

Reviews

Capital and Ideology. By Thomas Piketty (trans. Arthur Goldhammer) (Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 2020) 1093 pp. \$39.95

Piketty has long been engaged in a heroic and commendable attempt to bring history and economics into dialogue with each other, and to show how the result can address extremely urgent public policy problems, in particular, the rising inequality within countries and its implications for national political cohesion or solidarity. This volume follows Piketty's monumental *Capital in the Twenty-First Century* (Cambridge, Mass., 2013), and it is even longer (and heavier). The earlier work had a simple message, buttressed by massive statistical work originally focused on France but then extended to a relatively few additional countries. It could be summed up in three characters— $r > g$. Because the rate of return on capital exceeded the long-run growth rate, capital's share of income underwent a steady increase. Piketty did not invoke only statistics; he also made frequent references to literature, especially Honoré de Balzac's *Père Goriot* (Paris, 1835).

The new book is an impressive extension of the theme, with a wider geographical range of statistical material, including many of the non-European countries where Piketty's work has served to galvanize teams of researchers. *Capital and Ideology* is more difficult to summarize than *Capital in the Twenty-First Century*, although the bottom line is still clear and obvious: Ideology matters; it is indeed decisive in shaping the outcome that Piketty described in the 2013 book. Rates of taxation can immediately change r but have little effect on g . What all societies need to do if they are concerned about inequality is to raise taxes. The 2013 book made that point at the conclusion; the 2020 book extends that message into a detailed blueprint for a utopia, or what Piketty terms participatory socialism and social federalism. If the solution to inequality is so easy, however, why do societies resist increasing tax rates? Piketty has a simple historical answer for the nineteenth century—because voting was constructed to be dependent on income or wealth (what Piketty calls a “censitary” suffrage). Britain's exclusive franchise lasted longer than France's, where the revolution of 1848 and the move to a republic after 1871 brought universal adult male suffrage. Sweden had a highly exclusive and inegalitarian franchise until World War I. Germany had universal male suffrage at a federal level, but since most fiscal decisions were made at a state level, what mattered was the state franchise, and Prussia (the dominant state) had one based on property.

In the late twentieth century wave of globalization, the obstacle to effective taxation is the hyper-internationalization of finance, and the fact (which Piketty illuminates brilliantly) that despite the much vaunted availability of big data, governments, central banks, and international institutions

are failing to make that data available. Hence, it is easier to compile the historical data from the nineteenth century to the 1970s than to assess modern sources.

The beginning of the twentieth century was a turning point, when the balance began to turn against what Piketty terms the “proprietary ideology.” He focuses on the 1909 French law establishing the income tax and on Prime Minister Lloyd George’s nearly simultaneous People’s Budget and the constitutional conflict (reform of the House of Lords) that it produced in Britain. Joseph Caillaux, the French Finance Minister who launched his tax bill in 1907, becomes the key witness in Piketty’s thesis: He read out statistics in parliament to convince his audience that France was not really the country of smallholders that it pretended to be. Knowing statistics can be enough to change the world, or to impose taxes and reduce *r*.

Piketty develops another, historical, line of argument, concerned with the long-term persistence of what he terms “trifunctional logic,” the division of society into warriors (nobles), intellectuals (clergy), and the rest (the third estate or proletariat). A great deal of the book demonstrates not just the continuity of inherited wealth but also the dominance of aristocratic or noble wealth. Such an approach raises numerous comparative problems, since in some countries nobles (even though equipped with aristocratic privilege) might be poor. Piketty confronts those problems squarely, dealing in an interesting way with the modern analogues of the clergy in the ancient régime. An intriguing section of the book concerns an intellectual class, which grew enormously in number (as well as influence) as higher education expanded in industrial countries. Piketty describes how this new clergy assumed control of left-wing working-class or proletarian movements—the French communist and socialist parties, the British Labour Party, or the U.S. Democratic Party. The working class is no longer fully or properly represented by parties that now base themselves on cultural liberalism and internationalism.

Piketty wants to revive the move to egalitarianism that occurred in the early twentieth century. The most contentious and problematical claim in the book is that the compression of inequality was “well underway by the end of the nineteenth century, and it is reasonable to think that [this movement] would have occurred in one form or another even if [the First and Second World Wars, the Bolshevik Revolution, and the Great Depression] had not occurred” (30). At the very least, this claim is debatable. The World War precipitated a national mobilization that made redistribution within the national community (and hostility to anyone excluded from that community) inevitable, as well as appealing, on intellectual as well as social grounds. Egalitarianism could follow only from the complete disruption of globalization (with all its costs). Scheidel’s *The Great Leveler*, which makes this point with great authority, adducing data from a long time range, receives no discussion in Piketty’s account.¹ For Scheidel, wars,

1 Walter Scheidel, *The Great Leveler: Violence and the History of Inequality from the Stone Age to the Twenty-First Century* (Princeton, 2018).

combined with famines and epidemic disease, are what reverse inequality. Piketty largely leaves war and war finance out of his account, and his extensive discussion of property and the French Revolution amazingly omits the *assignat* inflation. Piketty begins with an appeal to social scientists that they learn more history, but choosing which bits of history to include and which to exclude is always likely to be a matter for contestation.

Harold James
Princeton University

Killer High: A History of War in Six Drugs. By Peter Andreas (New York, Oxford University Press, 2020) 352 pp. \$29.95

The Age of Intoxication: Origins of the Global Drug Trade. By Benjamin Breen (Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 2019) 304 pp. \$34.95

In *Forces of Habit: Drugs and the Making of the Modern World* (Cambridge, Mass., 2001), David Courtwright argued that a number of highly popular intoxicants (caffeine, tobacco, alcohol, opium, coca/cocaine, and cannabis) in combination with an emerging and gradually accelerating global trade triggered a “psychoactive revolution” in the early modern era. “Psychoactive revolution” may well be the most influential single phrase ever put to paper in the historiography of drugs, elegantly summing up how six intoxicants had become so important to the modern world, and why states eventually declared “war” on half of them. *Forces of Habit* was also unusual for being a creditable drug history, footnotes and all, written for a popular audience by a historian who already had a pedigree for serious, fine-grained research on drugs. Although Courtwright was not the first drug scholar to recognize the significance of the early modern era (Schivelbusch preceded him), he certainly broadened the horizons of drug historians working in the much more familiar terrain of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.¹

Andreas, a historically minded political scientist who, like Courtwright, has a long resume of excellent and highly influential scholarly work, is clearly aiming toward a more popular audience. Much like *Forces of Habit*, or his own *Smuggler Nation: How Illicit Trade Made America* (New York, 2014), Andreas clearly seeks to split the difference between popular appeal and serious scholarship. History buffs will surely devour this book. Breen’s study, however, is more scholarly and rigorous, drilling down deeply into Courtwright’s notion of “psychoactive revolution.” Andreas relies almost completely on secondary sources, many of them popular histories of the six drugs central to his story, but Breen delves into materials from eleven different archives in five countries (Brazil, Portugal, Italy, England, and the United States).

1 Wolfgang Schivelbusch, *Tastes of Paradise: A Social History of Spices, Stimulants, and Intoxicants* (New York, 1992).

Breen maintains that our present approach to drugs was born in the early modern era, a product of the global drug trade, which he calls, “an emergent property, born of a ferment of different beliefs, practices, and conflicts, following a course that was neither planned nor expected” (3). This concoction resulted in the bifurcation of drug markets into licit and illicit branches during what Breen calls the “Age of Intoxication” (he fears that a reference to “ages” might now be out of scholarly fashion, though Courtwright, who just published *The Age of Addiction: How Bad Habits Became Big Business* [Cambridge, Mass., 2019]) might disagree). The label is a bit misleading because Breen actually emphasizes that both psychoactive and purely medicinal drugs were important to the story. Nonetheless, he suggests that drugs had “impacts on global health, material culture, and intellectual life that were arguably even more transformative than the unevenly distributed intellectual currents of the Enlightenment” (3).

Breen offers much that is new. His focus on the British and Portuguese Empires makes for a novel but well-chosen pairing. Notwithstanding that most of the literature identifies the roots of drug prohibition in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, Breen argues that “the assumptions underlying drug criminalization include concerns about bodily and mental purity and the trope of intoxication as an enemy of civilization. . . . [T]hese associations arose out of early modern conceptions of racial difference, fears of non-Christian spirituality, and the commercial imperatives of merchants, slavers, and medical professionals Drugs became illegal not because of the arbitrary decisions of government leaders in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries but because of deep-seated epistemological, commercial, and social structures that emerged during an earlier age of globalization on the plantation, on the slave ship, and on the surgeon’s table” (7).

To make this argument, Breen splits the story into two parts. The first focuses on his view of the Portuguese Empire as pioneering both the search for new drugs and global commodification. The second part highlights how the British eventually “cannibalized” these networks and how, “by the eighteenth century a new, more global understanding of intoxication emerged, one guided by both empiricism and orientalism. The division between drugs and pharmaceuticals sprouted in this racialized soil of Enlightenment-era debates about intoxication, science, and empire” (11). Though not the first to locate the roots of modern drug prohibitions in the early modern era, Breen’s argument along these lines is the most comprehensive and nuanced to date.

Andreas’ subject matter—the relationship between drugs and warfare—is narrower than Breen’s, but it covers a longer chronology (all recorded history, in fact) across many regions, though mostly Europe, the United States, China, and Japan. Like *Forces of Habit*, Andreas’ book focuses on alcohol, caffeine, opium, cocaine, and tobacco. Instead of including cannabis, however, he studies amphetamine, a relative latecomer to the drug scene (1927), but probably the drug with the most direct relationship to actual warfare. Andreas emphasizes that there were five ways that these drugs were connected to combat—“war *while on* drugs (drug consumption

by combatants and civilians during wartime), war *through* drugs (the use of drugs to finance war or to weaken the enemy), war *for* drugs (the use of war to secure drug markets), war *against* drugs (the use of military means to suppress drugs or to attack or discredit military rivals in the name of drug suppression), and drugs *after* war (different drugs as winners or losers in the aftermath of war)" (7).

Despite its ostensibly narrow focus, Andreas' survey of the relationship between war and drugs has an obvious breadth. Since both drugs and conflict are everywhere in history, the potential connections are boundless. This ubiquity makes for entertaining but, from an academic perspective, sometimes frustrating reading. Unlike his *Smuggler Nation*, which depicts the United States as a country built on smuggling, this book lacks a provocative overarching thesis. His musings in the conclusion of *Killer High*, however, are thought-provoking. To wit: "The term 'narco-state' is typically used today to describe places such as Afghanistan that are deeply enmeshed in the illicit drug trade. Yet viewed from a longer historical perspective, all the major powers can actually be labeled 'narco-states' in the sense that they have, at various times, in various ways, and to varying degrees, relied on drugs and drug revenue to carry out their state-making and war-making objectives" (254). Nonetheless, much of the book covers territory that will be familiar to drug scholars. Courtwright and others have already shown how dependent governments can become on taxing drugs, especially during wartime. Moreover, at this point, drug scholars are well versed in the war against cocaine and in soldiers' propensity for coffee and cigarettes. Hence, Andreas' book might have more appeal for a popular rather than a scholarly audience.

Andreas' book is also suspect in its quoting of dubious contemporary sources, with the effect of vague or conflicting assertions. In the coffee discussion, for example, one source claims that by the end of World War I, the U.S. government had to provide 750,000 pounds of coffee per day to the army. The number is jaw-dropping. How many U.S. personnel were involved in World War I? The answer of 3 million, which emerges a few sentences later (from another source), establishes an individual's average consumption of coffee as a quarter pound per day. Could it be accurate? The next quotation, which suggests 2 million American soldiers instead, yields more than one-third a pound per person per day. The internet, however, estimates the total number of U.S. personnel involved in the war as closer to 5 million (the first quotation mentioned only the "army"). A few sentences below, Andreas informs us that, during World War II, which he calls "an even more caffeinated conflict," the U.S. military provided as much 250,000 pounds of coffee to its personnel per day. A quick internet search finds an estimated 12 million U.S. personnel in World War II, which amounts to about one-third an ounce of coffee per person per day, which would make World War II significantly less, not more, caffeinated than World War I (120-121). Which version is correct?

Other, more subtle flaws perpetuate outdated notions. For example, scholarship has strongly challenged the notion that China was overrun by

opium addiction in the nineteenth century. Current research, as well as many sources from the period in question, indicates that the vast majority of opium users had only a moderate intake of the drug, but the lobbying and propaganda of reformers, both Western missionaries and Chinese nationalists, effectively overwhelmed the facts.² Andreas conveys the traditional story of the Chinese being “hooked” on opium, its fighting capacity diminished by the drug and so forth.

These criticisms aside, the scope of Andreas’ book ensures that every reader will learn something new. Breen’s book might not be read as widely, but it will surely be widely cited in the various fields to which it speaks (drug history, the history of medicine, early modern globalization, and the Portuguese and British Empires).

Isaac Campos
University of Cincinnati

Maps for Time Travelers; How Archaeologists Use Technology to Bring Us Closer to the Past. By Mark D. McCoy (Berkeley, University of California Press, 2020) 257 pp. \$26.95

Remote sensing, or geospatial archaeology, is now coming into its own. It began with aerial photography after World War I and now involves everything from ground-penetrating radar to GPS, and, most important of all, LiDAR, aerial surveying with lasers. McCoy is literate in remote-sensing technologies and, refreshingly, has a realistic and critical approach, with no illusions about its uses and limitations. He argues that scientific archaeology and fictional time are both driven by a profound curiosity about the past. He uses the idea of time travel to describe the dimensions of how these approaches can deepen our understanding of the ancient world and, above all, to show how we can know what happened.

The book has four parts. Two chapters in Part I provide a brief discussion of how geospatial archaeology has expanded from being a narrowly defined approach to an all-encompassing one that expands the stories that we can tell about the past. The second chapter points out that archaeology is grounded in the sciences and humanities in ways that are a far cry from the treasure-hunting mantra of generations ago, still a popular stereotype of what archaeologists do. The main concern is to connect with the people of ancient times. Part II is a rapid journey through the beginnings of geospatial archaeology, starting with aerial photography and then moving to satellite imagery. Rich examples of methods and findings abound, among them the Stonehenge landscape, Near Eastern tells, China’s Great Wall, Landsat satellites, buried western Saharan rivers, and even the abortive search for Ubar in Oman. We now have not hundreds of sites but thousands. Turning

2 Frank Dikötter, Lars Laamann, and Zhou Zun, *Narcotic Culture: A History of Drugs in China* (Chicago, 2004). Rollo K. Newman, “Opium Smoking in Late Imperial China: A Reconsideration,” *Modern Asian Studies*, XXIX (1995), 765–794.

this knowledge into information about how ancient societies functioned, however, is much harder than merely locating them.

During his lifetime, McCoy expects to see more archaeology than any of his predecessors, thanks to lasers or, more specifically, to LIDAR, which first came into prominence with the uncovering of the Maya city of Caracol in Belize. Since then, LIDAR surveys have become relatively commonplace, as has the development of 3-D models using photogrammetry software, notably deployed on drones. Peering underground involves the use of reactivity magnetometers, ground penetrating radar, and other devices. Chapter 5 describes digital mapping, from GIS and GPS to high-resolution satellite imagery, as well as digital atlases, like the Digital Index of North American Archaeology (<http://ux.opencontext.org/archaeology-site-data/>). Digital mapping bristles with difficulties; it is far more than just locating sites.

Three chapters examine major topics explored by geospatial research. “Migration, Mobility, and Travel” discusses movement data and how geospatial technology expands the previous available data from a few locations such as the Chaco Canyon roads and Roman road systems. “Food and Farms” focuses on the spatial puzzles involved in decoding people’s ability to survive and thrive. Again, McCoy ranges widely, from Hawaii to the Mediterranean, pointing out that computer modeling using large data sets not only allows us to understand the course of history but also to glance into the future.

Everything comes together in Chapter 9, where McCoy argues that archaeology is as close as we are ever going to come to visiting the past. It is important to scale up geospatial technologies to investigate places and times otherwise overlooked. An extraordinary range of examples lies on these pages. Almost all of them required teamwork, which draws not only from disciplinary specialists but also from local stakeholders. Arising from this collaboration is the critical question of much data should remain hidden from the general public in the interests of preserving a finite resource of archaeological sites.

Maps for Time Travelers is a brilliant introduction to the frontiers of archaeology, exploring innovative and highly significant ways of bringing people closer to the past. Thanks to technology, archaeologists are no longer restricted to mere earthly discovery; they are becoming ever more skillful travelers in time. Lucid, entertaining, and highly informed in the art and science of geospatial archaeology, this short, beautifully written book is an exceptional guide to the interdisciplinary world of today’s archaeology and history.

Brian Fagan
University of California, Santa Barbara

Jephthah’s Daughter, Sarah’s Son: The Death of Children in Late Antiquity.
By Maria E. Doerfler (Berkeley, University of California Press, 2019)
396 pp. \$ 29.95

Doerfler addresses an original and thought-provoking topic—examining how Christians in late antiquity came to terms with child mortality. As

she notes in the introduction, “this is a book as much about bereavement as it is about children’s death” (6). Indeed, most of her study focuses specifically on how clerical authors in the fourth through sixth centuries constructed and adapted liturgical narratives to be useful to a laity familiar with an alarmingly high mortality rate. In a subject as delicate as this one, Doerfler is consistently respectful of her subject matter and how grieving parents emotionally and intellectually negotiated a life cut short. That attention to care serves her well for the most part, although a slightly less sympathetic eye toward the architects of this discourse would have been welcome.

After starting with a brief discussion of the prevalence of the phenomenon and an overview of early philosophical responses to such losses, Doerfler then turns her attention to late antique practices and rituals preceding and following death. She notes an unsurprising variation in customs but, more significantly, offers a context for understanding the deployment of homiletic consolation. To that end, Doerfler examines the development of several familial archetypes drawn from scriptural sources. The first model of parental loss was that experienced by Adam and Eve after Abel’s murder. The suffering of the “first family” ties into a broader cultural concern about a child’s premature demise. The loss of their second son and the loss of Eden were blurred as a means for navigating parental grief, offering the hope of Paradise regained in the life that followed.

A second narrative frequently deployed was the Akedah (the Binding). God’s commandment to Abraham that he kill Isaac became a model for stoical submission to divine will at the loss of a child—especially in death but also in any circumstance that separated a child from the earthly world (such as becoming a monk). Moreover, the absence of parental grief in the original tale necessitated invention and the insertion of Sarah (Abraham’s wife) by late antique writers into the story. As with Eve, maternal grief is a genuine concern, as well as an expected gendered response to a child’s passing.

The Akedah, Doerfler argues, also found resonances (“parallels” is too strong) in two other biblical accounts—Jephthah’s unwitting vow to sacrifice his daughter and the unnamed mother of the martyred Maccabees. In her examination, Doerfler highlights the theological ambiguity of parental grief. Some found it understandable and acceptable; others deemed it inappropriate, or at least unseemly.

The experience of Job was especially useful to invoke in matters regarding bereaving parents. As Doerfler notes, “his versatility arose . . . from his perception as an Everyman” (146). In his tale, the intersectionality of divine will, demonic interference, and human agency could facily be applied to the experience of overwhelming parental grief. The complexity of Job’s response to losing his ten children served as a heuristic bonanza—restrained and patient about his fate as a loving father and protector of his children, and faithful in “ultimate vindication” (172). The final biblical *exemplum* came in the widespread adaptation of the slaughter of the innocents, described in Matthew. Not only were the innocents considered martyrs and thus guaranteed paradise, but, unsurprisingly, the death of

infants in general became associated with these children, with an understanding that they, too, could share their reward.

One of the many strengths of this book is its impressive breadth. Although it tends to focus on the East, Doerfler draws from a wide number of sources. Her familiarity with the funerary epigraphy and her interest in amulets and other prophylactic devices reinforces this impression. What emerges from her study is how plastic these biblical figures became: Their form largely depended on the cleric interpreting their experiences and, we may surmise, on the audience receiving them.

Doerfler's reconstruction of a discourse of consolation creates the strong sense of Christian authors often having to bend biblical exemplars to the point of breaking—most egregiously in the case of Sarah. Doerfler acknowledges this tendency, but this liberality seems like a missed opportunity for deeper reflection on these hermeneutical exercises and their relationship with late antique exegesis more broadly. Nonetheless, taken as a whole, this monograph is a welcome addition to the study of family and children in late antiquity and takes them in a new and creative direction.

Geoffrey Nathan
University of California, San Diego

Sight Correction: Vision and Blindness in Eighteenth-Century Britain. By Chris Mounsey (Charlottesville, University of Virginia Press, 2019) 323 pp. \$79.50 cloth \$39.50 paper

Although substantial histories of emotional, physical, intellectual, and sensory impairment have proliferated throughout the past century, the historical study of disability as community is a relatively recent endeavor. As these studies have diversified, separate epistemologies that examine disability as a social phenomenon and impairments as a cultural phenomenon have evolved, particularly in English-speaking countries. However, few historical works try to address these separate approaches in a single coherent narrative. In *Sight Correction*, Mounsey attempts to develop such a narrative by surveying the intellectual and literary understanding of visual impairment as disability in Britain (by which he means Wales, England, and Scotland) during the eighteenth century.

As his analytical method, Mounsey employs a variability approach that examines individuals within a given era, in lieu of, as he argues, an effective cultural model of disability. Importantly, this variability approach is designed to examine closely individuals who inhabited an era and an epistemological space—philosophers, vision scientists, ophthalmologists, surgeons, and writers who were visually impaired—rather than to objectify a larger community such as “the disabled.” Thus, unlike many other works on this topic, Mounsey's stands out for not focusing on institutions and institutional thinking.

The book is divided into three sections, each of which contains three chapters. The first section, entitled “Philosophy,” reviews what Mounsey sees as the guiding theories related to visual impairment in the eighteenth

century. This section develops a framework and establishes a case for the arguments to be found in the following two sections. In the first of its chapters, Mounsey outlines how British ophthalmology in this era was found lacking in both approach and sophistication in comparison to its continental counterparts. As he observes, “If I were writing a history of ophthalmology in the eighteenth century, I would ignore England and concentrate on the technical developments in France and the pioneering work of Antoine Maître-Jean” (7). The rest of this section examines the discipline of disability studies from the late twentieth century onward (and how they inform a contemporary epistemology of sensory impairment) and the methods of textual analysis that he employs in the following sections.

The second section, entitled “Medicine,” examines the early experimental study of visual impairment in the eighteenth century and its roots in the philosophy of mind. Mounsey does not discuss the roots of the mind-brain duality that other works cover. Nor does he recognize the earliest discussions about the mind and brain through the analogy of blindness, as René Descartes did, which was to serve as a foundation for the Enlightenment. However, this section identifies the most important experiment in this era—Cheselden’s study of a boy who recovered his sight after early sight loss. This section also discusses the analyses of later philosophers, such as John Locke and Jean-Jacques Rousseau, who used blindness and deafness as the foundation of the theory of mind.

The third section, entitled “Lives,” the most significant in this study, examines the biographies of three outstanding British poets with visual impairment—Thomas Gills, John Maxwell, and Priscilla Pointon. Mounsey argues that he not only attempts to “tell the biographies of blind people to balance the discourse of the doctors but [also] to confront the disease-treatment-cure paradigm that is so often foisted upon the eighteenth century as the century of medicalization” (99). Thus, by highlighting such diverse poets, Mounsey provides both a departure from the scientific and medical epistemologies of the era and an insight into the moral, social, and intellectual history of seventeenth-century British society.

The book has three significant flaws. First, Mounsey’s analysis of eighteenth-century philosophies of mind has many gaps. A book of this gravity needs to identify discussions about the mind and brain as the foundation of the eighteenth-century philosophy of visual impairment. In this respect, Mounsey’s omission of David Hume’s work is puzzling, as is his inclusion of Locke’s, based as it was on William Molyneux’s “Problem” (the blind regaining sight), rather than that of Descartes and others to which Molyneux’s also responded. An analysis of the original texts from this era, rather than a survey of secondary-source literature, would have helped.

Secondly, Mounsey introduces a number of visual images, none of which appears to have *alt text* or verbal images, which in a modern book about visual impairment is a significant oversight. Thirdly, although Mounsey briefly summarizes his study in two paragraphs at the end of chapter nine, he could have been presented a farther-reaching discussion in a concluding chapter. As a result, the book seems to end in mid-air.

Despite these issues, this highly readable book is an important review of marginalized writers and a convincing narrative of exclusion in the eighteenth century. Moreover, as a penetrating critical analysis of the era's medical approach, written by a person with a visual impairment, it is a significant contribution to the field of disability history and the history of impairment.

Simon Hayhoe
University of Bath

Old-Regime France and Its Jetons: Pointillist History and Numismatics. By James E. McClellan III (New York, American Numismatic Society, 2020) 268 pp. \$100.00

Until 1789, the best-made and most carefully designed official objects coming from the sophisticated capital of Europe's largest kingdom were *not* French coins, long struck by hand at Paris' medieval royal mint. They were instead the millions of royal medals and official tokens called *jetons*, mostly in silver and all with royal effigies on front, produced at a state-of-the-art factory known as the *Monnaie des Médailles*, built in 1552 on the western tip of the *Ile de la Cité* and moved across the Seine to the Louvre in 1609. After 1663, their designs and inscriptions were minutely supervised by France's *Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, which survives today.

Composed by a retired social historian of pre-Revolutionary French science and seasoned collector of French *jetons* (x–xi), this physically beautiful book, produced with exquisite attention to detail (including a red satin bookmark), curiously resembles the elegant objects the history of which, numismatically distinct from those of medals or coins, it recounts (21–27). Its author justifies it as a much-needed bridge between modern history and numismatics, two well-organized disciplines with completely different audiences. This history begins with aids for “manual arithmetic” in medieval counting-houses, reaches its peak between the mid-seventeenth and mid-eighteenth century, and ends abruptly with the abolition of aristocratic privilege in 1789 (27–34, 201–202, 49–53). State-made French coins and medals are still being produced, but official *jetons* have never revived.

McClellan's investigation, which rests on an impressive mastery of the abundant numismatic literature about *jetons* in French—supplemented by a few vital archival sources (for example, 191–192, nn. 152–154; 202, nn. 5–6)—emphasizes two important peculiarities about official French *jetons*. They never reached the rustics who comprised the overwhelming majority of French people or even such major French institutions as *Parlements* or universities (71, 208). Geographically, Bourbon France was unusual but not unique in Europe, since thousands of patriotically themed *jetons* also circulated in the early modern Low Countries, where their sociocultural history “remains to be written” (45–46).

Within these parameters, McClellan's “pointillist” approach successfully illuminates the mentality of upper-level old-regime French society through “using *jetons* as microdots” (19). Three chapters analyze the

consumers of more than 13,000 different known types of French jetons that were made for a surprisingly wide range of government institutions and private organizations (73). They are followed by two exceptionally rich final chapters about the rigidly centralized royal institutions that controlled their appearance and their manufacture.

McClellan's numerous illustrations of jetons suggest that the language of their inscriptions may deserve more attention than he provides (154–155, esp. nn. 36–39). For example, Latin's "classical" prestige explains why the *Anno Domini* dates found on most French jetons are sometimes in Roman numerals (for example, 111, 117, 198, 238), whereas unusual contexts help to explain some of the jetons that are bilingual. French appears only on the reverse of one jeton for the *Académie Française*, an ongoing state institution that perpetually revises French vocabulary (98), but on the front only when the "Philadelphia Circle" of West Indian slaveholders acknowledged their colonial overlord (their own Latin motto on the reverse) (122). Overall, McClellan's enterprise offers remarkable material for a still-unwritten history of Western snobbery, where such non-French notables as Ben Franklin or Thomas Jefferson appear in unexpected contexts (121–122, 154).

William Monter
Northwestern University

Precarious Partners: Horses and Their Humans in Nineteenth-Century France. By Kari Weil (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 2020) 240 pp. \$30.00

Weil is an important voice in animal (or human–animal) studies. This new collection of wide-ranging but tightly linked chapters culminates her research since 1999 about horses in nineteenth-century France. The chapters harness several threads that now define interdisciplinary animal studies—animal ethics, continental philosophy, feminism, and visual culture. Weil's lively and witty prose is refreshingly restrained in academic baggage. This enjoyable and effervescent book does a remarkable amount of work in around 200 pages.

Though not a historian's history, the book is deeply historical. Its interdisciplinary perspective will interest scholars who study animals, culture, France, gender, race, and the nineteenth century. Weil reads literary sources, visual sources, and historical documents through the lens of American and French critical theory, particularly from human–animal thinkers like Derrida and Haraway, and she reminds readers that Foucault framed his idea of biopower around the horse-training term *dressage*.¹

1 Jacques Derrida (ed. Marie-Louise Mallet; trans. David Wills), *The Animal That Therefore I Am* (New York, 2008); Donna J. Haraway, *When Species Meet* (Minneapolis, 2007); Michel Foucault (trans. Alan Sheridan), *Discipline & Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (New York, 1977; orig. pub. in French [Paris, 1975]).

Weil's sources foreground famous French figures from far-flung fields—scientists (Georges Cuvier, the Comte de Buffon, the Saint Hilaires, Gustave le Bon); painters (Rosa Bonheur, Théodore Géricault, Edouard Manet); and literary figures (Honoré de Balzac, Charles Baudelaire, Théophile Gautier, Eugène Sue, and Emile Zola). She also introduces some fascinating lesser-known characters, including Adah Menken, the creole-Jewish-American woman and star of Paris equestrian shows (Chapter 5). Menken's career is crucial for illustrating Weil's argument that gender, race, and species are co-produced.

Weil joins horse historians Greene and Swart in examining the nineteenth-century intersection of class, gender, race, and species.² These authors show that people in that century consistently used horses to articulate social and biological differences. But unlike Greene, who writes in a U. S. context or Swart in a South African one, Weil links French anxieties about women equestrians (tellingly called “amazons”) with changing gender roles, views of race and evolution, and France's medicalized idea of national decline, underpinned by Lamarckian evolution and theories of degeneration. Although francophones and anglophones shared concerns about breeding, in which horse breeding informed emerging eugenics, the French voiced unique worries about the biological decline of their national “breed.” Weil reveals horse breeding as an underappreciated site for France's medicalized national identity and uncovers equestrian practices intended to heal the ailing national bloodline.

All nineteenth-century horse studies confront the diverse ways that horses served humans—through companionship, entertainment, labor, meat, and transportation. Although other horse studies explore many of these services, Weil's discussion of French debates about eating horse meat stands out as a rare study of hippophagy (Chapter 4). She also focuses more on entertainment (Chapters 5–7) and less on war than do Greene and Swart. With these unique emphases, Weil makes original contributions to understanding how horses became the essential animals in human–animal relations during the 1800s.

Weil also shows how past concerns about animal ethics can inform ethical deliberation today. Chapter 2 unpacks the discourse of “pity” that structured debate about treatment of workhorses surrounding France's 1850 Grammont law, which prohibited public cruelty to animals. Chapter 4 examines ethical debates about eating horses after 1850. The book's title nicely encapsulates Weil's major argument about animal ethics—that horses and humans have always stood in a precarious partnership. Steering a middle course between unfettered animal exploitation and abolishing domestication, she argues that human–horse relations require communication, empathy, and reciprocity. Resonant with recent care ethics, Weil argues that domestication demands cohabitation, collaboration, and companionship.

2 Ann Norton Greene, *Horses at Work: Harnessing Power in Industrial America* (Cambridge, Mass., 2008); Sandra Swart, *Riding High: Horses, Humans and History in South Africa* (Johannesburg, 2010).

Seeing and knowing animal others—above all, remaining open to affective and emotional relations with them—enables ethical interspecies encounters in which all partners are agents, and none leave unchanged.

The book's brief afterword is not really a conclusion; in little more than a page, it gallops past major contemporary concerns including the Anthropocene (see also 62). The book feels particularly relevant in 2020 as American and European cities pull down statues—often of men on horseback—that commemorate genocide, imperialism, racism, and slavery. Weil shows how long similar conflicts have raged over the raced and gendered meanings of these iconic images and the inequalities and injustices that they represent for both humans and horses.

Peter Soppelsa
University of Oklahoma

The Italian Renaissance of Machines. By Paolo Galluzzi (Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 2019) 276 pp. \$39.95

Galluzzi's lavishly illustrated *The Italian Renaissance of Machines* lacks a full-fledged introduction and contains no conclusion. Hence, it lacks an overarching framework that explains how the three chapters that compose virtually all of it fit together to form a unifying theme. To be sure, Galluzzi offers certain comprehensive arguments in the brief preface: "From the first decades of the fourteenth century, Italy was the stage of a revival of interest in technical issues, of original discussions on the very concept of machine, and of the development of new graphic conventions for effectively representing its structure, components, and functions" (vii). As he also observes, "The most original contribution of these new authors was indeed the systematic recourse to images and the prominent role assigned to them" (ix). As a result, "these works displayed a new dimension of the very concept of 'text,' as verbal descriptions now engaged in a constructive dialogue with a vast apparatus of evocative visual representation" (ix).

The book manifestly unfolds chronologically as it traces the interactions of text and image throughout roughly 250 years—from the fifteenth-century works of the Sienese artist-engineers, such as Taccola, to the sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century works produced by the commentators on Vitruvius' *De architectura*, various authors of the theaters of machines, and mathematicians of the new science, such as Galileo. In his preface, Galluzzi states his intention to link the rise in stature of the "artist-engineer," as he entered the "literary scene" and acquired distinction and "social prestige," with humanism as a cultural and educational program (x). Yet all in all, the compact preface cannot adequately bear the burden of unifying the entire book, as learned, informative, and elegantly designed as that book is.

Thus, *The Italian Renaissance of Machines* reads like a series of connected but not yet completely integrated scholarly essays centered on a set of common critical concerns (they grew out of Galluzzi's 2014 Berenson Lectures

at Villa I Tatti). That said, it does tell an important story about the rise and decline of the cognitive function of the image in texts devoted to machines in the long Italian Renaissance. Leonardo da Vinci's manuscripts function as the innovative intellectual and artistic climax. To oversimplify matters dramatically, before and after Leonardo, images largely served to clarify and/or elaborate an idea explicated in a text. If not completely subservient to such text, as mere illustrations, they tended not to occupy a separate conceptual plane, even though they could sometimes be speculative, fanciful, or even innovative. Leonardo's images instead functioned as entirely separate ways of working out ideas. They were not just part of the process of contemplating a mechanized nature—from actual machines to the human body conceived as an intelligible one—but absolutely essential to it.

In other words, Leonardo's drawings represented an independent mode of thinking—the art of *disegno*—distinct from writing, at once exploratory, generative, material, and experiential. Leonardo produced many of them rapidly, as if jotting down ideas rapid fire, much as an inspired writer dashes down ideas on paper. Word and image exist in Leonardo's manuscripts in dialectical tension, each bumping against its limits as a mode of representation and inquiry while complementing the other. By the time of Galileo, the language of mathematics, not the language of drawing, had begun to underpin exploration and cognition. Machine images, however, had by no means become superfluous; they were still purposive, though no longer serving the same probing, cognitive function. Rhetorically speaking, they became more stripped down, purged of the sometimes obscuring colors of *elocutio* to showcase instead what's essentially at stake in an *inventio* itself—"geometry," say, or "the universal principles of mechanics" (x).

Other stories weave through Galluzzi's compelling and erudite book. The text offers much to ponder, and the beautifully reproduced images much to admire. The book is well worth exploring again and again.

Douglas Biow
University of Texas, Austin

Four Fools in the Age of Reason: Laughter, Cruelty, and Power in Early Modern Germany. By Dorinda Outram (Charlottesville, University of Virginia Press, 2019) 167 pp. \$35.00

Bakhtin's *Rabelais and His World* marked a watershed in the study of early modern European popular culture in general, and folk humor in particular.¹ No doubt influenced by the paradoxes of his own time and place—Soviet culture was at once both incredibly suppressive and full of humor—Bakhtin used his study of Rabelais to demonstrate that early modern carnivalesque

1 Mikhail Bakhtin (trans. Helen Iswolsky), *Rabelais and His World* (Bloomington, 1968: orig. pub. in Russian, Moscow, 1965).

elements, including folk festivities, common rites and cults, clowns, fools, giants, dwarfs, and jugglers, did not just function as entertaining distractions from “real life.” Rather, such elements formed part of the period’s own life principle, means by which early modern people related to each other and sites where truth and power relations were unmasked and imaginatively recreated. In their different ways, Foucault, Burke, Darnton, and, perhaps above all, Davis each adopted and critically reinterpreted Bakhtin’s fundamental insight. Early modern cultural history as we understand it today is unthinkable without it.²

Although Outram’s book about court fools in eighteenth-century Germany does not mention Bakhtin by name, it bears his influence through and through. This quick read—less than 130 printed pages in length—tells the stories of four early modern court fools in order to “understand the nature of [princely] courts through a reconceptualization of fooling, and [to put] that fooling against some of the central concerns of the Enlightenment” (1). “Laughter is not simple,” Outram writes in a passage that could have been lifted directly from Bakhtin’s *Rabelais*; “[t]he pleasure and dangers of laughter are also the pleasures and dangers of power” (3).

In five short chapters, Outram discusses the life stories of Jacob Paul Gundling (1673–1731) and Salomon Jacob Morgenstern (1708–1785), both court fools in the service of Prussia’s King Frederick William I; Joseph Fröhlich (1694–1757), who served as the court fool of August the Strong and his successor, August III, in Saxony-Poland; and the itinerant court fool Peter Prosch (1744–1804). The book concludes with a short discussion of the figure of the Hanswurst in late eighteenth-century German drama. Like so much else in this book, this late shift of focus from real-life figures to the literary realm has unmistakable (if, alas, unstated) Bakhtinian overtones.

Outram’s achievement in this book is twofold. First, she sheds fascinating new light on an important cultural phenomenon that has attracted far less attention from Anglo-Saxon scholars of German history than from their colleagues who study Italy or France. Even in the twenty-first century, historians of early modern Germany are usually much more preoccupied with hefty theological and philosophical topics (the Reformation or the German Enlightenment) or violence (the Thirty Years’ War or the witch craze) than with the many carnivalesque and humorous features of early modern popular culture. Outram’s intervention is welcome and indeed important. Similarly significant (if a tad less original) is the author’s insistence, through the study of court fools, that the relationship between

2 Michel Foucault (trans. Alan Sheridan), *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of Prison* (New York, 1977: orig. pub. in French, Paris, 1975), 61; Peter Burke, *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe* (London, 1978), esp. 255–288 (Chapter 7, “The World of Carnival”); Robert Darnton, *The Great Cat Massacre and Other Episodes in French Cultural History* (New York, 1984), esp. 73–106 (Chapter 2, “Workers Revolt: The Great Cat Massacre on the Rue Saint-Severin”); Natalie Zemon Davis, “The Reasons of Misrule: Youth-Groups and Charivaris in Sixteenth-Century France,” *Past & Present*, 50 (1971), 41–75.

power and Enlightenment in the eighteenth century was never a simple one. She is right to insist that at least some eighteenth-century German rulers used intellectuals when it suited them (in the realms of law and political economy, for instance) but also derided scholars and indeed scholarship as such. One of the many convincing demonstrations of this ambiguity is the book's description of the public disputation between the Prussian court fool Jacob Morgenstern and members of the faculty of law in Frankfurt-an-der-Oder in 1737. Staged by King Frederick William I himself, the very existence of this grotesque exercise was part of its message.

This fine book is welcome new research on early modern German cultural history. It will also be of interest to scholars outside the field who take laughter seriously.

Yair Mintzer
Princeton University

The Lost Tradition of Economic Equality in America, 1600–1870. By Daniel R. Mandell (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 2020) 314 pp. \$49.95

Widening economic inequality has been one of the most striking and significant problems facing the United States during the past half-century. Mandell covers two facets of public and scholarly discussions of this issue in this wide-ranging and insightful book. First, he suggests that most accounts look back no further than the Gilded Age, the late nineteenth-century decades in which American inequality previously achieved unprecedented levels. To correct for this lapse, he traces a long previous history that originated during the earliest period of European settlement. Second, he presents this history as a story of repeated contestation over political and economic values. Because the Founders and the U.S. Constitution did not address the issue of laissez-faire liberalism and the preeminence of property rights, a resolution was left to emerge over time. An understanding of this history can inform contemporary debates at a time when anxieties about inequality and aspirations for economic justice are as powerful as they have ever been.

Egalitarianism, advocated by Diggers and Levellers, as well as by the English Commonwealth tradition, was a resilient strand in the ideologies that fostered the American Revolution and its republican ethos. Mandell notes the bitter irony that, although Native Americans served as emblems of equality, the appropriation of their lands underwrote whites' hopes for curbing poverty and building a non-hierarchical society. Revolutionary governments instituted the price controls and other regulatory measures that provoked the arguments for economic liberalism that were to prevail in the long run. Calls to restrict wealth accumulation stopped with the abolition of primogeniture and entail. Suspicion of "aristocracy," however, helped to secure the election of Thomas Jefferson and, later, Andrew Jackson, to the

presidency, initiating franchise reforms in many states that de-coupled political participation (for white men) from property ownership. Although an emphasis on equality of opportunity placed increasing weight on education, Mandell also shows that an early American reliance on English literature and on Federalist authors instilled in children conservative habits of deference to authority.

Widening inequality and capitalist development sparked labor protests in the 1820s and 1830s, and the panic of 1837 helped to spur a revival of the egalitarian tradition. The upsurge of communitarian efforts in the early 1840s, the New York anti-rent movement, and the calls for land reform initiated by George Henry Evans's National Reform Association, all challenged established orthodoxies. Coupled with abolitionism and opposition to the Mexican War, these developments fostered the political realignments that led to the Civil War. Land reformers eventually secured passage of the Homestead Act of 1862—albeit a measure that was “only . . . a shadow of the original goal” (221)—but Reconstruction-era hopes of redistributing land to liberated slaves were dashed. Mandell succinctly shows how that episode exposed the assumptions of a political system that prioritized racial hierarchy and attachment to private property, but that had also, for many whites, detached citizenship and opportunities for economic advancement from access to landownership. The conditions that doomed Southern land reform were also those that set up the Gilded Age's dramatic rise in economic inequality.

In one sense, Mandell's reference to a “lost tradition” points to hopes for an egalitarian America that have repeatedly been disappointed. As he suggests, however, they were also repeatedly revived several times in the nineteenth century. His brief epilogue lays out the post-Reconstruction history of arguments for equality—in labor campaigns and populist platforms, in Progressivism and the New Deal, in the Great Society, and in the recent Occupy movement. In another sense, however, the tradition seems “lost” because it no longer figures in mainstream discussions of economic possibilities or policies dominated by liberal or neoliberal ideologies. But its revival has often followed economic disaster, as in 1819, 1837, or 1929. The 2008 recession brought it partly to the fore again. Who knows what the 2020 covid-19 downturn will bring? Mandell's useful book belongs on the reading lists of the scholars, elected officials, and others who will be engaged with figuring out a path ahead.

Christopher Clark
University of Connecticut

Dust to Dust—A History of Jewish Death and Burial in New York. By Allan Amanik (New York, New York University Press, 2019) 272 pp. \$40.00

In the Jewish section of the large municipal cemetery in Moscow, numerous tombstones are engraved with an insignia indicating that the deceased was an honored member of the Communist party. What motivated individuals

so entrenched in this political/national ideology to desire to be buried among religious brethren? Amanik, in his excellent history of Jewish death and burial in New York from the seventeenth through the twentieth centuries, raises the same question when he asserts, “Despite . . . pivotal changes, one stark continuity . . . remained . . . : Jewish commitment to be separate in death.” To some degree, this circumstance is even more curious on American soil, where no clear record of excluding Jews from public burial exists. Indeed, this “drive to separate” stands in contrast to the exceptional degree to which Jews focused successfully on becoming key partners in forming New York’s multicultural mosaic.

Amanik is a meticulous social historian adept at featuring individuals or events that illustrate overall trends or unique phenomena. He is not, however, an anthropologist, a philosopher, or a theologian. Thus, little space is dedicated to explaining why New York Jews remained insistent on maintaining their own cemeteries for so long. Yet this fact serves as a provocative foil to the majority of the content in the book, which excavates and then narrates the vicissitudes and evolutions in the dynamics surrounding Jewish death rites, funerals, and cemeteries in the New York area.

The story begins with the small cadre of original Jewish settlers that found refuge in New Amsterdam/New York from the 1650s. Intent on adapting the modes of their Spanish–Portuguese origins to the New World, they dominated Jewish life on the Atlantic coast through the early nineteenth century. The next chapters trail the major waves of Jewish immigration in the mid-nineteenth century and throughout much of the twentieth century. First, the book chronicles the conflicts and adjustments related to the arrival of thousands of primarily German-speaking Jews—some of them having been exposed to early European Reform Judaism—and then the major transformation that emerged after millions of mainly East Europeans made New York the largest Jewish metropolis in the world. The volume, to be sure, is far more than a specialized study of Jewish expiration and interment. Rather, Amanik demonstrates that this issue not only reflected overall reworkings of Jewish life; it often spurred them.

Among the themes that feature prominently are the initial authority of synagogues regarding the acquisition of grounds, ritual treatment of the dead, and entitlement to, and location of, burial; the rise of burial fraternities that wrested the monopoly from the synagogues (many of these fraternities transforming into major benevolent societies that provided “insurance” to surviving family members); publication of death and mourning guides that facilitated wider access to specific life-cycle customs and traditions; the closing of burial grounds in Manhattan in favor of massive “rural” cemeteries for Jews in the outlying boroughs; the advent of the private funeral industry and its eventual dominance of what was once an intimate aspect of Jewish life; new roles for women in burial services beyond sewing shrouds, eventually resulting in distinct *hevra kadisha* burial sisterhoods; rabbis, lay leaders, and denominational organizations cultivating and reforming cemetery rituals and reasserting the synagogue as the proper vehicle for funereal functions; and more recent efforts to entrust sacred customs with Jewish

individuals again rather than professional frameworks. Throughout, Amanik selects key junctures to note parallels with other religions and societal issues that contextualize the Jewish developments within wider schemes.

This learned tome ends its main narrative in 1965. Yet, contrary to the brief epilogue that highlights the overall continuity of central trends in subsequent decades, two major digressions from prior accepted practice during the past half century challenge the ongoing viability of the “drive to separate” as a major constant. The first is exogamy/intermarriage, the initial “spike” of which was first recognized in the 1960s, and which today pertains to between 50 and 60 percent of all Jews in the United States. When so many “Jewish” families include members who do not identify as Jewish, the very idea of limiting burial to “Jews” is no longer possible, or even desirable, for many. This reality confronts congregations whose cemetery charters explicitly permit only Jewish burial on the grounds. A common solution is the purchase of additional space in which both Jews and non-Jews may be buried. Will this rising integration of non-Jewish spouses and children forever change the underlying premise of the “Jewish” cemetery in New York/America?

The second issue that complicates the prior norm is the growing number of Jews who are cremated rather than buried in the traditional manner. Although cremation does not automatically preclude interment in a Jewish cemetery, it sometimes meets with strong disapproval, if not outright prohibition. Even liberal denominations can object out of respect for the millions who were incinerated in Nazi crematoria. Many Jews, however, choose cremation for economic and ecological reasons, questioning the rationale for Jewish cemeterial “footprints.” Nonetheless, the Orthodox-affiliated National Association of Chevra Kaddisha dedicates considerable effort toward educating Jews about the ongoing importance of traditional burial, regardless of personal religious lifestyle, often citing the Nazi crematoria as boundary-marking symbols. The Association raised substantial funds to create a cemetery in southern Florida, the home to thousands of expatriate New York Jews, that offers free burial services to those willing to forego cremation.

The “drive to separate” in death that appeared axiomatic to most mid-twentieth-century Jews—be they in Moscow or New York—seems to be losing its potency among today’s American Jews.

Adam S. Ferziger
Bar-Ilan University

Out of Stock: The Warehouse in the History of Capitalism. By Dana Orenstein (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 2019) 326 pp. \$105.00 cloth \$35.00 paper

Out of Stock charts the history of the warehouse as a “spatial form” in the United States from the colonial era to 1989 (20). Although not quite the book that its title promises, it is full of interesting insights that will reward

the patient reader: Perth Amboy, New Jersey, was a major slave mart in the eighteenth century; the New York Crystal Palace of 1852 was a bonded warehouse for foreign importers; Chicago is, by some estimates, the third-largest container port on the planet, after Hong Kong and Singapore. Skeptical of the oft-voiced warehousemen's boast that warehousing is one of the "oldest businesses in the world," Orenstein contends that not until the 1850s would the warehouse emerge as a "stand-alone business," and not until after the Civil War would it become a "destination" on the "cognitive maps of city denizens" (31). Originally *depositories* for goods, warehouses are today *depots* for their transportation and processing. Use gave way to exchange and storage to circulation. Landmarks in this transformation included the Warehouse Act of 1846, which permitted importers to delay the payment of tariff duties, and the legislation establishing the first foreign trade zones in 1934. Among the sources that Orenstein mined are the trade press, government documents, and the papers of Brooklyn Congressman Emanuel Celler.

Although *Out of Stock* has the word "warehouse" in its title, it is primarily a history of the foreign trade zone, a spatially delimited territory that in recent decades has become increasingly central to the manufacture of foreign goods destined for the U. S. market. The international dimension of the warehouse is important to Orenstein, since it enables her to align her project with the globalizing impulse of historians of capitalism, and to disparage as parochial the bottom-up regionalism of business historians such as Philip Scranton. For Orenstein, as for historians of capitalism, capitalism is a monster abstraction that no individual, group, or institution can check. Question-begging, attention-getting pronouncements abound: "Only by showing the mismatch between fantasy and reality can we expose the counterfeit freedom that sustains the tyranny of capitalism" (25); "customs territory . . . constituted the very foundation of modern nation states" (107); "the foreign-trade zone repackaged warehousing into a dreamscape of frictionless transactionality" (181).

Orenstein is right to observe that foreign trade zones challenge conventional assumptions about national sovereignty, labor standards, and supply chains. Yet, even though their establishment is the "epitome of politics" (10), she never offers more than a glimpse at how the sausage is made. Her principal protagonists are "warehousemen" and "zone operators," one-dimensional stick figures, almost none of whom is identified by name. Some subjects are undoubtedly harder to cover than others. Yet in contrast to books on related themes—for example, Marc Levinson's *The Box: How the Shipping Container Made the World Smaller and the World Economy Bigger* (Princeton, 2016); Shane Hamilton's *Trucking Country: The Road to America's Wal-Mart Economy* (Princeton, 2008); and Pietra Rivola's *The Travels of a T-Shirt in the Global Economy: An Economist Examines the Markets, Power, and Politics of World Trade* (Hoboken, 2005)—*Out of Stock* is not written in a style that is likely to lead to widespread classroom adoption. Pitched at colleagues in American studies and related fields, it offers relatively little to business, economic, or political historians.

Even so, it is sufficiently suggestive in its assemblage of relevant detail that it might just become a cult classic among those academics who conflate cultural critique with interdisciplinarity.

Certain issues receive attention; others do not. Populist enthusiasm for government-backed storage facilities is duly noted, but the book has no index entry for *Munn v. Illinois*, even though the Supreme Court's affirmation of state warehouse regulation may well be the single best-known warehouse-related event in American history. The rise of the self-storage business since the 1960s also falls outside the author's ambit, as does cold storage, public granaries, and the off-site repositories maintained by libraries and art museums. Warehouse aesthetics is another neglected topic worth exploring. The warehouse, in short, has yet to find its historian. Even so, it is a tribute to Orenstein's patient and imaginative sleuthing that these and other subjects can now come more clearly into view.

Richard R. John
Columbia University

The Boston Massacre: A Family History. By Serena Zabin (Boston, Houghton, Mifflin, Harcourt, 2020) 296 pp. \$30.00

After 250 years and many previous treatments of the Boston Massacre, Zabin's innovative study truly breaks new ground by supplying richness and depth to a dimension of this iconic event that had only been sketched earlier. Hillier B. Zobel's *The Boston Massacre* (New York, 1970) was a thorough and influential analysis of the episode, shaped by British and loyalist sources, and Eric A. Hinderaker's *Boston Massacre* (Cambridge, Mass., 2017) supplied a balanced account, distinguished especially by its assessment of the historical context and memory of the event. Zabin, however, focuses closely on the soldiers who occupied Boston in the months before the deadly conflict of March 5, 1770, thus bringing us closer to the interpersonal aspects of the "massacre" than ever before. She follows the British regiments from their stations in Ireland to Nova Scotia and Boston—a posting preferred over the West Indies or Canada. She explains that officers' vigorous and successful efforts to bring their own and their soldiers' wives and children with them was costly, but Britain's military recognized that the presence of families enhanced troop order and morale.

This familial dimension of Boston's occupation had wide-ranging implications. Zabin's microscopic research into troops' living arrangements—in barracks, vacant dwellings, and taverns, and with colonial families—enriches understanding of their impact on the Boston community. Generally, Zabin finds that Redcoats engaged local society according to their own social rank; officers socialized among the official and mercantile elite, whereas common soldiers developed relationships among the working classes. In a town that had not grown for a generation and where women outnumbered men, soldiers who came without wives often formed local liaisons. Children born to soldier families were baptized at Boston's outpost of the

Church of England, King's Chapel. There Zabin found the records of godparents, which reveal the interwoven lives of some occupiers with some of the occupied.

In Zabin's telling, this mingling of soldiers with colonists seems ordinary, even benign. But from the perspective of the settled Boston community of congregational dissenters, led by psalm-singing Whig leaders like Samuel Adams, it was outrageous to bring soldiers and their corrupt behavioral baggage into the town to enforce British law and order. As they understood it, such was the archetypal design for tyranny that had long been laid out in radical Whig ideology. But Zabin, who drew substantially from British military sources and the records of the Bostonians who most closely interacted with royal officials, pays scant attention to the town's Whig and clerical leaders or their thoughts.

As Zabin explains, given the many conflicting eyewitness descriptions of the massacre, and of the separate trials of Sergeant Thomas Preston and his soldiers, in rival partisan publications, she, like Hinderaker, decided to avoid any attempt to provide a definitive account of that fatal night. Instead, she assesses the motives of prosecution and defense, crediting defense attorney John Adams with engineering a friendly jury and developing an argument that laid blame on "a motley rabble of saucy boys, negroes and molattoes, Irish teagues, and out landish jack tars," not settled Bostonians (216). Though Whigs were glad to see the regiments gone, they refused to be labeled "mobbish," as both Hinderaker and Zobel noted.

Zabin's study is not multidisciplinary. She skillfully employs the techniques of microhistorical narrative, tracing individuals across time and space. Her thorough research links public records, private papers (both manuscript and printed), church records, and contemporary printed sources, as well as secondary scholarship. Her resulting story of this major episode in the independence movement bestows, for the first time, individual faces and aspirations on the Redcoats who occupied Boston from October 1768 through March 1770.

Richard D. Brown
University of Connecticut

Lowcountry at High Tide: A History of Flooding, Drainage, and Reclamation in Charleston, South Carolina. By Christina Rae Butler (Columbia, University of South Carolina Press, 2020) 304 pp. \$34.99

Located on a marshy peninsula formed by the Ashley and Cooper Rivers just a few feet above mean sea level, Charleston, South Carolina, has faced challenges posed by water since its founding. Removing excess water, transforming swampy land into dry ground, and filling to raise the surface has characterized the city's built environment. Butler traces the history of these activities in *Lowcountry at High Tide*. She states her mission clearly at the outset—to provide "a thorough history of fill and reclamation" in Charleston, "a city in which flooding has been a continuous hindrance

to human habitation since European settlers first recorded the phenomenon in the late seventeenth century” (1).

Lowcountry at High Tide follows the city’s hydrological works from its founding in the late seventeenth century to the present day. Butler shows how drainage and fill efforts marked Charleston even in its initial years, although these colonial efforts were largely unregulated and piecemeal. Public works increased with the city’s incorporation in the Federal era, but a funding model based on assessing affected landowners meant that work was uneven and slow. The antebellum period saw even more extensive drainage and reclamation in the name of economic development and public health, although the Civil War and a shortage of funds temporarily erased some of these gains. The bulk of the book—Chapters 4 through 9—focuses on the city since the Civil War, for which the source material is most abundant. After the war, more modern understandings of disease led to efforts to build a distinct sewer system (separate from the storm-drain network). The city then turned much of its drainage and fill efforts to its northern fringe, expanding into the lowest and swamiest ground on the peninsula. In the second half of the twentieth century, drainage and reclamation changed in significant ways. More ambitious and expensive projects became feasible under new funding models; wetlands found defenders in the environmental movement; and the city shifted its expansion imperative from filling marshland to annexing suburbs located off the peninsula. Butler concludes with advice for Charleston’s current officials concerning the importance of understanding these historical efforts to manage the city’s hydrology.

The book exists at the intersection of several fields—history, geography, urban planning, and historic preservation (Butler’s academic specialty). Portions of the text are informed by the methods of environmental history, as Butler explores the importance of disease and public health in shaping Charleston’s growth and development. Outbreaks of yellow fever, mosquito populations, and the miasmatic theory of illness all encouraged the management of water and reclamation in particular ways. Several potentially useful works on southern water, health, and cities, however, are missing from the study, which would benefit from the inclusion of scholarship by Colten, Humphreys, Stewart, and Valencius, among others.¹

The research really shines in Butler’s intimate mastery of municipal records. From meeting minutes to engineering diagrams, she has plumbed these quotidian documents to reconstruct a fine-grained account of Charleston’s various hydrological and reclamation works. Interesting historical maps illustrate the text and help to make sense of the details. Although many of the city’s antebellum records were destroyed in the Civil War, Butler has reconstructed their accounts through minutes published in local papers and other reproductions to the extent possible. Her detail-oriented approach is also evident in the

1 Craig E. Colten, *An Unnatural Metropolis: Wrestling New Orleans from Nature* (Baton Rouge, 2004); Margaret Humphreys, *Yellow Fever and the South* (Baltimore, 1999; orig. pub. 1992); Mart A. Stewart, “What Nature Suffers to Groe”: *Life, Labor, and Landscape on the Georgia Coast, 1680–1920* (Athens, 2002); Conevery Bolton Valencius, *The Health of the Country: How American Settlers Understood Themselves and Their Land* (New York, 2002).

inclusion of three appendixes—two drainage reports that she found to be instrumental sources (one from the late nineteenth and the other the mid-twentieth century) and the third a helpful timeline of drainage, fill, and reclamation projects in the city. Butler provides a few comparisons between Charleston and other coastal cities, but overall the work is narrative rather than analytical. Nonetheless, the book is exemplary in showing how municipal records might be used to reconstruct a historical urban landscape.

Although the research is impressive, it raises the question of scalability. An extensive and thorough survey of municipal literature might be employed for similar case studies, but the time and energy involved would be prohibitive for compiling a history of urban drainage at the national level. This tension between fine detail and broad survey is inherent to historical analysis and in no way diminishes Butler's accomplishment.

This book will be most useful to Charlestonians, whether officials desiring a better understanding of the origins of the modern city or individuals engaged in historic preservation. More broadly, it should attract some interest from scholars of southern cities, coastal development, and municipal planning.

Drew Swanson
Wright State University

In the Matter of Nat Turner: A Speculative History. By Christopher Tomlins (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2020) 352 pp. \$29.95

Tomlins' *In the Matter of Nat Turner* is a provocative and important contribution to the growing scholarship about Turner's revolt. In a prologue about William Styron, Tomlins lays out the theoretical foundation for the project, which is to enliven Turner by paying careful attention to the sources that both describe Turner and resonate with the present day. Inspired by the eclectic style of Walter Benjamin, Tomlins takes six different approaches to Turner, trying to illuminate the enigmatic leader of the United States' most deadly slave insurrection.¹

Tomlins' first chapter focuses on the most important source on the revolt, Thomas R. Gray's *The Confessions of Nat Turner* (Richmond, 1832). Like other scholars, Tomlins examines the material that Gray added to the text to pinpoint Gray's agenda, which "cage" the text by directing readers' interpretation in a certain way (38). This observation is not new, but Tomlins follows it with one that is: Gray's apparently accurate transcription of Turner's account of his motives at the beginning of the revolt precedes a "relatively distinct text" in the second half of *The Confessions* in which Gray plays a more active role in composing the text (43).

1 See, for example, Walter Benjamin (ed. Marcus Bullock and Michael W. Jennings), *Selected Writings, I: 1913–1926* (Cambridge, Mass., 2004); *idem* (ed. Jennings, Howard Eiland, and Gary Smith), *Selected Writings, II, Part 1: 1927–1930* (Cambridge, Mass., 2005); *idem* (ed. Jennings, Eiland, and Smith), *Selected Writings, II, Part 2: 1931–1934* (Cambridge, Mass., 2005); *idem* (ed. Eiland and Jennings), *Selected Writings, III: 1935–1938* (Cambridge, Mass., 2006).

Tomlins' next two chapters examine what *The Confessions* reveals about Turner's intellectual world. Unlike most scholars who have placed Turner within an Old Testament framework, Tomlins focuses on Turner's attention to the Gospel of Luke. He suggests that Turner's New Testament readings may have had roots in seventeenth-century Pietist views of suffering. Tomlins even notes the points where Turner may have drawn from Jonathan Edwards' *History of the Works of Redemption* (Edinburgh, 1774), which may have informed Turner's own messianic self-understanding and his postmillennialist worldview. In his third chapter, Tomlins portrays Turner as a Kierkegaardian "knight of faith," whose religious sensibility transcends ethical obligations.²

In the fourth chapter, Tomlins turns his attention from texts to actions, focusing on the killings. He suggests that the "Southampton massacre" was a work of Hegelian self-transformation by people who had no other reasonable way to resist their oppressors. But the revolt failed as whites re-established control of the countryside and re-established the law on the bodies of the black people tried for their involvement in the revolt.

In the final two chapters, Tomlins examines the debate about slavery that followed the revolt. Some whites, including Gray, saw the revolt as a simple melodrama in which black rebels were "remorseless murderers" (130). Other whites grappled with guilt, knowing that the slave system was wrong. Some pushed for the gradual emancipation of Virginia's slaves, but that proposal was defeated in the Virginia legislature, in part by politicians who redefined the system of slavery as a "positive good." Tomlins' quarry is bigger than the rise of the "positive good" argument; he uses an assessment of Thomas R. Dew, author of *Review of the Debates of the Virginia Legislature of 1831 and 1832* (Richmond, 1832), to illustrate the failings of a political economy that conferred credits on slavery for its profitability but no debits for its moral horrors.

The result of this ambitious and wide-ranging study is uneven. Tomlins' review of the 1831/2 Virginia legislative debate about slavery is excellent; his description of the revolt itself is not. The discussion of Turner's reading of the Gospel of St. Luke is first-rate; the efforts to portray Turner as Kierkegaard's knight of faith does not fit the evidence of Turner as a figure beset with doubts. Tomlins has written the best portrait of Turner's own religiosity, even if it includes thinly sourced, speculative work about Edwards' influence (77). The clearest measure of the value of Tomlins' "speculative history," however, is its ability to withstand doubts about particular claims. For example, contra Tomlins, Gray's use of parenthetical insertions to correct Turner in the second half of the *Confessions* strongly suggests that Gray wrote down Turner's words as accurately as he could, whether he thought them to be right or wrong.³ Yet, even though

2 See Soren Kierkegaard (trans. Alastair Hannay), *Fear and Trembling* (New York, 1985; orig. pub. in Danish 1843).

3 Breen, *The Land Shall Be Deluged in Blood: A New History of the Nat Turner Revolt* (New York, 2016), 169-179.

Tomlins may well be mistaken in his view of *The Confessions*' second half as Gray's invention, not Turner's own words, he is right that scholars have not paid enough attention to its differences from the first half. For anyone thinking deeply about Nat Turner, slavery, or the production of history, Tomlins' smart, "speculative history" merits a careful read.

Patrick H. Breen
Providence College

Educated for Freedom: The Incredible Story of Two Fugitive Schoolboys Who Grew Up to Change a Nation. By Anna Mae Duane (New York, New York University Press, 2020) 240 pp. \$30.00

Duane's important new study began in the archives where she was captivated with the records of the New York African Free Schools. That research led her to James McCune Smith and Henry Highland Garnet—two of the most influential Black leaders of the antebellum period, who were also among the schools' most prominent alumna. Although studies of McCune Smith's and Garnet's lives exist, they have not been placed into dialogue with one another as Duane does in this book. Duane illuminates the meaning and significance of Black childhood to these men, both real and imagined, in their adult lives. The meaning of freedom, citizenship, and the role of education, as inextricably linked to Black childhood, fundamentally shaped McCune Smith's and Garnet's politics, testifying to the centrality of Black children in the fight for Black liberation. The strength of the book lies in Duane's study of the Black leaders' lives through the analytical lens of Black childhood.

Duane argues that McCune Smith's and Garnet's lives are crucial to answering the question of how to imagine and secure a Black child's liberation in early America. Education was central to this mission. At a time when whites propagated notions of Black inferiority, African Americans believed education was a means to refute racist ideas and work toward liberation and equality. For African Americans, the promise of education was constantly stymied by the politics of chattel slavery and its concomitant racism, which included whites assigning child-like dependency to all Black people to "justify" Black subjugation. McCune Smith and Garnet navigated this dilemma as children and sought lasting remedies to it as adults. Curiously, Duane spends little time contextualizing the history of African-American education in the 1820s and early 1830s when Garnet and McCune Smith pursued their studies. Instead, the views of white subscribers to the American Colonization Society (ACS), who controlled the New York Free African Schools and believed educated Black people must leave the country, figure more prominently in the early chapters. The juxtaposition between competing views on race and education would have enriched the analysis. In this environment, the two young Black men born to enslaved parents came of age and had formative experiences.

After receiving their educations, Garnet and McCune Smith's visions for Black liberation diverged tactically. Upon returning to New York City after earning his medical degree, McCune Smith became the physician at the Colored Orphan Asylum where he cared for sick Black children and strove to provide a path for them to lead fulfilling lives in the United States. Duane shows how McCune Smith's work on behalf of Black children shaped his refutations of scientific racism. An illuminating section about Omo, a Black child, about whom McCune Smith wrote to refute racist ideas about illness and Blackness is particularly fascinating. McCune Smith also believed in the efficacy of abolitionist transformation of American society.

Garnet's staunch advocacy of Black emigrationism by the 1850s put him at odds with McCune Smith and other Black leaders like Frederick Douglass. As a teacher and minister, Garnet helped to shape a generation of African-American youth. His family also aided young fugitive slaves, marking the significance of Black childhood in Garnet's adult life. Duane's ability to weave the motif of home and fugitive flight throughout the analysis makes the work a tremendous addition not only to childhood studies but to American studies generally.

The work is less successful, however, as a historical analysis. For example, the distinctions between the racial politics of the ACS and Black emigrationism and the reasons for the convergence of the movements in a specific historical moment warrants deeper engagement. Moreover, the portrayal of Garnet's need to escape history because of its link to slavery could have benefited from nuance to include his engagement with the history of Black people, which could reveal the multiple functions of history in his life. These quibbles notwithstanding, this important contribution to Black childhood studies and its understanding of the lives of McCune Smith and Garnet merits a wide readership.

Michael E. Jirik
Carleton College

Confederate Exceptionalism: Civil War Myth and Memory in the Twenty-First Century. By Nicole Maurantonio (Lawrence, University of Kansas Press, 2019) 264 pp. \$32.50

Civil War Monuments and the Militarization of America. By Thomas J. Brown (Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 2019) 384 pp. \$90.00 cloth \$29.95 paper

At the time of this review, Americans have defaced, reviled, and removed Confederate monuments. Confederate Civil War Memory—the Lost Cause—and its ties to white supremacy made these artifacts twenty-first-century targets of protests against racism and police brutality. Scholars have studied Civil War memory at length, but these two new books provide an extraordinarily valuable perspective on these objects at this unique juncture of history, memory, and current events. Maurantonio's *Confederate*

Exceptionalism examines contemporary manifestations of the Lost Cause, whereas Brown's *Civil War Monuments and the Militarization of America* assesses both United States and Confederate Civil War monument design in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. Although valuable separately, together these studies provide insight into how distinct disciplines approach the same controversial issue.

Maurantonio focuses on one epicenter of current Civil War memory struggles—Monument Avenue in Richmond, Virginia. She argues that Monument Avenue represents “a three-dimensional setting for the display of Confederate exceptionalism” (120). She explicates this description of the setting as “fusing elements of the Lost Cause ideology and American exceptionalism [that] nostalgically remembers ‘the South’ through an amalgam of embodied and textual practices that alternatively embrace and revise the Confederacy’s racial history” (2). Modern Confederates, rejecting the prominence of racism and slavery, remember instead a multicultural Confederacy; critical to their assertion are those black Americans who support the Lost Cause. Maurantonio’s study has two great strengths. First, it demonstrates a mastery of the historical scholarship about Civil War memory that relates to her subject. Second, it brings the methods of communication analysis to “historical” questions that need fresh thinking; her chapter about “Confederate” cookbooks is a revelation. Notwithstanding the strength of Maurantonio’s argument, it brings to mind Anderson’s notion of an “Imagined Community.”¹ Readers might find this theory valuable as they contemplate the rendering of a Confederate nation that is completely imaginary.

Maurantonio looks at one group at one time, but Brown examines both Confederate and Union monuments to identify their common elements. After examining these artifacts from the Civil War era to the immediate post-World War I era, he contends that the evolution of monument design reflects the militarization of America. Brown’s extraordinarily comprehensive analysis of these monuments includes a nuanced assessment of the artistic trends that shaped their design. As part of his assessment, he examines broader phases of memorialization, including the common-soldier monument, the general’s monument, and various other constructions, such as the arch erected in Brooklyn, New York. His richly illustrated volume allows readers to evaluate the commentaries that accompany the images of the artifacts. His assessments of these monuments include a discussion of the artists and their influences.

Although Brown’s book is an invaluable addition to Civil War studies and art history, its argument about American militarization is not totally convincing. The arch movement seems to have had little effect on Confederate monuments. Instead, the evolution in monument design may reflect those who approved these designs or veterans of the Civil War mourning their dead; elite northerners at the turn of the century could well have had their own agendas and artistic sensibilities. In fact, Brown finds evidence of Americans’ unease with war in the Civil War monuments designed after World War I.

1 Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (New York, 1983).

This critique in no way detracts from Brown's magnificent study. In fact, both studies are invaluable. Maurantonio examines a single phenomenon to see why it is exceptional. Brown examines disparate artifacts made by different people at different times to see what they might have in common. Despite their differences, both studies lend timely insights into an ongoing struggle about the legacy and memory of the American Civil War.

Barbara A. Gannon
University of Central Florida

American Slavery and Russian Serfdom in the Post-Emancipation Imagination.
By Amanda Brickell Bellows (Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 2020) 304 pp. \$90.00 cloth \$29.95 paper

The historiography of slavery, serfdom, and their demise usually focuses on abolition projects and the historical imagination during the pre-emancipation era and on achievements after the official abolition of bondage. This innovative book describes how many people in Russia and the United States depicted freed people after their emancipation. Diverse textual and visual images constitute the bulk of materials that Bellows explores in her vivid, subtle, and highly sensitive analysis.

The first chapter discusses radical literature in the two countries at the eve of emancipations. Bellows locates no abolitionist movement in Russia that paralleled that of the United States; she contrasts the rare Russian serf narratives with the relatively more common autobiographies of U.S. slaves. Chapter 2 moves to the nostalgic historical fiction produced by American and Russian landlords during the post-emancipation years, depicting the relationships between serfs/slaves and their masters as paternalistic and non-conflictual. Chapter 3 examines illustrated periodicals and lithographs. According to Bellows, "by reading periodicals, Americans and Russians grew increasingly aware of and connected to their nations and the wider world." In both countries, illustrators usually showed former slaves and serfs struggling to understand "freedom" and "modernity," when not actively involved in political uprisings. Stereotypes of violent African Americans and peasants consolidated at this time. The self-representations of African Americans and peasants occasioned distinct images of them attempting to improve education, farming, and business.

Oil paintings, as shown in Chapter 4, reflected the differences. Many Russia and American artists shared the goal of humanizing former slaves/serfs in displays of their daily lives of peasants. U.S. painters, however, often focused on runaways and various forms of slave resistance, whereas their Russian counterparts placed peasants' resignation at centerstage. Chapter 5 presents advertisements and ephemera aimed at introducing former slaves and serfs into the world of goods and business. Russian advertisements tended to show peasants in positions of equality with other people; the U.S. variety emphasized racism and ethnic difference and segregation. The final chapter discusses the literature and visual culture at the turn of

the twentieth century that dealt with social transformations, whether to idealize or criticize slavery and serfdom.

Although the materials in this valuable and innovative book are engaging, the conclusions that Bellows' draws from them seem too facile and familiar. She argues that these sources show Russian and American elites trying to maintain power in the face of social and political change and that "Americans' and Russians' divergent depictions of peasants and freed people stem from differing conceptions of race and ethnicity" (7), hardly a ground-breaking observation. Recent studies of the Russian Empire, however, have begun to challenge such clear-cut opposition. The literature and images of non-Russian ethnical groups deserve greater attention than Bellows pays them.

The book quotes but never starts a genuine conversation with the existing historiography. What is its main target? If it is the historical imagination and the consolidation of social stereotypes, the book should have complemented the visual and fiction materials with the more common historical analysis and the construction of national historical memories. Do Bellows' visual sources confirm or contravene what we know from the more conventional historiography? Bellows' methodology might also have benefited from insights based on a broader comparison—notwithstanding her mention of works by Bloch, Skopcol, and Kolchin.¹ Kolchin's comparison of Russian serfdom and American slavery in *Unfree Labor* was a by-product of debates during the Cold War era that focused obsessively on comparisons between Russia and the United States. Nowadays, however, a narrow concentration on the histories of those two countries fails to observe that in the 1860s, slavery and emancipation were issues not only in the United States and Russia but also in Latin America, Africa, China, and parts of the French, British, and Ottoman Empires.

Bellows has left another major "black hole" in the book. She barely notes that abolition in the United States came at the price of a devastating Civil War, whereas Russia's abolition of serfdom met with little more than an ephemeral, sporadic resistance from landowners. We find instead contrasts between "freedom of expression" in the United States (for former slaves?) and censorship in Russia, as well as race and ethnicity versus estate order. Bellows' treatment of the Civil War and the Crimean War as similar sources of abolition is misleading. The historiography about Russia almost unanimously rejects the pertinence of the Crimean War to the abolition of serfdom. Moreover, the American Civil War was not a root cause of the abolitionist movement but an integral part of it; the Crimean War was a European, eventually a global, concern related to the decay of the Ottoman Empire. How did this major difference in the two settings intervene in popular literature and paintings, in the nostalgia of bondage, the

1 See Marc Bloch (trans. William R. Beer), *Slavery and Serfdom in the Middle Ages: Selected Essays* (Berkeley, 1975); Theda Skocpol, *States and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia and China* (New York, 1979); Peter Kolchin, *Unfree Labor: American Slavery and Russian Serfdom* (Cambridge, Mass., 1990).

identification of the “other,” and the evaluation of “modernity”? Maybe, an older reference, such as Barrington Moore’s *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy: Lord and Peasant in the Making of the Modern World* (Boston, 1967), might serve as a useful corrective regarding the lapses in this work, given recent advances in the relevant historiographies.

Alessandro Stanziani
Ecole des hautes études en sciences sociales (EHESS)

Beyond the New Deal Order: U.S. Politics from the Great Depression to the Great Recession. Edited by Gary Gerstle, Nelson Lichtenstein, and Alice O’Connor (Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 2019) 416 pp. \$49.95

This book revisits and expands upon Steve Fraser and Gerstle’s influential edited volume, *The Rise and Fall of the New Deal Order, 1930–1980* (Princeton, 1989). The “beyond” in the title refers mainly to chronology rather than an attempt to reconceptualize twentieth-century U.S. political history in a manner that complicates or “moves beyond” the concept of a “New Deal Order.” Julian Zelizer’s crisp chapter about the persistence of Democratic liberalism in the 1980s and thereafter is the only chapter that substantially interrogates the New Deal Order’s utility as an organizing idea. The rest of the chapters focus primarily on synthesizing and deepening historians’ understanding of New Deal liberalism and its offshoots from the 1930s through the early 1970s and on exposing forces that helped to create what Gerstle calls in the volume’s coda a “neoliberal order.”

The book’s goals are notably different than those of another recently released edited volume that should be read alongside it—Brent Cebul, Lily Geismer, and Mason B. Williams (eds.), *Shaped by the State: Toward a New Political History of the Twentieth Century* (Chicago, 2019). Among other objectives, that volume seeks to scrutinize how widely used frameworks like the New Deal Order—often defined by watershed moments—can obscure “persistent features of American politics that cut across the usual break points—particularly hierarchies and privileges of race and gender, which are now at the center of scholarship on twentieth-century American history (6).”

Written by an exceptional group of prominent scholars, *Beyond the New Deal Order’s* fourteen chapters and introduction all merit attention, and much of the book will be of value to the interdisciplinary cohort of historians, political scientists, and sociologists who study the modern American state. For instance, Meg Jacobs’ important chapter describes how “New Dealers . . . empowered citizens . . . to effect a redistribution of economic and political power in the United States,” a process that Jacobs usefully characterizes as “state building from the bottom up (36–37)” and as deliberately establishing new ties between Americans and the government. By contrast, late-twentieth-century conservatives sought to weaken such bonds in an attempt to “dismantle and delegitimize the state” (49–50).

O'Connor provides an efficient, clear-eyed analysis of how politicians, strategists, and pundits have utilized various ill-defined constructs associated with nonelite whites, such as "forgotten Americans," the "Silent Majority," and the New Democrats' "forgotten middle class." She draws attention to these tropes to provide historical perspective on widespread claims about white working-class voters in the 2016 U.S. presidential election and to underscore how similar ideas have served specific political objectives and policy goals in the past. Paul Sabin's chapter about the early development of public-interest environmental law is similarly valuable, as is Kristoffer Smemo's chapter about liberal Republicanism and its decline. These are just a few examples of the book's many strong essays. The result is a coherent collection.

But the book's tidiness likely rests in part on its selective focus. Only one chapter foregrounds protagonists of color—David Stein's examination of Federal Reserve policy and the Black movement for full employment. In the book's second section, "Intersections of Race, Class, and Gender," only Eileen Boris' excellent chapter about weaknesses in the Fair Labor Standards Act is particularly intersectional in its approach. The volume rarely foregrounds immigrants and others who have been the focus of cutting-edge scholarship in recent years, such as LGBTQ Americans. Much of that scholarship utilizes periodizations that often do not line up neatly with the New Deal Order and its aftermath. The book also tends to treat neoliberalism as coterminous with anti-government sentiment and the heightened valorization of free markets. It generally does not grapple with scholarship that has tried to incorporate the expansion of state capacity in areas such as policing, incarceration, deportation, and surveillance into conceptualizations of neoliberalism. Nor does it engage significantly with urban-studies literature that underscores how government has often been redeployed, not eschewed, to further ends commonly labeled neoliberal.

These approaches and omissions might make the volume less illuminating for interdisciplinary audiences than it could have been. Still, each of the book's component parts is highly valuable, and revisiting Fraser and Gerstle's landmark 1989 collection is clearly an important enterprise.

Daniel Amsterdam
Georgia Institute of Technology

Creating the Suburban School Advantage: Race, Localism, and Inequality in an American Metropolis. By John L. Rury (Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 2020) 387 pp. \$39.95

Creating the Suburban School Advantage is an impressive contribution to the growing literature about how Americans with power and influence used the processes of suburbanization to develop remarkably inequitable school systems in the long postwar era. These systems, Rury makes clear, geospatially divided (mostly) middle-class and wealthy white suburbanites with college educations from (mostly) low-income and poor black urbanites

with less education. In the suburbs, white families, elected officials, and developers leveraged taxpayer money, notably for roads and home construction, to engage collectively in what Rury labels educational “opportunity hoarding” or intense forms of “localism.” Within their communities, which were defined by school-district boundary lines above all, “sharing resources was not high on the agenda,” and “[w]hen considering a proposed policy or public expenditure, individuals . . . would focus resolutely on how it could affect their immediate neighbors and themselves” (12).

As Rury notes, Americans still more or less live within this educational arrangement and its attending racial injustices—“a fact widely recognized today.” Nonetheless, “just how this happened, and what—if anything—can be done about it, are still not well understood,” a reality that this book addresses with skill (2).

The book’s central strength is that it is ultimately a case study, allowing Rury to work with a specificity unique in the literature. That is, though the title does not say so, he is focused squarely on the perniciousness of localism in the Kansas City metropolitan area (its development in both Missouri and Kansas) between 1950 and 1980. Chapter 1 is an overview of national trends in urban and suburban school systems, but the remaining chapters are primarily attuned to the local: metropolitan development and demographic shifts in Kansas City (Chapter 2); the sharp decline in prestige and white families in the Kansas City Public Schools (Chapter 3); fine-grained analyses of opportunity hoarding and infighting in suburban development on the Missouri (Chapter 4) and Kansas (Chapter 5) sides of the border; and an account of how this urban-suburban divide has remained persistent throughout the last forty years (epilogue).

By elevating hyperlocal stories, Rury shows—often in compelling maps and tables—the segregation of Kansas City’s black population in the decades after 1950 (50–58); disparities, broken down by school district, in the population’s racial background, education level, home value, and family incomes in 1960 and 1980 (64–66); the percentage of people with “professional or management employment” by school district in Johnson County, Kansas, in 1960 (138); and maps of the concentration of people with bachelor’s degrees (with corresponding ACT averages by school district just pages later) from 2013 to 2017 (163–170). When woven together, such details bring to life the historical consolidation of now-common words like “privilege” and “advantage.”

Rury’s interdisciplinary approach is another of the book’s strengths. In the introduction alone, he builds an argument with ideas from law, sociology, human ecology, urban planning, and demography, among other fields. Yet none of this disciplinary hopping detracts from the book’s historical analysis, nor from its prose or narrative clarity. Wisely, Rury moved the technical explanations of his methodologies to the appendix or, in the case of the more sophisticated statistical analyses, to articles published elsewhere.

Although *Creating the Suburban School Advantage* succeeds by explaining the power of localism, Rury fittingly ends his book with a consideration of Labaree’s broad sociological argument that inequity exists, and will continue

to exist, because most consumers of education (parents, in particular) view public schools as “private goods” for their own “social mobility.”¹ In this view, which Rury illustrates in Kansas City with superb detail, Americans with power have little reason to hope that children from other parts of the city, likely with less power, receive an equitable education. In fact, they have an incentive to hoard opportunities for themselves at every turn. Rury concludes that “[s]hort of a more fundamental shift in localist attitudes,” where more Americans see true attempts at educational equity as a “public good” for the health of a democracy, “the basic structure of metropolitan inequality in education—and in many other spheres of life—is unlikely to change” (183).

Kyle Steele
University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh

The Conservative Heartland: A Political History of the Postwar American Midwest. Edited by Jon K. Lauck and Catherine McNicol Stock (Lawrence, University Press of Kansas, 2020) 390 pp. \$65.00 cloth \$29.95 paper

If Hillary Clinton had read this volume she would never have ignored the Midwest. The Democrats took the Midwest for granted in 2016 because, for more than twenty years, Illinois, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin had leaned Democratic in presidential elections. But the chapters in this volume show that that famous blue wall was never so sturdy. The history of conservative resurgence in the Midwest has largely been ignored, despite a burgeoning scholarship about conservatism in the West, South, and Northeast. Ronald Reagan, after all, hailed from Dixon, Illinois, and spent the formative years of his life in the Midwest, developing a vision of America that he spent the rest of his life trying to get America to embrace.

The idea to explore conservatism in the heartland—including more Republican states beyond the blue wall—is a good one, but this book is wildly uneven, lacking both an organizing framework and clear conclusions. The book consists of contributions from historians who focus on specific episodes, events, or local sites, and from political scientists who offer abstract macro-overviews. The best of the chapters are gems: Catherine McNicol Stock’s astonishing story, “Reading the Ralph,” tells the entire history of the passing of one era to another through the building of a hockey arena in North Dakota. For this essay alone, scholars of conservatism or the Midwest—or scholars of higher education, college sports, racism, philanthropy, or the 1980s, for that matter—should hightail it to the library to get this book. Daniel Rowe’s contribution about resistance to the Reagan revolution is also interesting, although it contradicts the book’s stated goal of explaining the Midwestern conservative resurgence.

1 David F. Labaree, “Public Goods, Private Goods: The American Struggle over Educational Goals,” *American Educational Research Journal*, XXXIV (1997), 39–81.

Too many of the other chapters are of surprisingly low quality. The book does a disservice to their authors in publishing them. More importantly, the editors miss an opportunity to learn from the interdisciplinary background of the authors; they never take stock of what the essays combine to tell us. Is Midwestern conservatism identical to conservatism elsewhere? The volume presents the familiar themes of law and order, racism, activism on college campuses, and culture wars. Ann Marie Wambeke traces the Republican Party's increasingly conservative position on abortion, and Camden Burd the rise of anti-environmentalism, in Michigan. William Russell Coil tells of James Rhode, who embodied white working-class populism as the governor of Ohio and who was one of the politicians who brought a carnivalesque style of politics, now seen at the highest levels, into the business-club staidness of the Republican Party: "The Democrats used to say I wasn't fit to sleep with the hogs. . . . The Republicans defended me and said I was" (202). Ian Toller-Clark's chapter on "carceral populism" in Milwaukee extends our understanding of the consequences of the great migration.

But the authors and editors say nothing about the extent to which Midwestern conservatism was simply a regional facet of a nationwide phenomenon or the extent to which it differed from, anticipated, or followed national events. This silence becomes particularly problematical when considering what the chapters cover and what they do not: For example, it is not clear why the volume provides only a glancing mention of anti-communism—whether because anti-communism was not a central feature of Midwestern conservatism or because no author happened to be interested in exploring it. The overarching impression created by the book is that Midwestern conservatism is much like conservatism elsewhere, which leads to the question of why we ought to pay particular attention to it or conceptualize it as distinct rather than simply treating it as generic conservatism. Clinton might have benefited from reading *The Conservative Heartland*, but without her experience in 2016, the book would not have much claim to more than local relevance.

This book calls attention to the possibilities of exploring an underexamined facet of recent American history. In the absence of any effort to pull the chapters together into a statement about conservatism in the Midwest, however, it represents only the beginnings of a scholarly agenda that someone else will have to bring to fruition.

Monica Prasad
Northwestern University

Fermented Landscapes: Lively Processes of Socio-environmental Transformation. Edited by Colleen C. Myles (Lincoln, University of Nebraska Press, 2020) 367 pp. \$55.00

Ferment is a word that can mean different things—beer or sauerkraut, or social disturbance, often of a more dynamic, productive kind. As it turns out, it can also mean chocolate, coffee, and biotechnology, objects that

require fermentation but are not thought to be fermented products. Fermentation is an actual physical process that creates things, as well as a metaphor for process itself. *Ferment* as a category has always been present in the study of food. Lévi-Strauss, who describes food as “good to think with,” placed fermentation into the category “rotten,” viewing it as one way (along with the raw and the cooked) that cultures portrayed themselves.¹ Douglas, however, saw rotten as dangerous, as “matter out of place.”² Myles sees fermentation as a dangerous but dynamic kind of mixing of categories—such as nature/culture and rural/urban—that “results from the ‘fermentation’ of place, namely the active, sometimes volatile changes catalyzed by the mixing of some (f)actor with another” (11). Myles, a geographer, argues that ferment—the rot that produces welcome and sometimes troublesome materialities—can also be applied to the production of landscape. *Fermented Landscapes* provides examples of how both welcomed and troubled ferments can happen.

The chapters are a mixing that Myles mostly allows to speak for themselves. They span everything from a report on artisan chocolate makers in Hawaii (small in number, good at their craft, and isolated), to a history of a failed winemaking region (not pretty enough to attract tourists), to a successful micro-cider industry (in “coopetition” with larger producers), to a history of beer ethnicities in the United States (immigrants with different brews and brewing techniques), and to a group of kombucha makers (who also comprise a community). These are all interesting and well-researched articles, but the extent to which they are meant to be seen as a whole and to interact to produce a new way of thinking about landscape is unclear.

The last section is primarily theoretical. All its chapters, which are well written and thoughtful, feature compelling empirical examples and delve deeply into the meaning of fermentation. One of the most provocative chapters questions the viability of fermentation as a metaphor in biotechnology, preferring to depict the microbes used in the manufacture of biotech products as purified tools that are predictable and controlled—domesticated microbes in service to business. Thus, this chapter explicitly challenges my suggestion in *Dangerous Digestion* that *ferment* is a productive metaphor to describe the liveliness of inclusive politics.³ My view of the body as a coalition of microbes argues against the kind of monolithic control that biotech microbes are supposed to represent. Another chapter in this section, however, is more congenial to that perspective, exploring the biopolitics of the lively side of microbes as they relate to ideas about the body. It embraces new forms of biopolitics imagined through the metaphor of ferment, inspired more by the post-Pasteurian concepts of Paxson than by the idea of microbe as purified tool.⁴

1 See Claude Lévi-Strauss (trans. John and Doreen Weightmann), *The Origin of Table Manners. III. Introduction to a Science of Mythology* (New York, 1978), 495.

2 Mary Douglas, *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of the Concept of Pollution and Taboo* (New York, 1966).

3 DuPuis, *Dangerous Digestion: The Politics of American Dietary Advice* (Berkeley, 2015).

4 Heather Paxson, “Post Pasteurian Cultures: The Microbiopolitics of Raw Milk Cheese in the United States.” *Cultural Anthropology*, XXIII (2008), 15–47.

The question then becomes, When are microbes part of a lively landscape of uncontrolled mixing and when are they just tools like any other instrument of modern capitalism? Are microbrews more lively than bovine growth hormones? Are they less controlled, and if so, is that what their microbial masters want from them? Or are micro-breweries just biotech in miniature? How do people feel about liveliness when their kombucha “mother” goes bad? Should we think of microbes as Haraway’s “companion species,” or are they sometimes related only instrumentally to humans?⁵ Do they, like Callon’s scallops, sometimes revolt?⁶ These are questions that the chapters do not answer. The chapters might have engaged more in fermenting each other, exploring contradictions and digging deeply into how space becomes fixed and unfixed through liveliness. Nonetheless, the individual chapters are thought-provoking, making the reading of this edited collection a worthwhile pursuit.

E. Melanie DuPuis
Pace University

Atlantic Transformations: Empire, Politics, and Slavery during the Nineteenth Century. Edited by Dale Tomich (Albany, SUNY Press, 2020) 240 pp. \$95.00

This book is a festschrift for Christopher Schmidt-Nowara, who died in 2015. Nowara’s innovation was to place the history of nineteenth-century slavery in Cuba and Puerto Rico within the broader context of the Spanish Empire. Consistent with the spirit of his work, *Atlantic Transformations* invites another change of historical scale to revisit the topics of slavery and empire, moving from Nowara’s imperial approach to an even broader analytical framework based on the concept of the *second slavery*.

Originally proposed by Tomich, second slavery is an analytical category intended to trace the expansion of black slavery in the nineteenth-century U.S. South, Cuba, and Brazil within the historical context of growing global industrial economies and post-colonial states. After the Age of Revolution, the social and material organization of black slavery went through qualitative and quantitative transformations, thus becoming key to processes of both the accumulation of capital and the organization of state power. One of the concept’s greatest assets is its capacity to shed light on the interplay of local socioecological conditions, political actions, and global processes across distinct scales of time and space.

The concept of second slavery is partially indebted to the world-system perspective, the generative conceptual powerhouse that recasts

5 Donna Haraway, *The Companion Species Manifesto: Dogs, People, and Significant Otherness* (Chicago, 2003).

6 Michael Callon, “Some Elements of a Sociology of Translation: Domestication of the Scallops and the Fishermen of St Brieuc Bay,” *Sociological Review*, XXXII (1984), 196–233.

empirical data as world-historical processes, as in Arrighi's systemic cycles of accumulation, McMichael's food regime, and Moore's commodity frontiers.¹ It breaks down disciplinary boundaries. Instead of giving its body and soul to a passionate calculation of profitability that isolates the plantation from social processes of accumulation (as New Economic historians usually do), the second-slavery paradigm allows for the substantive incorporation of a wide range of interdisciplinary approaches, covering themes ranging from geopolitics to ideology, state power, social action, and world accumulation. Engaging freely with the concept, the contributors to this collection embark upon revisiting imperial history, particularly that of Spain, Schmidt-Nowara's specialty.

Josep Fradera argues that post-revolutionary Atlantic Empires rebuilt themselves by politically managing the future of slavery, abolition, and individual rights. Albert García-Balaña explores the connections of race, governance, and slavery during the Spanish invasion of Morocco (1859–1860) and Santo Domingo (1861–1865). Marcela Echeverri and Javier Laviña take their analyses to societies where the second slavery played no direct role: Echeverri makes the point that mainland Spanish America should be better integrated into the second-slavery framework, and Laviña shows the failure of creating a colonial slave society in Panama due to local adversities. Anne Eller and Luis Miguel García Mora examine, respectively, how the crisis of the second slavery shaped imperial policies for labor control in Santo Domingo in the 1860s and Cuba two decades later. José Antonio Piqueras explores Spain's political protection of the transatlantic slave trade to Cuba after its formal abolition (1820) and how it became a major issue uniting Spain and Cuba into the 1860s. Finally, Tomich and Rafael Marquese describe the global and local conditions for the take-off of Brazil as the main player in the world coffee markets during the nineteenth century.

Despite their distinct standpoints, what brings these authors to a common ground is the notion that the complex dynamic changes of slavery should not be reduced to uniscalar analysis nor to unidimensional factors like, say, slave resistance or the profitability of slavery. Nonetheless, most of the contributors take either the Spanish Empire or a specific commodity chain as their unit of analysis. Such approaches do not sufficiently consider the history of capital itself on a global scale, an underexplored theme that the concept of second slavery has the potential to illuminate. All in all, interested readers will find this book a valuable, thoughtful resource for the study of slavery and imperial history in the nineteenth century.

Tâmis Parron
Universidade Federal Fluminense

1 Giovanni Arrighi, *The Long Twentieth Century* (New York, 1994); Philip McMichael (ed.), *Food and Agrarian Orders in the World-Economy* (Westport, 1995); Jason Moore, *Capitalism in the Web of Life: Ecology and the Accumulation of Capital* (New York, 2015).

Ancient Maya Politics: A Political Anthropology of the Classic Period 150–900 CE. By Simon Martin (New York, Cambridge University Press, 2020) 520 pp. \$135.00 cloth \$108.00 e-book

This book is a tour de force about Classic Maya political history, largely from a top-down perspective, as would be expected for a study relying on inscriptions written by the royals themselves. Many archaeologists typically view Maya inscriptions with a grain of salt because of a couple of nagging questions: Did Maya kings actually do what they said they did, and, what does their history signify to the broader society as a whole? Martin seeks answers from a political-anthropology perspective, incorporating archaeological evidence when suitable. His strategy is to detail what the inscriptions signify beyond their literal meaning. In other words, he attempts to convey not only what they said they did but also the broader political significance of it.

Networks of political machinations reveal the nature of Classic Maya political systems, assisted through theories from political anthropology and political science, as well as cross-cultural case studies. In the end, Maya kingship consisted of hegemonic relations maintained through common ideas about kingship and its roles. Martin convinces us of the utility of this model, chapter by chapter, by addressing key questions: “How could a system of multiple polities persist essentially unchanged for hundreds of years, and why were none among them willing or able to create larger and more unified formations?” (4). He uses fourteen case studies sprinkled throughout the book to bolster his arguments, as well as to illustrate inscriptions as history.

Setting the stage for the roadmap to a clearer understanding of Maya politics are the three chapters in Part I (“Agendas in Classic Maya Politics”), which, after a brief foray into the history of Maya studies, largely focus on political theory and the insightful power of the written word, specifically its patrimonial rhetoric.

Part II, “Epigraphic Data in Classic Maya Politics,” is the meat of the book. The themed chapters flesh out the literal interpretations and the broader significance of hieroglyphs: “Identity”—royal and noble titles, emblem glyphs, and their significance; “Constitution”—royal life and the instantiation of authority; “Transcendence”—the importance of divinity, deities, and patron gods; “Matrimony”—and its influence on “legitimacy, succession, and power relations” (173), including polygyny; “Conflict”—the challenges of determining the nature, scale, and significance of “warfare”; “Hierarchy”—the “asymmetrical relations of power (237); and “Coda”—the whys and hows of Maya kingship’s demise of by 900 C.E. in the southern Maya lowlands, and the complexity of the urban diaspora that ensued.

In Part III, “A Political Anthropology for the Classic Maya,” Martin uses various strategies to synthesize what he presented in Part II, including network analyses in Chapter 12, “Classic Maya Networks.” In the final three chapters, he adroitly ties in the evidence that he has presented to lay out his interpretation of Classic Maya politics and their implications

for understanding how hegemonic systems work without an overarching monarch. The analysis is complicated, but Martin takes the time to discuss and argue that “the evidence consistently supports a hegemonic system, one in which an enduring multitude of polities were arranged within waxing and waning hierarchical orders” that heavily relied on political patronage and a membership within an “ideological commonwealth” (383–384, 385).

No book is perfect. The top-down approach leaves out the majority of people—the laborers, service providers, merchants, etc., who provided the backbone to the political system through the accumulation of surplus wealth. Moreover, scholars working with “unprovenanced” or looted items would do well to acknowledge the ethical issues of including such items in their scholarship. Looters have destroyed far too many buildings and displaced far too many human remains from the tombs and houses that they have violated.

This book justifiably belongs on the shelf of Mayanists, political theorists, archaeologists, and historians. Maya inscriptions are history indeed, inevitably mixed with some propaganda. After all, what politician does not exaggerate?

Lisa J. Lucero
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

Brazil's Revolution in Commerce: Creating Consumer Capitalism in the American Century. By James P. Woodward (Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 2020), 544 pp. \$95.00 cloth \$37.50 paper

Studies of the United States' influence on Brazil (and other Latin American nations) have a long tradition. Woodward's book takes a novel approach to this influence, focusing on the “implantation and adaptation of institutions, practices, products, and modes of thought originally associated with the consumer capitalism of the United States” (4). Rather than offering yet another denunciation or lamentation of U.S. influence, he shows how Brazilians creatively recast this very U.S. form of capitalism into their own particular version from the 1920s to the 1980s. Woodward's book skillfully explains “how these processes unfolded, identifying and understanding their principal agents, tracing the growth of Brazilian consumer capitalism and the processes by which it became national and contributed to the making of modern Brazil” (7).

One of the most significant contributions of this study is Woodward's use of the publications of trade and industry associations, their archives, and the accounts of the key figures, especially in the world of advertising and marketing. A good deal of this densely documented account are the words of the “principal agents” and their own reflections on the rise of Brazilian consumer capitalism. Most saw themselves as making the way for modernity in twentieth-century Brazil, especially in Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo, the country's two massive cultural, economic, and financial

centers. Woodard singles out banks, business associations, and key branches of government as the three great contributors to this uncoordinated, unplanned, and highly contingent process.

At the core of Woodard's analysis is the emergence of advertising agencies, the professionals who ran them, and their increasing success over decades. The first cohort of professionals to arrive from the United States in the 1920s and 1930s worked mainly for General Motors, General Electric, and J. Walter Thompson to promote automobile imports. Advertising flourished first with the rise of radio broadcasting and then with the advent of the published press and movies. Historically under the cultural influence of Europe—especially France and England—the rise of consumerism turned Brazilians increasingly toward U.S. cultural influence in the 1930s and 1940s. The “true revolution in consumption” emerged in the 1950s, driven by “prosperity professionals” who encouraged the expansion of consumer credit, installment buying, advertising, and sales promotion; they became self-appointed “educators of a buying public” (138). Their work gave birth to market and media research that included sophisticated polling and data about consumers and social classes. Most prominently, the Brazilian Institute of Public Opinion and Statistics (IBOPE), founded in the 1940s, became the iconic example of the new approach to marketing. Through the skilled use of the prosperity professionals' own writings, Woodard shows how they saw themselves acting in the “national interest,” while ironically producing their own critique of consumerism and the “American way of life.”

Woodard tracks the transformation of U.S. holidays—Mother's Day, Father's Day, Valentine's Day, and Christmas—into Brazilian ones, each with its own national characteristics. The rise of supermarkets (beginning in the 1950s) brought self-service, cash and carry, and one-stop shopping to Brazilian consumers in major cities. From the 1950s to the 1970s, the most striking feature of the consumer revolution was the creation of shopping centers, the “new cathedrals of consumption” (22). The state helped to move the revolution forward by subsidizing newsprint and by joining the advertising, marketing, and business professions to advance a mass-consumption revolution—an age of consumerism with a large middle class.

One of the most interesting and novel contributions of Woodard's study is his analysis of the rise and development of marketing and advertising. He estimates that Brazil had 5,000 marketing professionals at the beginning of the 1960s and 40,000 by the mid-1970s. The advertising professionals steered the “commercialization of the press, the rise of radio broadcasting, and the growth of television” (308). In the 1960s and 1970s, the rise of television, particularly the Globo Network, adapted U.S. media expertise to Brazil's society and culture. Television became the dominant advertising medium and a powerful driving force in the promotion of consumer demand.

Drawing on works from business, advertising, marketing, sociology, and history, Woodard weaves together an interdisciplinary interpretation of the rise of consumer culture in twentieth-century Brazil. The rise of

automobile ownership and culture, the shopping mall, and the supermarket from the 1950s onward resulted in a Brazilian form of consumer capitalism that had come into its own by the mid-1970s. As Woodard demonstrates in detail, this Brazilian version of U.S. consumer capitalism was an entirely unscripted process that transpired over decades and owed little to direct support from the state beyond its endorsement of the new age of consumerism.

Marshall C. Eakin
Vanderbilt University

Landscape of Migration: Mobility and Environmental Change on Bolivia's Tropical Frontier, 1952 to the Present. By Ben Nobbs-Thiessen (Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 2020) 342 pp. \$90.00 cloth \$37.50 paper

The politics of Bolivia's eastern *Media Luna* lowlands are under increasing attention after the ouster of the government of Evo Morales in 2019 and the repressive violence of the interim Áñez administration.¹ The economic and political power of Santa Cruz as the main hub of agribusiness and gas extraction grew tremendously in the past forty years. Right-wing and elite Cruceño organizations and personalities have captured media attention recently, but much less is known about the migration and internal colonization efforts that built the rising agro-industrial region in the tropical lowlands.² Nobbs-Thiessen's *Landscape of Migration* offers a richly detailed history that helps to explain the political and ecological dynamics of the region through the lens of transnational mobility and environmental change.

The book is composed of five distinct case studies that answer a common question: "What happens when people, ideas, and technologies are transplanted from one location to the next? More specifically, how are the meanings of that mobility interpreted, conscribed, and enacted in a frontier landscape?" (234). The case studies begin in the agrarian-reform era after the 1952 revolution, which brought the National Revolutionary Movement (MNR) into power. The MNR initiated a program of internal colonization called the "March to the East" that aimed to convert Amazonian tropical frontier into farmland. The MNR's motivations for this program were economic diversification from highland mining, food security, and demographic balance articulated as moving impoverished highlanders from the "overcrowded" Andes to the "undeveloped" tropical lowlands. The Bolivian state also welcomed transnational migrant streams, such as displaced Okinawans from the other side of the Pacific as well as Mennonites from Mexico.

Nobbs-Thiessen describes the complex and challenging lives of these migrants through a wide range of sources, including films from the era, letters making demands on the state, oral interviews, and archival research.

1 See <https://hrp.law.harvard.edu/press-releases/black-november-report/>.

2 See <https://mondediplo.com/2020/07/06bolivia>.

Stories about the differential treatment of migrants by the Santa Cruz elite and the Bolivian state shed light on forms of transnational agrarian citizenship and race relations that span Spanish colonization to Bolivian internal colonization. Buttressed around this migration history is also the story of the development professionals and religious missionaries who administered life in the new eastern colonies.

Landscapes of Migration's contribution to an interdisciplinary history of the lowlands is the nuanced description of how human and nonhuman migrations intertwine amid ecological and economic shifts. One of the most impactful transnational migrants to the Media Luna was the soybean. In the context of the international Green Revolution, agro-industrial innovation created new soybean varieties that flowed into the area through a new generation of Brazilian agronomists trained in the United States. Agro-industrial waste streams from North America were tapped by Mennonite farmers who repurposed aging U.S. machinery to jumpstart a “modern agricultural revolution in Santa Cruz.”

Global agro-industrial supply chains were disrupted by the collapse of Peruvian anchovy fisheries during the severe El Niño climate system in 1972/3. These fisheries were the world's largest source of the fishmeal that was a critical fodder for industrially produced cattle, swine, and poultry. As agribusiness looked for an alternative protein supply, South American soy production became turbo-charged by the confluence of these ecological events, knowledges, migrations, and market forces. In this confluence, the meaning of soy changed. What had started as a food crop in Asia became an industrial cash crop circulating in feedlots, food preservatives, and biodiesel. An advertisement from the agrochemical giant Syngenta opens the book by proclaiming a “United Soy Republic” has arisen in the center of South America.

The ecological and political implications of the move toward export-oriented industrial agriculture are at the heart of Bolivia's contemporary crisis. Questions of who will benefit and who will bear the burden of the lasting environmental effects of monocrop soy remain unanswered. Contradictions and contestations over the meaning of regional autonomy are one way that these questions have played out. Understanding the stories that braid transnational migrations with national internal colonization shows a living history for which the future is undetermined. *Landscape of Migration* unpacks this living history while also “demonstrating the ongoing work of migrants to lay claims to a contested landscape” (225).

Will Munger
Utah State University

Between Fitness and Death: Disability and Slavery in the Caribbean. By Stephanie Hunt-Kennedy (Chicago, University of Illinois Press, 2020) 228 pp. \$110.00 cloth \$28.00 paper

In *Between Fitness and Death*, Hunt-Kennedy explores representations of disability, racism, and slavery in an ambitious study that spans 200 years,

starting in the sixteenth century and concluding with the end of the British slave trade in the early nineteenth century. Working with a range of printed and archival sources from the Caribbean (mostly Barbados and Jamaica) and England, Hunt-Kennedy argues that disability served as a “trope” to “denigrate Africans and their descendants to the level of sub-human beings” (4). The association of blackness and disability, however, was more than discourse. As Hunt-Kennedy maintains, slavery had a disabling impact on the enslaved. Most lived out their lives under bondage in the “space between fitness and death,” experiencing the “methodical disfiguring and disabling” of their bodies (71). Such was the reality of life under slavery that served the economic interests of slaveowners. This undermining of the health and longevity of slaves by the very system that relied upon slaves’ bodies to realize profits is a contradiction that was not lost on other historians. But in using the lens of disability studies to explore this tension, Hunt-Kennedy provides a new and valuable way of reading the sources.

Hunt-Kennedy begins this work with an exploration of the origins of British racism in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, tracing its impact on ideas about slavery and enslaved people during the period of the transatlantic trade. She states that English writers’ descriptions of Africans as “monstrous” deformed beings “contained elements that anticipated later forms of racist thinking” (3, 5). But disability was more than just representation. Hunt-Kennedy points to the injuries that enslaved people suffered in their violent capture and confinement during the Middle Passage. Physically weakened, they were vulnerable to the harsh conditions that they experienced in the Caribbean.

Hunt-Kennedy shows the extent to which the Jamaican and Barbadian legal system allowed slaveowners to mete out punishments that often left enslaved people permanently disabled. Hunt-Kennedy’s close reading of almost 1,000 Jamaican and Barbadian advertisements for runaway slaves allows her to reveal the many ways that slavery disfigured, injured, and crippled the enslaved. One graphic advertisement for an escaped teenaged boy described his body as marked by whipping and scarred by disease. Hunt-Kennedy argues that such advertisements made the violence inflicted on enslaved people seem natural and mundane. But they also reminded enslaved people of the surveillance under which they lived and the violent consequences that infractions could bring. They echoed earlier representations of Africans and African-descended peoples as only “questionably human” (108).

Disability meant something different for abolitionists. They represented enslaved people as injured and broken in an effort to sway public opinion and enact legislation against slavery and the slave trade, countering images of the “strong² armed, and threatening black rebel” (164), in an attempt to reassure that freeing enslaved people would not threaten the empire. For their part, enslaved people sometimes resisted slavery by “masquerading disability,” which allowed them to evade work and exert some control over their lives (92). Disability could also indicate special abilities. Enslaved people viewed

spiritual specialists, such as Obeah—practitioners who had some kind of disability—as possessing a “higher degree of supernatural ability,” which could serve as a “compensation” for physical impairment (83).

In revealing the pervasiveness of disability among enslaved people and the various associations between blackness and disability, Hunt-Kennedy provides a new way of looking at the archives of slavery. *Between Fitness and Death* furthers our understanding of Caribbean slavery.

Juanita De Barros
McMaster University

The Terrorist Album: Apartheid's Insurgents, Collaborators, and the Security Police. By Jacob Dlamini (Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 2020) 375 pp. \$29.95

This book is microhistory at its best. Dlamini, born into South Africa's apartheid, discovered that a crude photo album containing more than 7,000 mug shots of “terrorists” and “enemies of the state” had been used to identify and keep tabs on opponents during the glory days of the regime. Supposedly, critical “intelligence” was derived from a mere photographic compendium.

After apartheid's demise and future President Nelson Mandela's release from prison, the security forces attempted to burn (in industrial furnaces) all traces—44 tons of paper and microfiche—of their operations and much of what passed for security files. They attempted, with good reason, to obliterate their past (just as many British colonial administrations tried to do elsewhere in Africa).

A South African police official called the album the “greatest form of terrorism” (xii). Three of its 500 copies unaccountably survived, with Dlamini hotly in pursuit. South Africa's researchers in the Truth and Reconciliation Commission discovered two copies on a desk in the Venda homeland. Dlamini's book is based on a digitized version, on interviews with the securocrats who compiled the album, on invigilations of Africans who cooperated with the police, and on interviews with several subjects whose faces appeared within the album's pages. This book's interdisciplinary character comes from its analysis of photographic representations as valid historical objects, and in giving them a form of agency that belies their black-and-white material substance.

The album was employed as an instrument of repression. But Dlamini shows how rudimentary and even misleading it was as an apartheid surveillance measure. Because the photos could not be updated, they barely resembled many of their subjects as time passed. Some of the individuals involved even had trouble identifying their own portraits in later years. Many photographs were attached to aliases or intentionally misleading *noms de guerre*.

The security police relied much more than they should have on the faces in the album, together with information supplied by African informants, by former African National Congress (ANC) adherents, and by officials in

neighboring countries who had been paid to tell tales about refugees, run-aways, and proto- or crypto-terrorists. Much less all-knowing and efficient than they believed and claimed themselves to be, the security police nevertheless managed intermittently to capture ANC infiltrators, torturing and otherwise compelling many of them to turn on their comrades, and they were able, at least intermittently, to reduce the ANC's military prowess and its ability to coordinate. But as the long search for Sechaba Setsubi, a graduate of Fort Hare University College and sometime teacher reveals (Chapter 4), the police were often clueless, easily misled, and manipulated.

The photographic compendium was created in the 1960s, just after the Sharpeville massacre and the prosecution of Mandela and others for treason in the Rivonia trial, and updated massively in 1985. It was intended to permit security forces to track all South Africans suspected of opposing apartheid, whether they were confirmed terrorists or, more likely, merely dissidents. Dlamini treats the material remains of the album and "linked objects" as "cracks through which to look afresh at the ruins of apartheid." (6). The album contains the raw effigies of the microhistorical reconstruction that Dlamini so imaginatively accomplished.

Through a detailed examination of the lives and experiences of several persons featured in the album from a twenty-first century perspective, Dlamini provides an intimate, corrosive, and encapsulating appreciation of how the security apparatuses of apartheid attempted to keep order and maintain control. Thus, he shows his subjects entangled by the tentacles of the apartheid state. He shows how they were warped by their encounters, brutalized, imprisoned, deprived of a sense of self, or, for those fortunate few, spared by the apartheid government's final decision to release Mandela and start afresh under African rule in 1989/90.

There are many good studies of South African politics, of South Africa under apartheid, of the police in South Africa during apartheid, of the ANC and its military procedures from outside the country, and of the activities of the United Democratic Front and other resistance operations within the country. But very few studies capture as well as this one does what it was like to be on the run, to be captured and tortured, to be jailed, and to resume activities effectively (or not) at a later time. This book stands with the resistance literature from Europe during the world wars, and with studies of guerilla groups, as well as with analyses of how security contingents attempted to protect the pariah state from its opponents.

What Dlamini never discusses, however, is what difference the album made as an intelligence instrument in the war between the forces of apartheid and their determined antagonists. Did all of the assiduous tracing and retracing of dissidents make much of an impact on the larger battle to preserve the racist regime? Even if the makers and keepers of the album, as well as their police superiors, were convinced of its value, was it really just an exercise—as Dlamini occasionally hints—of bureaucratic make-work?

Whatever the answer to those questions, the album has given Dlamini a revealing optic with which to scrutinize the underpinnings of apartheid's security framework. Dlamini's profile of a police apparatus trying without

lasting success to categorize and keep even with its antagonists is matched by his moving sketches of teenagers who went away to war and came back either emboldened or broken, the Janus-sided face of an album of intolerance.

R. I. R.

Muhammad and the Empires of Faith: The Making of the Prophet of Islam. By Sean W. Anthony (Berkeley, University of California Press, 2020) 304 pp. \$32.95

In this meticulously researched work, Anthony distinguishes between “first-order sources” and a “second-order source” for our knowledge of the origins of Islam. By “first-order sources” he means “the Qur’an, material and documentary evidence from the sixth to seventh centuries CE, and non-Muslim sources from the seventh century” (235). By a “second-order source” he means the *sīrah-maghāzī* literature. Anthony’s description of the *sīrah-maghāzī* literature as a “second-order source” reflects his position, illustrated among other things by a careful study of the call to prophethood account (what he calls the “*Iqra*’ narrative”), that this literature cannot always offer “what really happened” or granular details from the life of the historical Muhammad. Nevertheless, Anthony argues forcefully that it should not be dismissed entirely either. In other words, Anthony argues (responding to a famous statement of Patricia Crone in *Slaves on Horses* [New York, 2008]) that one can indeed, “work with it.”

Muhammad and the Empires of Faith is divided into three parts. In the first part, Anthony examines the value of the Greek text *Doctrina Jacobi* (usually held to be the earliest documentary witness to Muhammad) for our knowledge of the historical Muhammad and evidence (or the lack thereof) for the idea that Muhammad was a merchant in early non-Islamic literature. In the second part, he carefully discusses the origins of the *sīrah-maghāzī* literature, analyzing recent scholarship and classical sources on al-Ẓuhri (d. 124/742) and Ibn Ishāq (d. 150/767). In the third part, Anthony studies two traditions in the light of both the *sīrah-maghāzī* literature and late antique Christianity—the story of Byzantine Emperor Heraclius’ vision (and Muhammad’s letter to him) and the story of Muhammad’s call.

Anthony argues for a significantly later date for the *Doctrina Jacobi* based in part on a statement therein that Jews have been subjugated by the nations since the crucifixion of Christ 640 years ago. This evidence would place the *Doctrina Jacobi* in the 670s, not the 630s. He also argues that the reference to the coming of a prophet with “the keys of paradise” reflects an element of Umayyad war propaganda. The Qur’an (39:63; 42:12) insists that only God has the keys to heaven, and late antique Christian literature connects the motif of the “key of heaven” to the apostles and Peter in particular. Anthony argues, however, that this turn of phrase in the *Doctrina Jacobi* likely reflects *akhbār*, including a tradition associated with Yazīd b. Shajara, celebrating jihad with the idea that “swords are the keys to paradise.”

Anthony then turns to the widespread idea that Muhammad was a merchant, which, as he notes, appears early among non-Muslim sources, including the Armenian historian pseudo-Sebeos and Jacob of Edessa (d. 708). Anthony argues that these two authors are too early to have relied on Islamic biographies. He concludes, “The claim that Muhammad had been a merchant appears to be one of the earliest, best attested facts about his life as a historical figure” (63). In fact (and intriguingly), in the *sīrah-maghāzī* literature Muhammad is more commonly described as a shepherd than as a merchant (although much has been made of the two stories of his trading journeys with Abū Tālib and Khadīja). Yet, the Quraysh do feature as traders in that literature, and Anthony holds that the Qur’an itself (depending in part on how one reads Q 106) might point to that conclusion as well. But why then does no trace of Qurashī or Meccan traders appear in pre-Islamic sources from the eastern Mediterranean or South Arabian worlds where they supposedly conducted business?

The second part of the book contains a careful, illuminating study of the origins of the *sīrah-maghāzī* literature. Anthony begins with ‘Urwa b. al-Zubayr, the brother of ‘Abdallāh b. al-Zubayr, who was ‘Abd al-Malik’s rival in Mecca (although ‘Urwa eventually reconciled with the caliph after ‘Abdallāh’s death). He dedicates an entire chapter to the letters that ‘Urwah allegedly wrote to the caliph, as recorded in a variety of third/ninth- and fourth/tenth-century texts (whereas early scholars often avoided referring to written documents). Anthony supports the authenticity of the letters, and the likelihood that they include reports with verified information about the historical Muhammad. The letters include descriptions of (among other topics) the persecution of the believers in Mecca, the hijra to Medina with Abū Bakr, the death of Khadīja and the Prophet’s marriage to Ā’isha in her youth, the Battle of Badr, the truce established at Ḥudaybiyah, and the conquest of Mecca. One argument for the historicity of these accounts is that they are “matter-of-fact” (that is, with few supernatural details), but the problems with the *sīrah-maghāzī* literature do not end with the miracles therein but include its relationship to the Qur’an, improbable details (for example, a shepherd leading his entire flock daily to Muhammad and Abū Bakr in their cave hideout without arousing suspicion), and legal purposes (including the account of Muhammad marrying a woman named Qutaylah but sending her away without consummating the marriage).

In the following chapter, Anthony carefully traces the origins of historiography with al-Zuhrī in Umayyad Damascus. He lays out the various recensions of Zuhri traditions (which Zuhri never wrote down but only had recorded in memory aids). At the same time, Anthony underlines the achievement of Ibn Ishāq under the early ‘Abbasids (including al-Mahdī, before he became caliph, and al-Manṣūr). According to Anthony, Ibn Ishāq effectively created the literary genre of *sīrah-maghāzī* by developing earlier Islamic reports, consulting Jews and Christians, incorporating poetry and written documents, and shaping his accounts for the benefit of his ‘Abbāsīd patrons: “With Ibn Ishāq’s *Maghāzī*, the corpus transformed into a genre that encompassed a bricolage of prose and poetry of sundry origins” (169). In

emphasizing the role of Ibn Ishāq, Anthony challenges the view of Nabia Abbot, who wanted to push back the origins of creative historical writing to al-Zuhri.

The final section of the book offers original perspectives on two accounts—Islamic stories involving the court of Heraclius and the account of Muhammad’s call to prophethood by the angel Gabriel on Mt. Hirā’. In both cases, he means to show that a rigorous assessment of such accounts must involve both a knowledge of Islamic literature and the Judeo-Christian context of the late antique Near East. The Heraclius account (for which Anthony provides a detailed web of traditions, stemming from al-Zuhri) includes three parts: the emperor’s vision of the rise of a kingdom of the circumcised, Heraclius’ conversation with Abū Sufyān, and the arrival of a letter from Muhammad. Anthony argues that this account has origins partly in Christian traditions of Heraclius as astrologer. He also investigates Zuhri’s report of having heard the story of Heraclius’ vision from someone named Ibn Nātūrā, which Anthony proposes stems from Syriac *nāṭar kūrsyā* and refers to a “holder of the chair” of the bishop at a time when there was no patriarch in Jerusalem.

Finally, Anthony enters into the debate over the relationship of Muhammad’s call narrative and Venerable Bede’s story of a seventh-century Anglo-Saxon named Caedmon who miraculously learned to compose hymns in English. A few earlier scholars have argued that Caedmon’s story might have been influenced by the story of Muhammad’s initial vision and call to prophethood. Anthony makes a strong case for the possibility of transmission between the Islamic world and England. Nonetheless, it is a legitimate question whether Bede would have known anything about Muhammad’s biography. Although Bede speaks of “Saracens” entering Europe, he never mentions Muhammad. In the end, Anthony argues that both accounts likely developed from “late antique hagiography’s tales of holy men and women” (217). Anthony also argues convincingly that the “Iqra’ narrative” is “early but not historical,” in part because of the insights of Angelika Neuwirth that Sura 96 (on which it is based) has qualities of middle and late Meccan texts and not of the earliest Meccan stratum of texts.

Anthony convincingly demonstrates that the *sīrah-maghāzī* literature is more than “historicizing exegesis” of the Qur’an (as Henri Lammens had argued) but also more than a “closed self-sustaining textual universe that curates the earliest memories of Muhammad’s followers.” He argues, in the epilogue, that a historically reliable, basic account of the Prophet’s life can be achieved through his method of studying the *sīrah-maghāzī* literature together with early material evidence, the Qur’an, and early non-Islamic sources: Muhammad was a merchant who claimed to be one in a long line of “Abrahamic prophets” to receive revelation; he formed a community at Yathrib where he became a ruler; and, inspired by his teachings, this community engaged in military campaigns and built an empire (for more, see 237). He also argues that even though seventh-century non-Islamic sources do not refer to the Qur’an, material (and other) evidence suggests that they constitute an early and an important source for our basic knowledge of Muhammad’s teaching.

Anthony's work strikes a careful balance between extremely skeptical views that would deny the Arabian origins of Islam, or even the historicity of Muhammad, and more sanguine views that would see the *sīrah* as only a collection of reports more or less faithfully transmitted. Anthony rightly claims that there is "scant basis" to reject categorically the data of the *sīrah-maghāzī* literature, but the real lesson of *Muhammad and the Empires of Faith* is that there is scant basis to work *only* with the *sīrah-maghāzī* literature. Historians of Islam's origins must now contend with the significant epigraphic and other material data, the entire world of late antiquity represented by Syriac, Greek, and other literature, as well as a critical reading of the Qur'an. The real question for the field of Islamic origins is not whether a relatively small number of extreme skeptics have been able to disqualify the *sīrah-maghāzī* literature but whether scholars will show the critical skills to do more than hadith criticism and put that literature in conversation with other data. Happily, in this highly consequential work, Anthony offers an example for scholars to emulate.

Gabriel Said Reynolds
University of Notre Dame

Empires of Vice: The Rise of Opium Prohibition across Southeast Asia. By Diana S. Kim (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2020) 336 pp. \$35.00

Kim's intriguing exploration of the establishment, operation, and eventual dissolution of lucrative opium monopolies in British and French colonial regimes in Southeast Asia reveals a process that belies the assumption that imperialist governments/enterprises were exclusively extractive and largely indistinguishable. Opium monopolies appeared in a variety of forms across Southeast Asia, but the timing and motivation (both stated and actual) varied considerably, in some cases focusing on the moral ramifications and in others, on tax revenue. Kim argues that the path to prohibition was different in each country, and less informed by the post-World War I international political landscape than by the concerns expressed and documented by local colonial bureaucrats. Those men engaged in what Kim describes as an "overlooked layer of activity undergirding high bureaucratic expressions of official knowledge" (50). The book successfully combines theoretical and methodological tools from history, political science, economics, and sociology to dig deeply into that layer.

The volume is divided into three parts: The first establishes the theoretical, interdisciplinary framework for Kim's analysis; the second delves into more detail about three specific monopolies; and the final part analyzes the lasting impact of those institutions in the post-World War II era. The country-specific analyses move in a chronological fashion, from British Burma in the 1870s to the 1890s to British Malaya from the 1890s to the 1920s, and then to French Indochina from the 1920s to the 1940s. The final section argues that the ways in which colonial opium monopolies were both conceived and dismantled in all three cases had important impacts

on post–World War II drug prohibitions and illegal drug trafficking in those countries.

Kim effectively blends the extensive archival work (in French and English-language sources) of a historian with the state-centered analysis of a political scientist, and she incorporates a sociological focus on the ways that the lower levels of colonial bureaucracies functioned. Plumbing archives in Britain, France, and the United States, as well as in former French and British colonies (today’s Cambodia, Myanmar, and Vietnam), Kim examines the voluminous documentation of colonial governance, revealing the surprising influence of lower-level bureaucrats who were responsible for categorizing, summarizing, and deriving meaning from those documents. Such men were assumed to be “weak actors,” in comparison with top-tier colonial administrators or the world leaders and diplomats who devised international narcotics-control policies after World War I. Those lower-level bureaucrats constituted, as Kim notes, “a small group of privileged [white, male] British and French administrators [who] wrote about what they did, said, and claimed to believe” (27). However, in some cases, they managed to privilege their own observations, impressions, and anxieties over verifiable statistics, and in others, to generate actionable statistics based on those impressions. Their very presence on the ground established their authenticity and authority, and their concerns often shaped or created the problems that colonial regimes decided to address.

This volume is neither a study of the intricacies of the opium monopolies themselves nor an exploration of the social or economic consequences of opium consumption, cultivation, prohibition, or trade. Rather, the book reveals the often mundane but crucial processes by which “colonial reality” and morality were created, and how the data that informed colonial policy-making was often generated by low-level bureaucrats (107). The blending of historical evidence with political and sociological theories about the state and bureaucracy, along with a focus on colonial economies, enables Kim to present an engaging study that disproves the notion of monolithic colonial regimes and adds welcome nuances to our understanding of narcotics control in Southeast Asia.

Joyce A. Madancy
Union College, Schenectady