Sexuality Information and Education Council of the United States (SIECUS) a target, giving rise to groups like Citizens for Parental Rights, the Citizens Committee of California, and the Movement to Restore Decency. Petrzella suggests that this issue aligned with
larger events—for instance, Barry Goldwater’s campaign for the presidency in 1964 and Ronald Reagan’s election as governor of California two years later. Reagan’s establishment of the Moral Guidance Committee in 1968 was a potential line drawn in the sand, but a consensus on how to proceed failed to materialize. As Petrzella notes, the advance of sex education during the following decade contributed to disillusion in certain circles, possibly abetting the anti-tax movement that led to the passage of Proposition 13 in 1978. It cut property taxes across the state and reduced support for public schools.

Petrzella’s book provides a state-level analysis of controversies in education that Zimmerman, Moran, San Miguel, and others have examined nationally or in additional locales. It represents a sound, if largely descriptive, contribution to the political history of education during this period. Other historians can build upon her work to continue plumbing the depths of cultural conflict in California and elsewhere, bringing us ever closer to understanding classroom wars in the past.

John L. Rury
University of Kansas

At Home with the Sapa Inca: Architecture, Space, and Legacy at Chinchero. By Stella Nair (Austin, University of Texas Press, 2015) 268 pp. $125.00 cloth $45.00 paper

The Incas were among the greatest builders in the ancient world. This book represents a sustained and subtle inquiry into one of their greatest constructions—the lavish royal estate built by the ruler Topa Inca (b. 1408?–1493) at Chinchero, Peru, a vast complex still largely intact and unreconstructed.

Nair’s inquiry is an “attempt at reqsiy, the Quechua word meaning ‘to know a place or people’” (1). This inquiry involved careful and nuanced documentation of the architectural remains at Chinchero, as well as a wide-ranging use of historical, ethnographical, and linguistic data. Nair describes her approach as ideographic—rooted in phenomenology, attentive to architecture as three-dimensional space, and “highlighting the ways people create and transform their spaces to give meaning to their world” (6). Although all human societies engage in this recursive practice, the Incas were particularly skilled and subtle in their creation of space, in many cases conveying messages about power and place. “By incorporating in their architecture the understandings of seeing, hearing, touching, and tasting the material world,” Nair writes, “the Inca conveyed a message that spoke of their close relationship with nature and their power over their subjects” (31).

Four concepts are central to Nair’s analysis—facture (the process of making), materiality (especially the sacred qualities of stone that linked constructions to landscape), patronage (the political relationships implicated in the construction of a royal estate), and spatial practice (the “ability to make subtle yet deeply meaningful architectural gestures that transformed the experience of place” [7]). Nair applies these concepts to specific components of Chinchero’s built environment—Pirca/Wall, Pacha/Place and Time, Pampa/Plaza, Puncu/Doorway, Uasi/House, Pata/Platform, and Llacta/Community.

During this exploration, Nair discovers numerous insights into Inca architecture. For example, the Incas used a basic rectangular unit to enclose a single interior space with a doorway on one long wall—a modular construction that could be replicated and combined into buildings with different uses and adapted to different landscapes. The form of Inca buildings did not follow function. The Incas manipulated place and time at Chinchero, constructing “grand roads and intimate pathways to create distinct and increasingly exclusive theatrical experiences for visitors and inhabitants” (63). Open air spaces were essential elements in Inca settlements. The largest spaces—the pampa—were areas where religious and political ceremonies and spectacles were performed, “an autocratic theater that attempted to control the visitor’s experience and create hierarchies among participants” (86). Doorways confined movements and defined what could be seen and experienced. Although much of Chinchero was designed to impress, there were also pragmatic problems, such as matters of sewage disposal that Nair tackles in the discussion of the aca luasi or “excrement house.” Finally, Nair discusses the changes imposed on Chinchero by the Spaniard invaders, including the “violence of the grid” (179).

Nair’s book is an important contribution to Andean scholarship, demonstrating that a nuanced appreciation of architectural space can result in surprising insights about an ancient culture.

Jerry D. Moore  
California State University, Dominguez Hills  


In this important book about the enslaved population in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Puerto Rico, Stark breaks new ground by using long-established methodologies. His main argument can be summarized briefly. In the mid-colonial period, Puerto Rico’s (and likely the entire Spanish Caribbean’s) livestock-centered (hato) economy allowed slaves the opportunity to form stable families, resulting in a slave population that not only reproduced itself but was also rapidly growing. His findings compel a revision of prevailing wisdom about slavery in the Caribbean.
With good reason, historians have regarded Caribbean slave societies as exceedingly brutal, characterized by high mortality, skewed gender ratios, and low fertility, which could be sustained only through continual, massive imports of African captives. But these generalizations, largely correct for the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries when sugar was king, were wrongly understood to apply to all of the Caribbean, all of the time. Stark is among the first scholars conclusively to demonstrate positive growth in a Caribbean slave population through an exhaustive, statistically significant analysis of demographic trends over time. He shows that for a period extending from roughly 1660 to 1815, Puerto Rico was different.

After a sugar boom during the second half of the sixteenth century, Puerto Rican slaveholders transitioned to an economy based on livestock breeding, ranching, and staple-crop production (Chapter 1). Much less labor-intensive than sugar, these activities required fewer workers and resulted in a less coercive—and less deadly—work régime (Chapter 2). The hato economy did not need to rely on the Atlantic slave trade for workers (Chapter 3). By the 1690s, hatos had developed a more balanced sex ratio that proved conducive to family formation (including marriage in the Catholic Church), natural reproduction, and even demographic growth. Sadly, these conditions deteriorated with the expansion of sugar production in the nineteenth century, when life for Puerto Rican slaves came to more closely resemble that of their other Caribbean neighbors (Chapters 4–5).

Stark grounds these conclusions firmly in the quantitative analysis of thousands of records from twenty-one parishes around the island, focusing on Arecibo, a quintessential hato region on the north coast (2, 4). As colonialist and early modern historians know well, ecclesiastical records are often incomplete; there are many questions about slave life that “data derived from parish registers cannot answer” (138). Unfortunately, sources such as “censuses, notary records, diaries, plantation records, bills of sale, criminal and court cases, slave narratives,” and others that would help to provide a more textured view of slave life do not exist for Puerto Rico in this period (5).

Stark candidly discusses his sources and their limitations (11–17), but he does not present a concise statement of his methodology, at least not in one place. His major method, crucial to many of his conclusions, is “family reconstitution” from parish records of baptisms, marriages, and funerals, a technique pioneered by demographic historians of early modern England in the 1960s. Social historians will appreciate the exhaustive—and exhausting—research that Stark’s family reconstitution required, but other readers will be at something of a loss because Stark offers only the barest outline of what this methodology entails (2, 4, 11–14). Similarly, Stark on several occasions asserts that his results are “statistically significant,” but he only hints at how he arrived at them (4, 13, 14). These omissions might lead readers to underestimate his thoroughness, rigor, and original treatment of familiar documents.

Stark’s work is a major contribution to the study of slave demography, slave families, and comparative slavery generally. It should be translated into
Spanish and hopefully released in a more affordable paperback edition so that it can reach the widest possible audience.

Russell Lohse
Pennsylvania State University


Primary research into Mexican regional history gives this work its specific character, in conformance with a thriving contemporary approach. But Brittsan also connects his particular issues and period to wider implications regarding national political life. Beyond the historical details, necessary for factual elucidation, his themes branch outward into the disciplines of sociology, cultural anthropology, political analysis, and economic geography. These linkages make this work especially useful for scholars investigating how representative institutions emerge from post-colonial societies with rural majorities where absolutist forms of government had once prevailed. Brittsan discusses the problems encountered by “modernizing” liberal regimes in Southern/Eastern Europe or Latin America due to their lack of central control; the opposition to external interference in local affairs; the defense of community lands, grazing rights, and access to water; and the attempts to implement taxation and secularizing measures. In Mexico, “the emerging liberal state did everything in its power to dictate the terms of public memory,” portraying Lozada, an executed bandit and rebel leader, as an agent of barbarism and disorder (2).

The phenomenon of popular conservatism, which in the Spanish and Mexican contexts had a strong religious foundation (37–57), receives focus in this book as a mobilizing force distinct from personal allegiances, banditry affiliations, and the elite conservatism embraced by the leadership in the capital city. This topic is still in its infancy. Much has already been written concerning banditry in Southern Europe, Mexico, Brazil, and other parts of Latin America, but source materials about popular conservatism are difficult to find. Similarly, peasant rebellion—its origins, motivations, distinctions, internal divisions, ties with other social groups, and consequences—continues to be explored across a range of disciplines. In linking his work to this context (168–169, nn. 15–19), Brittsan moves well beyond empirical research into a broader theoretical discussion of revolt, rebellion, revolution, and insurgency in rural and small-town society. He examines the nature of federalism in terms of the issues arising from the Mexican Constitution of 1857. Liberal defense of federalism in the state of Jalisco, for instance, met with demands for autonomy in the district of Tepic, which in 1917 became the state of Nayarit.
Lozada’s alignment first with national conservatism and then with the French Intervention (1862–1867) provided him with a large platform from which to wage war on liberals supporting the presidency of Benito Juárez. After 1867, Juárez discreetly left Lozada alone, once he had nominally abandoned former allegiances: “Rather than a force of opposition, popular conservatism became practical reality, carving out a legitimate if uncomfortable existence alongside the liberal nation” (108). “By early 1872, Lozada and his allies had taken full advantage of this reduced liberal presence in Tepic and the Sierra de Álica to solidify a socially and ethnically diverse coalition that had taken shape over the course of a decade” (128). Lozada’s attempt to launch a new insurrection, stretching his sway beyond Tepic, brought about his downfall and, henceforth, virtual elimination from the historical record.

One minor error is the statement that the Constitution of 1857 prohibited re-election (130). There was no reason for it to have done so, since few presidents had even survived the prescribed length of their term under the 1824 federal Constitution. Disenchantment with re-election began to emerge only after Juárez’s second term in 1871, reaching a crescendo with Porfirio Díaz’s seven re-elections between 1884 and 1910.

Brian Hamnett
University of Essex

_Punishment in Paradise: Race, Slavery, Human Rights and a Nineteenth-Century Brazilian Penal Colony._ By Peter M. Beattie (Durham, Duke University Press, 2015) 352 pp. $94.95 cloth $26.95 paper

We can learn a great deal about a society, its culture, and its patterns of power by examining its penal institutions, thereby discovering its rules of behavior, the sorts of people who broke those rules, the kinds of punishment that they incurred, and much more. When the prison happens to be an island, its voluminous records can provide a special opportunity for interdisciplinary analysis. The island of Fernando de Noronha is about two miles wide by six miles long, with several hundred cultivable acres, separated from mainland Brazil by 200 miles of open ocean that made walled cell blocks unnecessary. At its high point in the second half of the nineteenth century, it had a diverse population of convicts ranging from 1,000 to 1,500 (including a small number of women), along with several hundred wives or partners and their children. An army garrison of 200 soldiers and officers was in charge. A few non-convict provisioners completed the island’s population.

Beattie treats Fernando de Noronha as a microcosm of several themes relevant for the history of Brazil as a whole. Several unsuccessful political dissidents were exiled there, removing them from mainland machinations while adding an element of potential agitation to an already tense environment. Political affiliations also affected the appointments of
garrison commanders and their subordinates. The convict population grew much of its own food, either in labor assignments on the large prison farm or on individual plots. But the island depended on the mainland for certain foodstuffs, tools, clothing, and other supplies. The available goods were distributed through what Beattie calls the dark twins of licit and underground commerce, often in exchange for services involving sex, favored treatment, and access to networks of patronage that crisscrossed the ragged boundaries between convicts and non-convicts.

The main social categories on the island were the prisoners, both slaves and non-slaves, and the soldiers sent to supervise them, many of whom were the victims of military impressment. Beattie uses their interaction to explore what he terms the “category drift” among sectors of Brazil’s intractable poor. Issues of sexuality and gender were complicated by official policies allowing some of the convicts to live separately with wives or consensual partners while the bulk of the prison population had to occupy large dormitories. Since Brazil did not abolish slavery until 1888, the situation of slaves is of particular interest. Amid legal debates about their status during the transition from old-regime absolutism to liberalism, slave convicts tended to receive treatment much like that of their non-slave counterparts.

As a way to reflect on Brazil as a whole at the time, as well as on penology, gender, slavery, and human rights in the greater Atlantic world, Fernando de Noronha’s history magnifies some points and either distorts or omits others. But Beattie’s approach shows how this unique setting can inform a varied range of larger issues.

Thomas H. Holloway
University of California, Davis


This excellent study dissects discourses about regionalism and nationalism in Brazil primarily from the 1930s to the 1950s through a deep study of the state of São Paulo. Weinstein’s sophisticated analysis shows how Brazil’s most economically powerful state fashioned a regional identity built on whiteness, modernity, and economic success in a nation that has privileged a discourse of racial harmony and mixture. A largely frontier society until the mid-nineteenth century, the state (and city) of São Paulo emerged as the “locomotive” of Brazilian economic growth during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In a country that imported 3 to 4 million African slaves prior to 1850, Brazil’s southern region (including São Paulo), which was populated largely by European immigrants after 1870, has remained stubbornly white.

Weinstein crafts her book around two major moments, the 1932 Constitutionalist Revolution and the 1954 commemoration of the 400th
anniversary of the founding of the city of São Paulo. São Paulo was the dominant player in national politics from the 1890s to the 1920s, and the state’s failed 1932 revolt attempted to challenge the rise of the centralizing regime of Getúlio Vargas fueled by paulista perceptions that São Paulo’s interests were being sacrificed to those of national government and other states. The first half of the book carefully reconstructs the discourses surrounding the revolt; the second half uses the 1954 commemoration to unpack the discourses regarding the memory of the revolt and its meaning. Newspapers, magazines, the writings of diplomats and travelers, personal archives, photographs, and literature are just a few of the many sources that Weinstein explores in her wide-ranging examination of the many social and political groups involved.

Weinstein argues that “discourses of difference are generative of policies and decisions that consolidate and exacerbate regional inequalities” (2). The emergence and consolidation of a paulista identity that privileged the whiteness and modernity of the south had its flip side—the disparaging of blackness and backwardness in northeastern Brazil, the other major population center. Regional identities, she argues, emerged in concert with national identities in the twentieth century. São Paulo saw itself at the top of a national hierarchy. Weinstein argues, “National identities, in Brazil and elsewhere, will always be imagined through regional referents” (343).

The paulista identity that took shape during the 1930s (galvanized by the failed revolt) was built (ironically) on the image of the racially mixed colonial pathfinder/frontiersman (bandeirante). Despite lip service to racial mixture and harmony, paulista identity emphasized whitening and whiteness. As São Paulo urbanized and industrialized, regional identity became equated with progress and modernity, and an urban middle class. As Weinstein deftly shows, these images were complicated and often contradictory. The paulista woman, for example, was both modern and traditional, and São Paulo was both exceptional and exemplary.

The 1932 revolt crystallized São Paulo as the most successful, modern, and progressive region of Brazil. Even though the 1954 commemoration updated this imagery, it had become harder to make the claim that São Paulo’s success was good for the nation, let alone representative of it. By the 1950s, the paulistas were imagining their state as the Brazil that had turned out right (deu certo). But a white, middle-class, industrial, and modern São Paulo seemed increasingly to be a regional exception rather than a national rule.

Marshall C. Eakin
Vanderbilt University

By Edward Murphy (Pittsburgh, University of Pittsburgh Press, 2015) 343 pp. $27.95 paper $27.95 e-book

For A Proper Home is a well-researched and thoroughly detailed account of the movements and programs for property and propriety (that is, dignified
housing) in Chile, or a nexus that Murphy calls “the urban politics of propriety” (5, 266). He walks readers through Chile’s tumultuous political history from the decades just before and immediately following the dictatorship of Augusto Pinochet. Murphy shows that Chile’s government was always involved in the homeless movement, in one way or another (266). Under the Christian Democrats, the state attempted to co-opt and soften the radical goals of the movement. Although the Popular Unity government sought to advance these goals, its strict adherence to Marxist rhetoric alienated the “less law abiding” members of the marginalized communities. The Pinochet regime physically attacked and even eliminated the communities (166), while simultaneously calling upon the activists to use their homes to work “for the progress of the entire nation” (148). The post-Pinochet regimes used the housing movements and their own poverty programs to promote collaboration and unity rather than confrontation and discord. The housing movement was so significant that regardless of the regime in power, the state needed to interact with it. Indeed, housing provisions ultimately became a social service run by the state, largely through the efforts of homeless activists. In short, this movement demands deep scholarly inquiry, and a privileged place in Chile’s history.

For A Proper Home is the result of thirty months of research conducted between 1999 and 2011. In his archival work, Murphy “cast a wide net across the entirety of Santiago in housing and urbanism, with forays into the designs, consumptive practices, and neighborhood settings of homes” (11). He examined media accounts, plans, reports, debates, and legislative initiatives at all levels of government. He also analyzed letters, requests, and applications submitted by individual citizens and the organizations that represented them in their quest for legal recognition, infrastructure support, and housing development (11). These primary documents are particularly important in conveying the voices of the people involved, including those intent on co-opting, advancing, derailing, or eliminating the activists and their movement. Murphy also conducted ethnographic research and collected oral histories in four specific neighborhoods of historical importance (12). Despite his prolonged and extensive field work, however, he might have solicited more information from the people that he interviewed. The book certainly relies upon their stories, but more direct quotations would have allowed the activists to become their own spokespeople.

Murphy was clearly mindful regarding the significance of his research for posterity as he “prepared [his informants’] testimonials for the public record” (265). His careful approach to collecting and reporting the “data” reflects the sensitivity of scholarship in a nation where history was re-written, and archives (and archives to be) were literally destroyed, during decades of dictatorship.

Murphy employed interdisciplinary research methods to learn about the movement for dignified housing and to offer a sense of Chilean history and politics beyond a mere description of the activists and their movement. For example, we learn about Chile’s often contradictory relationship with neoliberalism, its evolving representation of poverty and
the poor, and the complicated nature of gender in its social and national politics.

Julie Shayne
University of Washington, Bothell


In Unreasonable Histories, Lee challenges what he views as the excessive focus of African studies on communities that can be traced through time and used as the basis for nativist myth making. He studies instead a more fragmented and disparate group, namely, multiracial people between the 1910s and the 1960s in the British imperial territories that are now Zimbabwe, Zambia, and Malawi. The result is a rich and thought-provoking study that speaks beyond its immediate subject to raise issues about the boundaries of African studies and the ways in which archives are framed to promote particular epistemologies.

Terminology is problematical for Lee, given his commitment to breaking down essentialist categories. Lee rejects the dated terms mixed race or mulatto in favor of the more capacious multiracial, but all such descriptors tend to enshrine certain ideas about ethnicity. Be that as it may, in twentieth-century British Central Africa, racialized categories were crucial for the functioning of colonialism: Inhabitants were categorized as “native” or “non-native” and were subject to different legal regimes as a result (British common law or African customary law). “Multiracial” people, who usually had “African” mothers and fathers of South Asian or European descent, did not fit readily into these categories. Their histories might be seen as “unreasonable,” Lee claims, from a number of perspectives. Lee chose the term unreasonable carefully; it does considerable work in framing the project (19). In one sense, unreasonable refers to the difficulty of assembling evidence about an under-documented group. Lee uses this first sense to shape the opening section of the book, which he terms “histories without groups”; in this section, he examines historical beginnings in the 1910s and 1920s and explores fragmented archival evidence.

In the second sense, which frames the middle portion of the book, unreasonable refers to the disruption of assumptions and the thorny challenges posed by the very existence of a group of people who did not fit colonial typologies. In what sense were they “non-native” in colonial terms, with the attendant legal implications? Focusing on commissions and policy responses, the middle section of the book looks at colonial attempts to create categories and develop policy in response to the perceived problem of an impoverished community of partial European descent (because the nub of the “problem” seems to have been that this community was comprised of primarily the neglected or unrecognized...
children of white officials, policymakers seem to have given more attention to the descendants of Europeans than of Asians).

The final section examines the responses of multiracial people themselves and their efforts to make claims on the colonial state. Lee uses unreasonable in this context to describe the racism that often permeated the call of multiracial people for the state to give priority to their paternal rather than their maternal heritage. The book thus traces an arc that moves from individual family relationships to the fleeting creation (or attempted creation) of political community: Colonial kinship ties were transformed from a "familial phenomenon" to "an articulated genealogical imagination that sought political connection and entitlement" (20).

An important point for Lee is the limitation of the archive. He accordingly highlights the documents that he uses and is scrupulous about acknowledging their limitations, laying bare some of the sleights of hand to which scholars resort to disguise the limits and provenance of their sources—a move that is arguably more routine for anthropologists than for historians, given anthropology’s longer-standing engagement with the politics of self-reflexivity. He also beautifully explores some of these documents themselves, including their eloquent silences. A particularly haunting example is the anonymous testimony of a colonial official about the African woman who had borne his out-of-wedlock son and still lived in his house even though they were estranged, blackmailing him and (he claimed) furiously and violently tormenting him. He wanted advice about how to expel her while keeping the child. Hard as such a document is to interpret, it certainly suggests that real-life relationships could be complicated and that rage might be close to the surface. Yet, by organizing his chapters both by chronology and by clusters of sources, Lee risks dropping certain themes. He might have inserted family histories to bridge the chronological divides. Part of Lee’s argument is that these histories are difficult to trace and, in any case, distorted by the ambiguity surrounding absent fathers, but any further attempt to foreground evidentiary problems would have been valuable. For example, the final section is based on the records of groups that made claims: Would family histories reveal people who re-integrated into other kinship networks?

An interesting sub-theme is the influence of South Africans termed “coloured,” both as active political agents and as models for colonial policymakers. Lee’s focus on the influence of so-called “coloured” people outside South Africa is an interesting innovation, highlighting one way in which South African history was interwoven with that of the rest of Africa, but along lines not usually followed by those who deconstruct South African exceptionalism. Lee discusses at some length the efforts of the colonial state to create a similar “coloured,” or multiracial, category for British Central Africa. Lost in this discussion, however, is the Khoekhoe, San, and slave provenance of “coloured” people in South Africa, and the long and distinct history of what by this stage had become a separate community.

This theme highlights the irony that a scattered group of people linked only by accidents of birth and treated as a “people” by colonial policymakers
also came to define themselves as a “people,” however fleetingly. These processes created archival traces. The shibboleth of ethnic studies that individuals choose among available identities at particular moments according to need seems to hold in this case. Lee’s discussion also emphasizes ethogenesis and the fluidity of ethnicity, particularly through Africans’ pragmatic use of marriage and sexuality to form kinship alliances, before colonial classification schemes helped to reify certain groupings. Lee’s analysis of British Central Africa in the late nineteenth century offers an interesting comparison with other contexts, such as Amerindian practice in early modern North America.

The examination of claims at the end of the book almost inevitably defaults to those that men made about and, to some extent, on their fathers, resulting in the state sometimes substituting for an imagined father. Did women think and argue in the same way? This question is difficult to answer, given (again) the limitations of the archives. Men’s voices were more prominent than women’s; men led the political groups that argued for the rights of multiracial people. It would, nonetheless, be interesting to know whether daughters were as willing to repudiate their mothers, and whether they were more or less likely to assimilate into “African” communities. This thoughtful and theoretically well-informed work raises a multitude of interesting questions, even if the difficulty of answering them is in itself revealing.

Elizabeth Elbourne
McGill University


In this authoritative and richly documented volume, Aiyar provides a history of the Indian community in Kenya throughout the eighty years of the colonial era and the subsequent decade of what she calls “uhuru [freedom] and exodus” (261). At the center of her argument is the assertion that Indians in Kenya saw themselves as possessing two interlocking homelands, one “civilizational” and the other “territorial” (8, 119). The first involved not only an enduring connection to India but also a consciousness of racial identity that saw Africans as “savages” in need of “uplift” (66). After an initial few years in which the British conceived of Kenya as “the America of the Hindu,” they shifted to making the new colony a “white man’s country” (22). Its Indian residents could never make good a claim to racial equality.

This volume primarily narrates the always tense and ambiguous relationship between Indian and African. For the Indians, this relationship involved the awkward co-existence of interracial solidarity with an insistence on racial difference. From the African side, over time a discourse of “indigeneity” emerged that claimed Kenya as a land of and for Africans.
This sentiment was fueled by Indian control of Kenya’s economy, most visible in the small shopkeepers scattered throughout the countryside. Inevitably, as Aiyar makes clear, the “promise” of an interracial politics, manifested above all in the trade-union movement of the 1940s, inevitably foundered on the “limits” imposed by these divergent discourses (136, 167).

Most studies of the 1950s Mau Mau movement ignore Kenya’s resident Indians. Yet, in the most suggestive and original chapter of the book, Aiyar shows how the colony’s Indians, occupying a space between rebellion and loyalty, were simultaneously involved in supporting and suppressing Mau Mau. According to Aiyar, however, Indian hostility to Mau Mau violence, with its undercurrent of resurgent racial consciousness, put an end to any thought of an enduring interracial alliance. Hence, the decolonization that followed in the 1960s could not escape the competing “nationalist imaginaries”—a multiracial state of separate communities versus one constructed upon the “majoritarianism” of African dominance (219). Indians’ insistence upon maintaining their economic dominance, now in industry as well as commerce, exacerbated racial tension. In effect, after independence, President Jomo Kenyatta refused to allow Indians to retain their dual homelands—in both India and Kenya. Permanently marginalized in the new state, Indians could be only “guests” (261). By 1970, one-third of Kenya’s Indians had migrated to Britain.

Aiyar denies that this outcome was “inevitable,” preferring instead to emphasize the distinctive nature of Kenya’s postcolonial path (263). Above all, she insists that Kenyatta’s encouragement of voluntary emigration differed from the brutal expulsion of Uganda’s Indians. Nonetheless, the history of Kenya’s Indians must be embedded in the larger story of Indian migration throughout the Indian Ocean, to South and East Africa as well as to Burma and Malaya, in the colonial era. This volume will be welcomed by all scholars of migration, diaspora, and the politics of colonialism.

Thomas R. Metcalf
University of California, Berkeley

Making History in Iran: Education, Nationalism, and Print Culture. By Farzin Vejdani (Stanford, Stanford University Press, 2015) 288 pp. $60.00

Vejdani’s study of Iranian historical writing and history making from the late nineteenth to early twentieth centuries works largely with the traditional toolbox of historians. It engages in deep analysis of texts and their meanings, contextualizes sources, and examines conceptual changes over time. Although this study fits squarely within the discipline of history, its methodology and conclusions offer certain interdisciplinary ramifications.

Building on social theorists like Pierre Bourdieu and Jürgen Habermas, the book explores how Iranian historians “operated within a field of historiographical production in which their position within institutions and
in relation to dominant discourses” shaped their understanding of the past (9). Moreover, Vejdani documents how historians worked within and shaped a modern public sphere of Iranian writers and readers, functioning with relative autonomy from the modern state. Thus were they able to create “new forms of historical writing insofar as a broad spectrum of political and social movements employed history to craft a genealogy for their present-oriented programs” (11). Linking to studies of modern education and literature, Vejdani’s book shows how history writing in Iran accompanied and facilitated the establishment of the earliest modern educational institutions, while contributing to the development of new trends in Persian literature. The book’s interdisciplinary contribution is mainly confined to the fields of education and literary studies.

In exploring how Iranian historical texts (textbooks, translations, pedagogical manuals, and serialized accounts in the periodical press) were produced, circulated, debated, and contested over time, Vejdani focuses on social strata comprised of court employees, state bureaucrats, journalists, poets, students, educationalists, teachers, men, women, Muslims, and ethnic minorities—in addition to those who, by the 1930s, worked as professional historians. Vejdani’s treatment of Iranian educationalists bears closer examination. He argues that in the absence of a centralizing state, advocates of modern-style schooling and private founders of schools in the late nineteenth century and the early twentieth century had the freedom to compose histories that were experimental in both form and content. This era of relative openness about reflections on the past allowed for “contending visions of citizenship in a revolutionary era” (37).

By the 1930s, a rising authoritarian state assumed a greater role in opening schools and controlling curriculum, pushing historians and educationalists toward more standardized interpretations of both past and present. This development was accompanied by a change in the social background of history writers, who now tended to be university-trained, working for the state as bureaucrats or teachers in primary and secondary schools.

Vejdani’s chapter about the British Orientalist Edward Granville Browne has broad implications for the field of literary studies. Building on recent scholarship, he challenges Edward Said’s claims about the nature of Orientalism and the production of knowledge about the so-called Orient. Holding a Cambridge University chair of Arabic and Persian literature, Browne was more directly engaged in Persian affairs than his European Orientalist counterparts, acting as an ardent critic of British imperialism, supporter of Iranian nationalism, and friend of Iran’s radical and liberal reformers. His ground-breaking work in Persian literature, history, and politics featured extensive input from Iranians and Indians. As Vejdani argues, the “Republic of Letters” to which Browne and his Iranian colleagues belonged “constituted a novel mode for canonizing Persian literature in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries” (152).

Making History in Iran is a rich study based on primary sources that makes important contributions to Iranian historiography by situating it
within a broad comparative analytical framework informed by recent studies in European, Islamic, and Middle Eastern history. In addition to its essentially historiographical purpose, this work also merits attention as an interdisciplinary study because of its specific contributions to the fields of modern literary and educational studies.

Jasamin Rostam-Kolayi
California State University, Fullerton

418 pp. $45.00

Asia Inside Out: Connected Places is part of an ambitious transregional research project spearheaded by editors, Tagliacozzo, Siu, and Perdue. A companion work, Asia Inside Out: Changing Times, has already been released, and a third volume is forthcoming. This larger initiative seeks to map new geographical and chronological foundations for the study of Asia that eschew conventional regionalization schemes, avoid state-centered narratives, and challenge linear notions of historical development.

The results are promising. The thirteen chapters in Connected Places portray familiar locations in a new light while highlighting the significance of otherwise obscure peoples and places. The spatial and temporal scope is broad, with topics ranging from marriage laws in Oman to economic developments in Korea, and from the fourteenth-century Indian Ocean horse trade to the twenty-first-century dissemination of popular culture. Many chapters gain vitality from mini-biographies and other stories of individual actors. Throughout the volume, analysis and narrative remain balanced and complementary.

Connected Places gains much of its intellectual heft from its interdisciplinary nature. Roughly half of the authors are historians; the rest are anthropologists, sociologists, literary theorists, and economists. Throughout the work, historical descriptions are enriched by cultural and economic inquiries. Although no geographers contributed to the book, geographical analysis abounds, drawing from the recent theoretical developments in field.

Such a catholic approach allows the authors to challenge a number of stock ideas about Asian history and geography. The common view of the Mediterranean as providing a generalizable model for other (semi-) enclosed seas, for example, receives a much-needed corrective. So too does the concept of Zomia, which defines the historically stateless uplands of Southeast Asia in strict opposition to the state-centered lowland basins. Another old chestnut that receives its due roasting is that of the Chinese Imperial Tribute System. As Purdue makes clear, this idea “implies a structured set of cultural and geographical relationships that did not match a constantly shifting multiplicity of encounters” (197).
Although it is difficult to select standouts in such a fine collection, several chapters merit special mention. Charles Wheeler’s exploration of “Chinese Pirates” in the Gulf of Tonkin forces a rethinking of both the unification of Vietnam in 1802 and the spatial contours of the South China Sea. William van Schendel’s sequential depictions of Chittagong in 1600, 1900, 1950, and 2010 reveal how thoroughgoing the transformation of a particular place can be, rooted in this case in changing patterns of imperial rule, economic linkages, and even physical geography. Priya Satia’s explication of British visions of, and policies for, Iraq at different historical junctures helps us to understand the country’s current trauma. Her fascinating discussion of “how making Iraq remade India” is alone worth the price of admission.

The book would have been even better with more extensive editorial framing. The introduction is insightful and tantalizing; would that it were longer, given the book’s broad range and conceptual ambition. Casual readers may not realize that the book is part of a larger project unless they read the acknowledgments. One can only hope that the final volume of the trilogy contains ample illustrations. Some of the chapters in this one are graced with informative and arresting images, but others are bereft. Most of all, more maps would be welcome, not merely to identify locations but to advance understanding of this complex geographical terrain.

Martin W. Lewis
Stanford University