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Buy American: The Untold Story of Economic Nationalism. By Dana Frank. (Boston, Beacon Press, 1999. xii + 316 pp. $26 cloth, $17.50 paper)

Dana Frank’s study of popular movements against free trade could hardly be more timely. Engagingly written and consistently provocative, it traces themes in economic nationalism from the Revolutionary era through the late 1990s. At the heart of her argument is the concept of the “economic nation,” meaning how various groups of Americans have defined their country in economic terms. Frank maintains, persuasively, that differing constructions of the economic nation reflect conflicts embedded in American society.

Thus, an initial chapter on nonimportation agreements in the 1760s and 1770s contends that merchants and planters manipulated the movement for their own advantage, gaining the allegiance of artisan groupings but excluding women, African Americans, and Native Americans from their new economic nation following independence. Nineteenth-century tariff controversies generated torrents of heated words, masking both sides’ underlying agreement on the need for empire and foreign markets and their desire to squelch class conflict at home. Both of these chapters are quick overviews that run the risk of oversimplification. For example, Frank ignores the literature suggesting that economic liberalism, not nationalism, motivated many of the revolutionaries and drafters of the Constitution. She also does not explain how the nineteenth-century tariff debate served to define party identities for millions of white American men who seem to have taken the controversy very seriously.

Frank hits her stride in a creative treatment of Buy American campaigns during the Great Depression. She sharply reminds us of the racist and xenophobic elements in economic nationalist drives. Business unionists like Matthew Woll of the American Federation of Labor joined with corporate special interests like
the manufacturers of building materials in demonizing foreigners, especially Japanese, and even ethnic groups in America whom they deemed to be outside the economic nation.

Mid-century organized labor leaders usually followed behind their corporate counterparts and endorsed a free trade ideology, but by the 1960s, as challenges to U.S. economic predominance grew, economic nationalism reemerged. Frank focuses on the International Ladies Garment Workers Union (ILGWU) and the United Auto Workers (UAW). In each case, she maintains, union strategies looked for enemies abroad, played into the hands of racists, and thrust labor into collaboration with management while avoiding the challenges of democratic unionism. By the 1980s, tycoons like Roger Milliken and Sam Walton pulled the strings behind ostensibly populist movements for economic nationalism, trumpeting their own patriotism while using cheap labor and materials abroad. Finally, as Americans became fixated on Japan’s seemingly endless economic ascent, an angry, demonizing rhetoric reappeared, along with ugly attacks on Asian Americans. By the end of *Buy American*, Frank’s call for a working-class internationalism to overcome the retrograde aspects of economic nationalism will come as no surprise. Opponents of corporate-dominated globalism who have taken to the streets in Seattle and elsewhere would do well to heed her warnings not to fall into the traps that have bedeviled and misdirected popular economic nationalist movements in the past. Whether the forces that shape today’s movements share her values and accept her logic remains to be seen.


Reading these witty and engaging essays is almost as good as hearing Patty Limerick in person. Indeed, that is clearly one reason for their publication: not just to demonstrate the usefulness of the New Western History, but also to give substance to her claim that western historians should act as public intellectuals—that is, to contribute their expertise in appropriate ways to ongoing western public policy debates. Since the publication of *Legacy of Conquest* in 1987, Limerick herself has become one of the country’s best-
known and most effective public intellectuals. She is at the top of nearly everyone’s favorite speaker list. The fact that she has given so generously of her time to official and popular groups is surely one reason that the New Western History, greeted so grumpily in the late 1980s, is today credited with the revival of interest in western history. Furthermore, she notes with some surprise, in the essay “Turnerians All,” the NWH has become the new orthodoxy, and Limerick herself might be in danger of becoming ossified, were it not clear that she is determined to avoid that fate at all costs.

Almost all of the sixteen articles in this book have appeared before in journals and anthologies, and western historians have already read many of them. But taken together, they form an appealing introduction to the New Western History and therefore ought to have a wide popular audience, especially among East Coast people whose image of the West needs updating. This is, then, the perfect gift book for anyone living east of the hundredth meridian.

Nevertheless, professional western historians have things to learn from this collection as well. The book not only covers a range of topics but also puts on display many of the intellectual strengths and narrative techniques that make Limerick one of the most notable synthesizers in our profession. Foremost is her ability to discern patterns and write clearly about them, skills that serve especially well in “Haunted America,” an examination of the meaning of the “tales from hell” (p. 34) that document the bloody conquest of American Indians. Second is Limerick’s ability to rethink and reconsider, as in her use of Asian American sources in “Disorientation and Reorientation: The American Landscape Discovered from the West.” This essay also exhibits her characteristic wit and generosity: She always scrupulously credits the work of other scholars. Other notable characteristics are her use of story and anecdote, which she credits to her Utah heritage (p. 240) and her fundamental belief that “how we write and interpret history matters” (p. 239) because it is the only effective antidote to the “fuzzy nostalgia” (p. 26) that afflicts popular thinking about the West.

As for her little lectures to the profession on the need for clear writing and public speaking, who can argue?

Washington State University

SUSAN ARMITAGE

Readers familiar with the terminology and methods of folklore will find this book more accessible than the rest of us, although author John Dorst devotes no fewer than two chapters (one and four) to teaching us the strokes we will need to navigate the deep water of which he is the Jacques Cousteau. We are well advised to plunge in, for his insights and methods make the effort worthwhile.

Dorst contends that, in order to understand the West, we need to examine the very ways in which we look at it and display it for others in historic sites or “living history” presentations. This region, famous for its wide-open spaces and picturesque characters, lends itself naturally to such an examination. Dorst’s analysis embraces much more than artistic or photographic views, although it does include those. Historians will be amazed at the diversity and unusual nature of his sources, including jokes (like most folklorists, he knows some good ones), urban legends, popular literature, yard ornamentation, sculptures welded together out of obsolete farm equipment, a historic museum, a national monument, and a living history exhibit. It is a breathtaking journey, integrated in a virtuoso analytical performance.

While Dorst’s larger conclusions are interesting, historians will probably be most impressed by the nature of his sources and his creative methods of analysis. This especially applies to us western historians, who have not often distinguished ourselves by the diversity of our sources nor our imaginative use of them. To be sure, things seem to be getting better, but our ranks still include too few like Richard Etulain, whose prize-winning Re-imagining the Modern West moves easily from historiography to literature to art. Dorst’s analyses of The Virginian and of the famous photograph of Buffalo Bill and Sitting Bull featured on the cover of the book are stimulating in their originality and especially in their close observation of detail, while his facility in dealing with folkloric materials is a skill few historians possess. Those of us interested in extending our competencies will find him a helpful instructor.

Those unaccustomed to this kind of close analysis will almost inevitably find Dorst going too far in his extraction of meaning from his sources, as I do in his attempt to link the urban legend of swimming rattlesnakes to the theme of optical illusion in chapter one. But if he occasionally overshoots his mark, he hits it often
enough. Some of his terminology, too, is translucent at best; his sources, for example, do not offer multiple meanings, but rather a “discourse.” Familiarity smooths some of that difficulty.

*Salt Lake Community College*  
GARY TOPPING

**Buffalo Bill’s Wild West: Performance, Celebrity, and Popular History.**  

Buffalo Bill’s Wild West and other Wild West shows have attracted a great deal of scholarly attention over the past few years. Joy Kasson’s book is a welcome addition to this literature. Her insightful and highly suggestive examination of Buffalo Bill’s “national entertainment” deserves careful consideration by historians of the American West and cultural historians more generally.

There is, of course, much in this book that is well known—Cody’s path into show business, his spendthrift habits and playboy persona, his positive relationships with American Indians, and his phenomenally successful European tours. But Kasson does much more than retell old tales. She examines Cody’s life and show in light of the substantial body of cultural and performance theory that has reshaped the terrain of American Studies. To take just one example, Kasson calls attention to Cody’s self-representation—the way he cultivated “the palpable fact of his own extraordinary body” (p. 268)—and proceeds to show how Cody’s performance of self would inform the concept of the modern celebrity.

To her credit, Kasson also takes seriously the name of Cody’s early show: “America’s National Entertainment.” Cody, she argues, thought of Wild West performances as a nationalizing force that, in the aftermath of the Civil War, could provide Americans with a sense of their national identity and Europeans with convincing evidence that the United States had a foundational history that positioned it to become a modern nation state. This prototypical form of American mass culture, Kasson emphasizes, was a force to be reckoned with both at home and abroad.

But how should we understand this show? This is where Kasson is especially provocative. She makes clear that Cody thought of his performances as objective, true, and real depictions of the not-so-distant past. But his real genius, Kasson suggests, was to transform an entertainment spectacle into what Pierre Nora calls “a site of memory” (p. 222). The issue, as Kasson frames it, is not whether audiences really fell for Cody’s “objective” perfor-
mances. Rather, the issue is how audiences connected with Cody’s efforts to help them remember the past and find their place in the modern world.

With this book, Kasson has moved Cody to center stage in American cultural history, treating him as a powerful ideological innovator whose enactments and performances of American nationalism provided cement for the modern American nation state. Given how well written it is, there is hope that Buffalo Bill’s Wild West will make its way to undergraduate and graduate U.S. history courses that take seriously the interplay between American culture and American political identity.

Montana State University-Bozeman

ROBERT W. RYDELL


Lary May has long been known as one of the profession’s most insightful analysts of film and culture, so this reinterpretation of the political significance of Hollywood’s trajectory between the Great Depression and the Cold War has been much anticipated. It was worth the wait, for its conclusions take us beyond the films themselves to a deeper understanding of the vistas potentially opened by the New Deal, along with their reversal by the conformist implications of the postwar corporate order. Standard interpretations of the conservatism of Depression culture will now need to be rethought.

May’s critical gaze ranges from a quantitative tracking of film plot formulas to take in the images and labor unions of the film stars themselves and the design of the theaters in which the films were shown (although the films’ reception itself plays a lesser role in this study). He resurrects the largely forgotten or condescendingly dismissed film career of Will Rogers. May shows that Rogers’s iconic status in the first half of the 1930s evoked not a backward-looking escapism but a “radicalism of tradition” hostile to monopoly capitalism and class inequality. May even brings Rogers’s Cherokee heritage to the center of his story, a hybridity that challenged the racial exclusivity of visions of “Anglo-Saxon Americanism” (p. 94). Modernism, May argues, was allied with this more inclusive, pluralistic, egalitarian, mass cultural vision, as demonstrated by the shift from the extravagance of 1920s theater
palaces to the streamlined and less class-stratified architectural style and community links of 1930s theaters.

For May, wartime nationalism began a process of declension in which films stigmatized “grassroots reform and class conflict . . . as unpatriotic” and celebrated the state, the defense industries, and the corporate order. May’s *Casablanca*, for example, is a story of loss in which Rick (Humphrey Bogart) sacrifices romantic republican dreams in order to conform to the demands of war and “hierarchical institutions dedicated to saving the world” (pp. 150–151). May therefore follows the recent tendency to see a continuity between the conformism and fear of subversion of World War II and postwar McCarthyism. He leaves readers with an acute sense of loss, as he traces the domestication of Hollywood and the Screen Actors Guild or the whitening out of Rita Hayworth’s Spanish origins to fit ideals of white women in suburban domestic bliss. Associations with New Deal politics and cultural challenge gave way to celebration of a postwar, patriotic, classless community. This consensus was never total; May sees film noir and the film personas of James Dean, Marilyn Monroe, and Marlon Brando as critiques of postwar society that lacked the civic idealism of the “alternative Americanism” (p. 258) of the 1930s but still linked it to the emergence of a counterculture in the 1950s and 1960s.

The ambition of May’s arguments must be balanced by a certain skepticism and even frustration at an overreaching style of analysis that can appear forced and formulaic—as when, for example, May on p. 40 follows Rogers’s famous quip that “People are taking their comedians seriously and their politicians as a joke, when it used to be vice versa” with the sentence, “Rogers meant that in the past filmmakers validated a static Victorian artistic canon that pervaded nineteenth-century art geared for educated Anglo-Saxon readers.” Selective readings such as his rehabilitation of Stepin Fetchit as a culturally subversive vehicle for “bringing black energies and voices into public life” (p. 36)—a supposed contrast to the more constricted public space for diversity in the Cold War—seem unlikely to win many converts. A certain statistical sloppiness may only heighten discomfort. For example, the huge decline in the number of theaters between 1929 and 1933 (as claimed on p. 123) is followed two pages later with a claimed large increase; the percentages on film plots given on p. 93 either differ from the cited figures on pp. 273 and 287 or bear no discernible relationship to them. But the linkages that May has forged between Hollywood and possibilities for political and cul-
tural change promise to recast historical debates over American life since the New Deal.

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

MARK H. LEFF


This is a frustrating but useful book. Patterns of Vengeance lacks focus. John Phillip Reid is concerned with interracial homicides in the fur trade, but the study’s geographic and chronological boundaries are vague. Much if not most of his evidence is drawn from northwestern North America. However, there is also a great deal from the Great Plains, the Great Lakes, and the southeastern United States. British and U.S. fur traders are covered in much detail, while Spanish and Russian traders are not. Reid asserts that he is concerned with how white fur traders and trappers went about avenging homicides committed by Native peoples, although most of the book’s first half is given over to describing Native law.

This wandering from place to place and topic to topic means that the reader is exposed to little comparative or historical analysis, such as change over time. It would be useful to know approximately how many interracial homicides occurred in the fur trade in particular places or during certain periods. But Reid seems not to be interested in such concrete questions. He instead describes and analyzes a series of interracial homicides: “This is a study of issues, not a history of events,” he warns (p. 16).

One wishes that these issues were stated more clearly and Reid’s conclusions about them evinced more convincingly. The closest thing to a central argument in Patterns of Vengeance is that the fur traders were more apt to use Native than European legal principles when responding to interracial homicides. Indeed, British fur companies often punished Native groups rather than particular killers and were very willing to offer goods to “cover” killings of Native peoples committed by their employees. Reid is less successful at showing that European traders had therefore internalized Native law. In fact, he illustrates that expedience commonly shaped the nature of white vengeance. I am particularly intrigued by his contention, presented in the book’s conclusion, that the traders often punished Native transgressions not so much from a sense of outrage as from a realization that Native people
expected them to. Missionaries and even government officials would later impose a legal system that seemed more humane and less bloody but that in fact constituted a much more ambitious program of colonization.

Reid’s greatest service in *Patterns of Vengeance* is to challenge historians’ conflation of “law” with “European.” He repeatedly illustrates that Native peoples had well-established and consistently applied procedures for treating homicides and that behavior whites considered innocuous—such as traveling or trading freely—could deeply offend and injure them.

Despite or because of its shortcomings, *Patterns of Vengeance* rewards readers by offering suggestive insights into the contested cultural, social, and political interactions of the fur trade.

*George Fox University*  
DAVID PETERSON DEL MAR

**Duels and the Roots of Violence in Missouri.** By Dick Steward. (Columbia, University of Missouri Press, 2000. ix + 286 pp. $29.95)

Dick Steward writes that “Missouri, with its brusque amalgam of southern and western heritages,” provides an excellent case study of the origins of violence that “stalks the American landscape and haunts the minds of our people” (p. 1). *Duels and the Roots of Violence in Missouri* explores dueling during Missouri’s antebellum years. Steward’s themes are the class ramifications of dueling and its role in upward social mobility, the chivalric qualities and folkloric status often ascribed to duelists, the unique aspects of dueling as practiced in an Old Southwestern milieu, and the ubiquitous American violence that Steward believes Missouri dueling symbolized.

“This book will disclose the violent paths taken by many of the state’s prominent and not so prominent citizens to achieve their goals” (p. 3). Prominent duelists include Senator Thomas Hart Benton, Charles Lucas, Thomas Biddle, and John Smith T. (the latter is of particular interest to Steward, who has written his biography). Much of the action takes place on jurisdictionless Southwestern river “dueling islands.” Having thoroughly combed an impressive array of primary and secondary sources (including over one hundred firsthand accounts of duels), Steward ably describes the causes, conduct, and ramifications of *code duello* in the Old Southwest. Yet, ultimately, “the duelist became an anachronism” (p. 209), Steward concludes. He was replaced after the Civil War by the less formal Western “shootist” of Missouri’s borderlands.
Interestingly, this book further documents one side of a debate that has arisen since its publication. Steward narrates and footnotes references to hundreds of “firearms” that he states were “commonplace among the pioneers” of Missouri (p. 4). This documented conclusion counters the thesis recently presented (with much fanfare) by Michael Bellesiles. Bellesiles and other gun control advocate-historians contend that the notion of widespread antebellum gun ownership is an American “myth.” This history of Missouri duelists and gunmen proves that widespread gun ownership in that state was no “myth.”

_Duels and the Roots of Violence in Missouri_ will achieve the author’s aim of providing one of the “building blocks of historical generalizations” (p. 1). While its sharp focus and academic prose make it inappropriate for public or undergraduate libraries, it belongs in graduate and regional library collections and on the bookshelves of all serious scholars in the field.

*University of Washington, Tacoma*  

MICHAEL ALLEN

**American Alchemy: The California Gold Rush and Middle-Class Culture.**  
By Brian Roberts. (Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 2000. xii + 328 pp. $49.95 cloth, $19.95 paper)

The California gold rush was central not only to the history of California but to American middle-class formation, argues Brian Roberts in this interesting new cultural history. “At its most basic level...the gold rush was a rebellion against certain middle-class values; this revolt, in turn was largely carried out by middle-class individuals” (p. 5). Occurring at the same time as the consolidation of the market revolution, the 1849 rush both revealed and changed the ways American middle-class men attempted to define themselves in a changing economy and society.

Focusing on the Northeast, Roberts explains that one of the most striking features of the gold rush was its status as a literary event. As any historian who has studied the event knows, the miners left behind a torrent of diaries, letters, and reminiscences. The discovery of gold in California forced middle-class men to confront profound questions of what it meant to be middle-class—how could they fiercely seek individual wealth and still remain respectable? For those middle-class men trapped by the strictures of bourgeois decorum, the rush seemed to offer a way out of their former existence, to begin life anew.

But, Roberts argues, it was impossible to get truly away. Once
in California, the euphoria gave way to hard, steady work that rarely ended in success. And, most crucially, wives and mothers remained back East. Roberts shows how, through their letters, the forty-niners and their wives attempted to define the meaning of the event—the Wild West was constructed in a discourse with the Tame East. The rush strengthened the idea of separate spheres and helped define the meaning of middle-class. The frontier and the bourgeois home were not in competition; instead, they became “elements of a forming middle-class character that would be balanced between respectability and physicality” (p. 264).

American Alchemy is clearly written and well documented and provides interesting examples of the complexities faced by the men, and women, affected by the event. The interpretation of the gold rush as an event defined by social class, however, seems unconvincing. Roberts’s definition of middle-class is so broad as to include the great majority of white male Americans. Social historians such as Stuart M. Blumin and Jonathan A. Glickstein have shown how critical the manual-nonmanual divergence was in defining class in antebellum America. Yet Roberts ignores this critical divergence and includes both farmers and skilled workers in the middle class. The limited statistics that are available for the forty-niners show they corresponded fairly closely with the American occupational structure as a whole in a nation that was 85 percent rural. Roberts’s own evidence suggests that hard-working, sober, and pious men—those he considers culturally middle-class—were found in all social groups. Rather than class, this cluster of values is perhaps seen best as a construction of masculinity that owed much to religious beliefs and transcended social position. The more basic story that Roberts tells, however, seems right—many men did see California as a liberation from respectability with consequences revealing and unforeseen. American Alchemy successfully establishes that the gold rush was a major cultural event in nineteenth-century America.

George Washington University

RICHARD STOTT


Agriculture in California brings to mind extensive vegetable fields, orchards, and vineyards, and bitter confrontations between growers and migrant workers. Scholars who have studied the inter-
action between landowners and agricultural workers in California have emphasized labor organization in its social, cultural, and ideological contexts as well as in relation to technological change, politics, and agribusiness. Little attention has been given to specialty crop growers and their personal relationships with seasonal workers during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. David Vaught, however, has provided the first extensive study of growers of specialty crops—raisin, almond, fruit, and hops—near Fresno, Newcastle, Davisville, and Wheatland between 1875 and 1920. The result is a finely crafted set of case studies in which Vaught finds the growers to be informed, publicly oriented horticulturists who believed their hard work contributed to the improvement of society, particularly in fostering virtuous communities in the Jeffersonian tradition. Vaught convincingly argues that these specialty crop growers were not the archetypal villains depicted by Carey McWilliams. Yet Vaught is no apologist for the growers, and he places them in perspective concerning their varied economic, marketing, and geographical problems. He argues that the growers were not masters of their own destinies and that they succeeded in providing a rational order for the production and sale of specialty crops only after prolonged efforts to develop marketing organizations and the systematic employment of agricultural workers.

Vaught is particularly interested in the daily interactions between growers and workers, rather than radicalism and unionism. He observes that, while the growers preferred docile and skilled labor, particularly Chinese, Japanese, and Sikhs, these immigrants could not be easily assimilated or acculturated. As a result, when growers sought these workers, they often confronted white residents who challenged their commitment to the social order and role as community guardians. Moreover, the growers’ need for cheap, efficient, available labor put them at odds with Californians who wanted restrictions on Asian immigration and land ownership. At the same time, World War I convinced the growers that they could gain anything they wanted from government, especially regarding the introduction of Mexican labor. By 1920 they had attained increasing state and federal support and regulation of agricultural labor; they had also abdicated their long-heralded benevolent relations with their workers. At the same time, they began to turn away from their perception of themselves as Jeffersonian farmers and accepted the mantle of industrial agriculturists. Ultimately, then, market imperatives, labor requirements, and changing political conditions set the growers apart
from their workers and fostered a paternalism founded on the economic bottom line and racism rather than benevolence.

Vaught has written a solid history of the early labor relations of specialty crop agriculturists, or horticulturists, as they preferred to be known. It should be read in conjunction with the works of Cletus Daniel, Devra Weber, and Craig Jenkins, as well as Carey McWilliams, to provide perspective on California agriculture and labor relations. Some readers might want a clearer depiction of the ways these growers served as community leaders and guardians of public virtue, but agricultural, labor, western, and California historians will find this book an informative read.

Iowa State University

RAY DOUGLAS HURT


In _Transforming California_, urban planner Stephanie Pincetl has turned to history in order to understand the bewildering array of environmental issues confronting the Golden State today. The result is a professional planner’s lament that reads into the past an “ever present tension between idealistic visions for the state’s future—based on science and romanticism, planning and coordination—and capitalist development.” Unfortunately, capitalism always seems to win. For Pincetl, California history is a depressing tale of “visionary proposals…and the far more powerful forces of development that have systematically defeated them time and time again” (p. 3).

Indeed, whether she examines the history since 1850 of water development, timber management, commercial fishing, corporate agriculture, or suburban sprawl, the results for Pincetl are always the same: waste, degradation, and spoliation. Today, urban smog threatens the once pristine forests of the Sierra, while California leads the nation “in loss of biodiversity and in numbers of endangered or threatened species listings” under the federal Endangered Species Act of 1973 (p. 280). Worse, despite the passage of tough and innovative laws like the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, government regulation and planning offer little hope for the future. In fact, government is a major part of the problem. “It is my contention,” says Pincetl, “that California’s political paralysis, environmental degradation, and economic inequality are due, in large part, to the structure of the state’s systems of governance
from local city halls to Sacramento” (p. xi). Consequently, “It is unlikely that any of the important issues facing California will be addressed unless there is fundamental political reform in the state. Political institutions need to be substantially revised” (p. 319).

According to Pincetl, the frustrating inability of California government to protect the environment stems from two fundamental sources: outmoded Jeffersonian values that cherish local control over land use planning, and the “perverse legacy” of the regulatory or “franchise” state built by Progressive reformers and their immediate successors between 1910 and 1930. The former has completely baffled efforts at intelligent planning by hopelessly fragmenting public authority and thus undermining attempts to coordinate zoning or manage growth within regions defined by natural boundaries and common concerns. Meanwhile, the latter, which sought to curb corporate greed by subjecting it to public oversight by appointed regulatory boards and commissions, instead gave rise to “business associationalism,” which effectively placed state government “at the service of powerful economic interests” (p. xv). The regulated, in other words, quickly became the regulators, enabling timber companies to set public priorities in the forests, while corporate agribusiness decisively shaped state water policy.

To correct this deplorable situation and liberate California government from the clutches of the private sector “growth machine,” Pincetl concludes by offering a brief but impassioned plea for reform. Not surprisingly, her twelve-point agenda includes the abolition of appointed regulatory boards and the establishment of strong regional governments to unify and supersed more numerous and squabbling local agencies.

Coming as they do from an obviously committed author who cares deeply about her native state, such provocative suggestions should have made Transforming California a compelling book. Unfortunately, Pincetl’s reform blueprint remains woefully undeveloped, and her six-chapter environmental history possesses neither the succinct summary of a textbook nor the clarifying detail of a focused monograph. By covering too many complex issues over too extensive a time frame, Pincetl winds up supporting her arguments more often with repeated assertions than with actual proof. The text, moreover, is riddled with errors that make it impossible to embrace the author’s interpretations with any degree of confidence. In the end, Transforming California succeeds neither as history nor polemic. This is truly a shame, since Pincetl’s work will prove most disappointing to those (like this
reviewer) who sympathize with her point of view and were thus hoping to recommend her book as essential reading.

California State University, Chico

MICHAEL MAGLIARI


The title of this book is deceiving. It suggests that William Mulholland and the Rise of Los Angeles is both a biography of Mulholland, longtime head of the city’s water department and controversial builder of the Los Angeles-Owens River Aqueduct, and an examination of his role in the transformation of Los Angeles from cow town to major city. The preface supports this interpretation of the book’s intent. Alas, the book is neither an overview of Mulholland’s life (it deals almost exclusively with his work), nor does it adequately explore his influence on the emergence of Los Angeles as a city of consequence (such larger considerations are almost nonexistent). Rather, it is mostly an overly detailed history of the early development of the city’s water system and yet another retelling of the saga of the city’s supposed rape of the Owens Valley, this time told from the somewhat defensive perspective of the protagonist’s granddaughter. It presents little new information of importance. Moreover, the author’s attempts to correct misconceptions about her grandfather and the aqueduct offer minimal evidence that has not been reported elsewhere.

The most disappointing aspect of the book is the author’s puzzling insistence on remaining objective. Thus, the book lacks the insights that a family member might be able provide about Mulholland. Sorely missing from all that has been written about this man is much information about him as a person, beyond his duties as a bureaucrat. The author emphasizes that Mulholland’s work was his life, but even the most single-minded workhorse reveals aspects of their personality in social and familial situations. As Mulholland’s kin, the author should have had a better opportunity than most to create a portrait of her grandfather as a human being. She does provide a few anecdotes that help create a fuller picture, but there’s too little of that, particularly as he grew older. Moreover, the author does not even reveal her relationship with the subject until the fifth page of the preface and saves any personal reflections for last few pages of the book. The author should also have attempted to talk to more people who knew her
grandfather and should have investigated a greater array of primary sources (only ten manuscript collections and four interviews are listed in the bibliography). The portrait she has presented is one-dimensional, based primarily on the subject’s own statements and newspaper reports. It is a remarkably impersonal study.

The book also has shortcomings in its scholarship. The author is erratic in her citation of primary sources. Personal information about Mulholland, presumably obtained in conversations with family members or drawn from personal knowledge, is not consistently cited. There are also obvious factual errors, which raise concerns about the accuracy of other details. Mulholland’s oft-quoted statement about the attractiveness of the Los Angeles River has been transposed into a comment about the city in general (p. 17). The author falsely claims that the river originates in the western foothills of the San Fernando Valley (p. 24), when its actual source was groundwater beneath the valley, replenished chiefly by runoff from the San Gabriel Mountains. An infiltration gallery is not a “submerged dam,” contrary to her supposition (pp. 82, 102). As Sarah S. Elkind has written, the city of Boston supplemented its water supply not from New Hampshire’s Lake Winnipesaukee, as the author states, but from the Swift and Ware rivers in Massachusetts (p. xv). The book is also a dry read because of the author’s inability to distinguish between details that may have been newsworthy in their day but are insignificant in retrospect, from those that history has proven to be important. Minutia abounds. Aqueduct food contracts, for example, hardly warrant so much attention a century hence.

*William Mulholland and the Rise of Los Angeles* is not without merits, but the author’s aims would have been better served if she had focused only on correcting those myths and misconceptions about her grandfather and the Owens Valley story that she was capable of disproving. As it is, her most salient points (e.g., that Los Angeles was hardly unique in trampling over others in search of resources) get lost in the details.

B. Gumprecht

*University of South Carolina*  


A major source of corporate profits and government revenues over the past century, the rain forests of western North America
have recently provided the setting for numerous confrontations between environmentalists and pro-industry forces. The principles of sustained yield and multiple-use forest management have come under attack, along with the entire structure of commodity production they support. Caught between the forces of environmentalism and corporate capital accumulation, timber-dependent communities confront a grim reality of mill closures, unemployment, and limited options.

Historian and journalist Kathie Durbin documents Southeast Alaska’s share of this process in *Tongass*, a welcome addition to the environmental history of the Far West. Clarifying her perspective at the outset, Durbin describes Prince of Wales Island today as the site of a war against nature where clearcutting has “ravaged salmon spawning streams and erased habitat for Sitka black-tailed deer” (p. 1). But this is more than a polemic against the environmental degradation associated with industrial forestry. Durbin provides a comprehensive indictment of the two pulp operations that came to dominate the region’s forest economy, and she is at her best in describing the long struggle by activists who sought to correct the abuses inflicted under corporate and U.S. Forest Service policies.

Established in 1907, the Tongass National Forest escaped large-scale logging until the mid-1950s when Forest Service ambitions were realized with the signing of contracts with U.S. and Japanese firms for the establishment of pulp mills at Ketchikan and Sitka. Each received a fifty-year supply of timber, setting in motion a process that brought short-term economic benefits but failed to achieve sustainable relationships with nature or communities. Executives colluded to monopolize Tongass timber, forcing independent operators into bankruptcy or subordinate status as contractors and breaking the unions in their plants during the 1980s.

Durbin attributes much of the Tongass debacle to the timber supply contracts that placed the Forest Service in a subordinate relationship to the pulp companies. Feeding the mills became the dominant objective, and, despite the introduction of some reforms after passage of the 1969 National Environmental Policy Act and 1976 National Forest Management Act, the agency continued to resist environmental and wilderness pressures. Not until the threat of listings under the Endangered Species Act and the accumulation of conclusive scientific evidence did officials make a decisive commitment to habitat protection. Durbin relates the campaign that produced the 1990 Tongass Timber Reform Act
with great insight, and she provides an important discussion of the disastrous consequences of Native corporation logging under the 1971 Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act.

Both mills closed in the 1990s, burdened by competition in the world market and dismal pollution records. Durbin acknowledges the hardship that followed for workers but depicts the economies of Ketchikan and Sitka as surprisingly resilient to the loss of manufacturing jobs. This reader wishes that the author had drawn the threads of her narrative together in a conclusion, but *Tongass* successfully straddles the line between advocacy and scholarship in a manner that will appeal to a wide readership.

*Victoria, B.C.*

RICHARD A. RAJALA


In a careful and exhaustive analysis of air pollution politics in Los Angeles, New York City, and central Florida, *Don’t Breathe the Air: Air Pollution and U.S. Environmental Politics, 1945–1970,* charts the process by which the federal government gradually assumed primary responsibility for addressing the nation’s environmental problems in the decades following World War II. According to Scott Hamilton Dewey, the major impetus behind greater federal intervention was quite simple: Local control was ineffective. Each of Dewey’s case studies highlights a different aspect of the inadequacy of local pollution control. In Los Angeles, an aroused citizenry and increasingly responsive public officials at the state and local level found it difficult to exert pressure on the Detroit auto makers who bore much of the responsibility for horrendous levels of photochemical smog. Likewise, New York City was powerless to curb the industrial emissions that wafted across the Hudson River from New Jersey. Central Floridians, on the other hand, were stymied in their war against airborne phosphate emissions by a state government that had been captured by chemical industry interests. Despite federal officials’ long-standing reluctance to meddle in local affairs, the public outcry resulting from these failures compelled Washington to step in and develop uniform air quality standards by the early 1970s.

In addition to providing a well-reasoned explanation for this important shift in the locus of environmental policymaking,
Dewey offers a trenchant critique of 1960s environmentalism. For all that environmental activists and their political allies were able to accomplish by 1970, they remained wedded to a naive faith in technological solutions. Unwilling to sacrifice high levels of personal consumption and living arrangements that depended upon automobile transportation, they could do no more than make a modest dent in the rising levels of pollution. Long-term solutions would have to await a more mature understanding of ecological relationships.

The main virtue of Dewey’s methodology is that it enables us to see how a technology-oriented approach to pollution control emerged out of the pull and tug among business interests, scientific experts, politicians, and citizen activists at the local level. The analysis would have been strengthened, however, had the author delved deeper into relevant archival collections rather than relying so heavily on newspaper accounts. A drawback of the case study approach, moreover, is that its narrow focus on air pollution inhibits consideration of broader shifts in American political culture. After all, at the same time that the federal government was assuming broader powers to regulate pollution, it was also expanding its role in the areas of poverty and consumer protection. Finally, Dewey often undermines his contention that public opinion was instrumental in shaping governmental action by presenting material on policy development and citizen activism in discrete sequential chapters rather than following a straight chronological organization within each case study.

University of Missouri–St. Louis
ANDREW HURLEY


Literally thousands of books, articles, court cases, and commentaries have been written about the Winters Doctrine, but this is the first book-length examination of this famous case. This book covers in great detail the history of that case, and related cases, and then describes the application of the doctrine on the Uintah Reservation in Utah in the years immediately following the Winters case.

Shurts goes far beyond the typical case law analysis by providing a detailed understanding of the social and political context
within which the drama of the various reserved water rights cases took place. This context ranges from the political machinations of Milk River irrigators to the overall effort to settle the West and resolve the “Indian problem.” This provides the reader with a much richer understanding of why the various actors behaved as they did.

Shurts finds that, contrary to the usual perception of the Winters case, it was not simply an anomaly that contradicted prevailing policies. Rather, he argues that “the litigation and its outcome fit well within the existing legal context” (p. 4). Shurts makes a convincing case that the doctrine of reserved water rights was viewed by at least some influential westerners as a welcome alternative to the prevailing doctrine of prior appropriation. In addition, he points out how the supporters of the Winters Doctrine maintained a long and spirited defense of it in the face of enormous hostility from various quarters.

Shurts faces a considerably more difficult task in supporting his other principal contention, that the Winters Doctrine “had real effects on water allocation decisions” prior to the 1960s (p. 8). He notes that downstream irrigators on the Milk River actually favored the case filed on behalf of the Indians: “[A]t its best, these downstream people believed, Winters could be an opportunity for them: It could leave water in the river that might just come past the reservation to them” (p. 79). Of course, this would only be true if they assumed the Indians would never actually gain access to their new-found water rights. To a great extent, this is what happened. To be fair to Shurts, he acknowledges that the effects of the doctrine were only “partially favorable” (p. 8) to the Indians, but even this may be too optimistic.

Shurts supports his thesis with a case study of the Uintah Reservation, where federal officials “aggressively pursued a Winters claim” (p. 246) that resulted in “a real difference in the water allocation decisions for these lands” (p. 247). Alone, this single case study would be insufficient to allow any conclusive statements regarding the effectiveness of Winters advocacy, but Shurts also includes two excellent chapters on the regional and national context of Winters in the decades after the decision was handed down.

Despite the occasional successes of the Winters Doctrine described in this book, the hard political realities of western water politics have dramatically limited the real impact of reserved rights, at least until the 1960s. Shurts’s description of what hap-
pened at Fort Belknap could be applied to all Indian reservations: “Ultimately, however, the reserved rights at Fort Belknap were ‘undone’ by the realities of capital flows... the really significant investments for water development went to the non-Indian farmers and not to the Indians” (p. 149).

This is a well-researched book on an important topic. The writing is clear, insightful, and full of nuanced interpretations. It fills an important gap in the literature and is a must-read for anyone interested in western water policy.

University of Utah

DANIEL McCOOL


For thousands of years Indians have lived on or near the banks of the Columbia River, fishing for salmon for food and for use in religious rituals. By the 1850s a growing white population in the area was coming into conflict with the natives, and in 1855 the U.S. government negotiated a series of treaties with the Indians under which the Indians agreed to move to reservations in return for guarantees of their fishing and hunting rights. Although a small number of Indians refused to leave their riverside homes, white-Indian relations were generally peaceful until the 1930s. Then, under the New Deal, the Army Corps of Engineers began to build a series of dams on the Columbia. The first of these, Bonneville Dam, was completed in 1939. To meet the obligation of the 1850s treaties, the Corps agreed that, as the pool behind the dam flooded traditional Indian fishing sites, the Corps would replace them with 400 acres of new sites in lieu of the old ones. Empty Nets is the record of the sixty-year (so far) struggle of the Indians to have that promise honored, to preserve their right to fish on the river, and, more recently, to protect and restore the vanishing salmon runs.

The story will be depressingly familiar to anyone even passingly familiar with the history of Indian-white relations in the United States. It is less a tale of outright villainy (although there is some of that) than of bureaucratic infighting, foot-dragging, ignorance, and apathy on the part of the whites, and inexperience, ignorance, and tribal rivalries on the part of the Indians. Only in the 1980s, when new federal laws strengthened the Indians’ position and their
more aggressive stance was backed by professional expertise, did they begin to make real progress. At the time of writing in 1999, however, only about half of the new sites had been constructed, and the alarming drop in the number of salmon in the river had become a critical problem. It was beginning to look as if even securing all of the in-lieu sites would be a pyrrhic victory.

Roberta Ulrich, the book’s author, was a reporter for United Press International and The Oregonian. She was introduced to the issue in the 1970s, when the Bureau of Indian Affairs was threatening to remove the handful of Indians who were still living permanently in tiny sites along the river. In the view of the BIA, the sites were supposed to be used only seasonally for fishing, not as permanent residences. While following up that story, Ulrich was gradually introduced to the bigger issues of Indian-white relations along the river. More importantly, she got to know many of the Indian leaders and their families. As a volume in the Oregon State University Press’s “Culture and Environment in the Pacific West” series, Empty Nets is intended to explain to general readers the issues involved in Indian fishing along the Columbia.

This is the sort of book that might go far toward moderating the conflicts among Indians, sport fishermen, sailboarders, and other users of the Columbia if it were widely read. Unfortunately, it is unlikely to gain the readership its subject deserves. For a reporter, Ulrich has surprisingly little skill in evoking the personalities of her main characters or finding telling incidents to illustrate broader issues. The subject cries out for a colorful narrative like Marc Reisner’s account of the work of the Army Corps of Engineers in the West in Cadillac Desert (Viking, 1986), but Empty Nets is weighed down by the author’s compulsion to give a full account of every bureaucratic memo and fruitless meeting. Series editor William L. Lang suggests in his preface that Wasco Chief Nelson Wallulatum “stands literally and figuratively as the personification of this powerful Columbia River story” (p. vi). So he might be in another telling of the story, but in Ulrich’s version the chief is never more than a shadowy, insubstantial figure. Although the book ought to be required reading for officials of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, it lacks the human interest and narrative drive that would be likely to attract a broad audience.

University of South Carolina

KENDRICK A. CLEMENTS

In 1991 scholar Alison R. Bernstein’s American Indians and World War II became the standard study of Native Americans and the global conflict of 1939–1945. Now historian Kenneth William Townsend has taken another look at the topic in World War II and the American Indian. Despite some overlap, the newer work represents a valuable contribution to the field. It covers a wide range of topics, contains a wealth of fascinating detail, and offers valuable insights.

Drawing on over a dozen archival collections and numerous published sources, the book is divided into topical chapters that are roughly chronological. After an overview of Indian affairs in the 1930s, Townsend discusses Nazi propaganda targeted at American Indians. Subsequent chapters explore Native men’s and women’s wartime experiences in the military, in the defense industries, and on the reservations. Although Indians enlisted and served in the armed forces in relatively large numbers, some resistance to the draft occurred. The Iroquois Nations of New York, for example, argued unsuccessfully in court that they were sovereign peoples not subject to selective service. Additionally, the war encouraged the development of the termination policy, which sought to assimilate American Indians into mainstream society.

Townsend deserves praise for the fascinating stories included in each chapter. A particularly interesting one deals with how Native opposition helped thwart a racist government official’s plans to prevent Indians from serving in the same military units as whites. Such details are further complemented by the inclusion of nearly two dozen photographs.

The author ultimately concludes that World War II brought Native Americans to a crossroads by providing greater opportunity to enter the mainstream as well as greater opportunity to strengthen tribal identities. Admittedly, his evidence seems to offer more support for the former idea. After all, American Indians were drafted like other Americans, served in the same military units as whites, and worked in the defense industries alongside non-Indians. At the same time, the author rightly points out that objections to the draft based on assertions of tribal sovereignty showed the persistence of Native identities. In addition, the skills that Native Americans learned in the military and the factories could be used to fight against detribalization. Thus, World War II
was not simply a first step toward termination. It was a complex event that presented opportunities and challenges for both advocates and opponents of assimilation.

Admittedly, some parts of the book cover ground already trod by Bernstein and others. This is especially true of the chapters on military service and home-front experiences. Townsend goes into much greater detail on certain topics, however, such as particular cases of draft resistance and the effects of Nazi propaganda. Without question, Bernstein’s work remains a critical source for those interested in American Indians’ experiences during World War II. Nevertheless, anyone wishing a deeper understanding of this important topic must give *World War II and the American Indian* a thorough look as well.

*Lewis-Clark State College*

CHRISTOPHER K. RIGGS


Scholars of U.S. immigration and ethnic studies have been studying the themes of identity formation and transnational ties in recent years. Against the grain of the assimilationist paradigm, immigrant communities in late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries fashioned mentalities and historical realities that linked to their countries of origin. Yong Chen’s volume is part of this growing scholarship.

The contours of the Chinese community in San Francisco, although shaped by the contemporaneous racialized discourse, were also determined by Chinese immigrants who never abandoned their ties to the past. Making full use of available Chinese-language sources, particularly newspapers in the United States and government records in China, Chen argues that the origins of this community lay in early trans-Pacific trade and missionary ties between southern China and America. Chinese merchants, he suggests, passed on skewed information about the United States to potential Chinese immigrants. American missionaries, for their part, also introduced secular knowledge to the Chinese, although their impact was limited by their small number. There is an absence of data about the class origins of the early immigrants, but Chen postulates that most of those who did migrate to the United States did not come from impoverished families. This revi-
sionist understanding is in line with the current understanding of European immigration. Chen’s interpretation challenges historians to question the role of famines, localized rebellions, and socioeconomic dislocations in shaping emigration.

Following a pre-emigration chapter, the book is divided into two parts. The first explains the demographic, physical, and social landscapes of Chinese San Francisco. Chen argues that the increasing number of children, the expanding number of businesses, and the rapid establishment of cultural institutions and recreational activities show that the Chinese were both sojourners and settlers. They created a vibrant community that countered the hegemonic image of a decaying, isolated ghetto. Arising from this discussion is the possibility that this duality—economically tied to the larger society and yet politically and socially wedded to the Old World—might have created tensions in the world view of these immigrants.

Scholars might also quibble with Chen’s assertion that the number of Chinese prostitutes in nineteenth-century San Francisco was exaggerated by biased European American sources. While that possibility certainly exists, there is still the significant number of Chinese American sources that suggest otherwise. Furthermore, Chen’s argument that some of the alleged houses of prostitution were simply dwellings of non-natal sisterhoods—a practice found in Guangdong, the main source of Chinese American ancestral origins—remains seemingly speculative since there is no evidence that these sisterhoods existed in United States.

The last section of the book traces the growing “American-ness” of the trans-Pacific community. The 1905 boycott of American-made goods, both in the United States and China, stemmed from and further galvanized China-centered nationalism. But this nationalism on the part of Chinese Americans was linked to the growing realization, bolstered by the embrace of Social Darwinism, that a strong China would create a favorable European American impression of Chinese in America. In the long run, exclusion would be a thing of the past and acculturation would take place. While little of this argument is new, Chen’s skillful use of Chinese-language, U.S.-based newspapers shows that immigrants often placed blame for past misfortunes far from the doorstep of the oppressors and more on their own. Uplift of the individual and community through self-improvement became the rhetoric of the day. Rather than exert pressure for the repeal of the exclusion laws on the basis of discrimination, Chinese Americans resorted to moral persuasion and highlighting Sino-
American friendship. Chinese even went so far as to internalize America’s hegemonic racism against African Americans and Japanese Americans, presumably to find acceptance from the larger society.

Chen’s volume is another reminder of the contradictions that stemmed from the complex interplay of race, identity, and nationalism in the history of immigrants of color. Written in an accessible style and humanized with the voices of Chinese of all backgrounds, *Chinese San Francisco* challenges us to see these lives as located in more than one world.

*Wichita State University*  
BENSON TONG


On September 25, 1904, the Sisters of Charity, a Catholic order of nuns, dispatched fifty-seven toddlers from their New York City Foundling Hospital to what they hoped would be good Catholic homes in southern Arizona and points further west. Like so many of the orphan trains that had been dispatched west since the 1850s, the children on this one had been abandoned by their poor mothers shortly after birth. Of Irish, Italian, Polish, and mixed European ancestry, in New York these lower-class children were deemed swarthy and nonwhite, mere “human driftwood thrown up by a great city in the ebb tide of misfortune” (p. 16).

The gripping story this book tells is what happened when the orphans arrived in Arizona and were adopted by upstanding Mexican Catholic families in Clifton and Morenci, Arizona. The orphans’ blond hair, blue eyes, and light skin were seen as signs of whiteness by the local pioneers. Intent on upholding their own dominance and putative racial superiority in local affairs, the white citizens of these two towns kidnapped the orphans from their Mexican Catholic homes. They claimed that the children had to be rescued from such vile and profligate folk, whose dark skin and Indian racial traits made them unfit parents for white orphans and whose Mexican homes were dens of filth and debauchery. The Anglos maintained custody of the children by force and by law, taking their case all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court. The courts concluded that the interests of the displaced children would be best served by remaining in the homes of “Americans,” rather than
in those of “half-breed Mexican Indians [who were] impecunious, illiterate . . . vicious” (p. 294).

Linda Gordon illuminates this story with great passion and flair in a densely researched and textured narrative that offers us a window into the social construction of race at the beginning of the twentieth century. We learn much about the metaphysics of the racial order in Arizona, of ethnic stereotypes and religious hatreds, of the relationship between class and color, of the materiality of existence in Arizona’s copper-mining towns, of maternal ideologies rooted more in sentiment than in biology, and of the Anglo personalities that played major parts in the showdown over the orphans.

What is particularly laudable about this book is the rich context Gordon creates for the 1904 actions of the residents of Clifton and Morenci. Although the archival sources are particularly sparse and silent on what the Mexican parents may have said or thought on seeing their adopted children abducted and custody over them granted to their Anglo Protestant neighbors, Gordon offers sensitive and thoughtful speculation. With dexterity she elaborates a host of intersecting perspectives based on class, gender, race, and religion. The only disruption of this otherwise spectacularly gripping narrative comes in Chapter 7 on vigilantism. Here the book digresses into a historiography of violence, typologies of vigilantes, the psychology of violence and vigilante rituals, and the complex meanings of violence, all of which do not significantly extend our understanding of the events of 1904.

In sum, this is a fascinating book written in a style that will surely garner a wide audience. Any person interested in the history of race relations in the United States or on the transformation of European ethnics into whites will find this an absolutely essential book.

University of California, San Diego

RAMON A. GUTIÉRREZ


Mario T. Garc’ a and Luis Leal, both from the University of California, Santa Barbara, have collaborated to produce, in the tradition of the Latin American testimonio, an outstanding account of the intellectual life of a deeply respected Chicano scholar. Garc’ a has opted to present the material gathered during thirty-five hours
of interviews with nonagenarian Don Luis Leal as straight edited dialogue rather than as a “disguised monologue” (p. xvi). The result, according to García, is “a synthesis of two genres, an auto/biography” (p. xvi).

The dialogues are contained in chapters that follow the chronological flow of Leal’s life. Their titles refer to the various places in which he has lived: Linares, Mexico; Mississippi; Illinois; Aztlán (the Southwest); and Santa Barbara. Only the final chapter deviates from this organizing principle; it is called “Work and Reflections at Ninety.” The two chapters bearing the title “Aztlán” highlight an important moment in Chicano history and also a decisive change in Leal’s intellectual trajectory. Beginning in the late 1960s, this eminent scholar of Latin American and Mexican literature was to turn his attention to the literature produced in the United States by Mexican Americans.

Don Luis, as García (and all who know Professor Leal) affectionately calls his informant, speaks modestly about his personal life and gives vivid testimony regarding the key historical events that he witnessed first hand during the course of the twentieth century, among them the Mexican Revolution, the Great Depression, World War II, the turbulent 1960s, and the Chicano movement. He also speaks with deep knowledge and authority of the literary history of Latin America, of individual writers from various countries, and of scores of Chicano writers. Because Leal was a well-known and deeply respected scholar of Latin American literature here and abroad, he, perhaps more than any other literary historian, lent legitimacy to the field of contemporary Chicano literature by giving it his attention and, more important, by linking it to the long and rich Spanish-language literary tradition that had existed in the Southwest since the arrival of the first Spanish and Mexican colonizers.

The material in this book reconstructs the sometimes forgotten details and players in the evolution of Chicano literature and provides testimony to the important role Leal has played in bridging a literary production related by language and cultural legacy but separated by geopolitical boundaries.

While García’s training is in history, his questions demonstrate more than a passing familiarity with Chicano letters and Chicano literary history. They are incisive and substantive, and they are designed to tease out his subject’s memories and rich repertoire of knowledge. This book will be of interest to scholars of western and Chicano history and to Latino and Latin American literary critics. It will be of special interest to the scores of individ-
uals who hold Don Luis Leal, the man and the scholar, in the highest esteem and who have long been waiting for someone to pay him homage in a manner commensurate with his stature and his contributions.

Oregon State University

ERLINGA GONZALES-BERRY


Less than a half-century ago, California’s public education system seemed to show the nation that democratic inclusiveness and academic quality could go hand-in-hand. Emblematic of western optimism, investment in public schools was thought to help everybody. At mid-century in the eastern United States, by contrast, observers noted social and academic attributes that divided private and public education. Wealth and privilege tended to aggregate around private institutions, which were more prestigious. The less affluent, including more recent immigrants, tended to go to public schools. In higher education, no eastern public university matched the distinction of the Ivy League colleges and universities.

The California Idea and American Higher Education is a history culminating in the 1960 Master Plan for Higher Education. More than any other state, argues John Aubrey Douglass, California conceived of higher education instrumentally as a means to contribute to economic and social progress. Rooted in Progressive-era assumptions concerning knowledge and its uses, Douglass characterizes “the California Idea” as the rise of a cohesive and popular vision of public higher education as an ameliorative and pro-active agent of state and local government, which would set the stage for a modern and scientifically advanced society. More specifically, the California Idea is the manifestation of this vision into a system of public colleges and university campuses (p. 82).

At the center of the story is the creation of the University of California at Berkeley, its gradual begrudging acceptance of, first, UCLA, then other UC campuses, followed by its successful attempt to thwart the graduate school aspirations of the former teachers’ colleges known finally as the California State University system. The practical compromise known as the 1960 Master Plan preserved the doctoral role for the University of California system,
granted increased governance authority to the then state college system, and accelerated the role of community colleges as “feeders” for the other two systems.

If the heart of the Master Plan was a protection of the status quo for the University of California, it nevertheless was an impressive reconciliation of quality and access. Academic distinction demonstrated faculty quality, and post-secondary attendance demonstrated student access. And it was all done economically. Some of the best institutions, and many fine ones, served a large and increasing number of students who paid little to attend. The Master Plan’s segmentation of institutional function avoided duplication common in other states. The California taxpayer contributed no more than the national average per capita, despite the quality and accessibility of education offered at the three levels.

Nevertheless, Douglass ends on a melancholy note, invoking the perspective of Peter Schrag, who stated in *Paradise Lost* (1998):

> The state, which has almost doubled in population since the early 1960s, has built some twenty new prisons in the past two decades. But it has not opened one new campus of the University of California for nearly three decades. . . . And what had once been a tuition-free college and university system, while still among the world’s great public educational institutions, struggles for funds and charges as much as every other state university system, and in some cases more (p. 8).

*The Huntington Library*  
ROBERT ALLEN SKOTHEIM


Parts of this book will interest mostly those with a personal connection to Portland State University, who constitute the primary intended audience. The vicissitudes of the university’s early years—its survival of a 1948 flood that wiped out the entire Portland suburb where it was originally located, the struggle for recognition and funding in a state where the two preexisting public universities seemed plenty to some, the shuffling from one location to another, the politics of departments and colleges—are described engagingly but will not in themselves reverberate much beyond the leafy campus where the university finally came to rest at the south edge of Portland’s downtown commercial district.

Other aspects of the story, however, will interest even those
who never set foot in the Park Blocks. The fifty-year history of PSU comprises a period of revolutionary change in American higher education, and Dodds’s account covers the most important aspects of the revolution. The first phase encompassed the arrival of mustered-out GIs from World War II, who hit the campuses with years of catching up to do and government money to finance the chase. The predecessor of Portland State was established at Vanport, a government company town built around the shipyards just north of Portland; the town seemed a natural location for a government-sponsored experiment in higher education, until the dikes along the Columbia River burst, destroying both Vanport and the university’s initial incarnation. Vanport was never rebuilt, but the school was, on higher ground.

Just as the GI money was running out, the Kremlin inspired America’s political classes to pay attention to higher education once more. Portland State, like many other colleges and universities, benefited from the Sputnik scare with fresh funding and permission to establish new programs, especially in the sciences and engineering. For those whose careers in higher education postdate the 1960s, descriptions of a time when jobs outnumbered applicants might seem hard to credit. Dodds tells a revealing story of how the chairman of Portland State’s physics department got wind that Reed College, on the east side of the Willamette River, was interviewing a candidate; the PSU chairman hurried across town and pirated the candidate away, even getting a Reed official to notarize the contract.

The politics of protest roiled Portland State in the late 1960s and early 1970s. The present reviewer (who was a teenager in Portland at the time) recalls the demonstrations that brought out the police Tac (for “tactical,” but often construed as “attack”) squads after the invasion of Cambodia in the spring of 1970. The police violence was less severe at PSU than at many other locations around the country, but it shocked laid-back Portland and—as Dodds ably demonstrates—jolted the university into institutional adulthood.

The days of rage were followed by years of retrenchment. There was a connection: The Oregon state legislature, which like many other state legislatures disproportionately represented rural districts, saw little reason to underwrite the radical politics of Oregon’s only urban university. (Beyond this, PSU’s youth meant that it had few alumni in positions of political influence.) But the overall economic malaise of the 1970s was equally responsible for the budget cuts, the hiring freezes, and the consequent decline in faculty and staff morale. Troubles continued into the Reagan era and be-
yond, as a statewide tax revolt forced additional cuts on the university administration.

Dodds, a former chair and longtime member of the PSU history department, writes with the appropriate mix of concern and objectivity. For many years outside observers of Oregon wondered that Portland, a city with nearly everything else going for it, struggled along without a major public university. Eventually it got its university, but, as Dodds makes abundantly clear, not without even more struggle.

*Texas A&M University*  
H. W. BRANDS

*The Bakke Case: Race, Education, & Affirmative Action.* By Howard Ball. (Lawrence, University Press of Kansas, 2000. xv + 231 pp. $29.95 cloth, $12.95 paper)

The *Bakke* case put affirmative action on trial in the streets and in university admissions offices across the country. Emotion and results, rather than law, prevailed in the streets and faculty meetings, but in courts questions of constitutional law and the cobbling together of juridical thought and coalitions prevailed. Howard Ball has produced a remarkably clear, concise, and learned study of this most complex case.

Today Allan Paul Bakke is practicing medicine at the Mayo Clinic in Rochester, Minnesota, because the legal system required his admission to the University of California, Davis, despite his rejection for admission. Bakke was Norwegian American, a graduate of the University of Minnesota mechanical engineering program, a Marine who served his country for four years (including a combat tour in Vietnam), and qualified by examinations, education, and experience for admission to the study of medicine. Admission should have been a no-brainer, but in the 1970s university admissions thinkers set aside seats for minority students who otherwise would not qualify for admission. These quotas were prohibited by Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, but colleges and universities across this country firmly believed that the ends justified the means. Higher education seemingly had a moral duty to admit minority and women students to professional schools and change the lily-white male complexion of law and medicine.

Allan Bakke would not take “no” for an answer and contacted Reynold Colvin, a San Francisco lawyer and active member of the Jewish community. Colvin and the Jewish community knew exactly what Bakke was suffering because higher education had long
discriminated against Jews in admission to professional schools. Colvin’s argument throughout the litigation was simple: “racial quotas, however laudatory their rationale, were nevertheless un-
constitutional” (p. 53). Marco DeFunis was fighting the same fight against the University of Washington School of Law. Quotas had kept him out of law school, and he was in court, ultimately the U.S. Supreme Court, trying to right the wrong. DeFunis came from a Sephardic Jewish family and knew discrimination. The Supreme Court would decide not to decide the affirmative action question in the DeFunis case, finding it moot due to his graduation from law school. Bakke could not be so easily avoided.

The Supreme Court, the White House, the Department of Justice, and numerous special interest groups were torn asunder by the issues Bakke presented. Ultimately, the justices produced multiple opinions, admitting Bakke to the study of medicine, throwing out quotas and set-asides but allowing race to be continued as a factor in admissions. The University of California paid $183,089 to Colvin and his associates pursuant to a trial court judgment. Lawsuits, propositions, and state plans continue to contend over the issue of affirmative action.

This book is an excellent study of the mechanics of judicial decisions and the politics of advocacy. For those who believe in the rule of law: semper fidelis.

California State University, Fullerton

GORDON MORRIS BAKKEN


Robert G. Kaufman has written a thoughtful and fascinating biography of Washington’s Henry Jackson, who served forty-two years in Congress—including thirty-one in the Senate—until his death in 1983. Kaufman’s research, which includes many interviews and substantial archival work, is commendable. The result is a readable, informed study that sheds light on transformations in the Democratic party, American liberalism, and Cold War foreign policy.

Some readers will nevertheless feel uneasy about the triumphant Cold War perspective that informs the book. Kaufman, for example, approvingly quotes former senator and Reagan adviser Howard Baker: “Jackson made sure we did not lose the Cold War during the 1970s so that Ronald Reagan could win it in the 1980s” (p. 438). According to the author, the senator’s “synthesis
of power and principle” helped the United States outlast “a Soviet empire that was not only truly malignant but truly dangerous” (pp. 6–7). Kaufman believes that Cold War “hard-liners such as Jackson were largely correct” (p. 460) and concludes that even the U.S. mistakes in Vietnam “do not invalidate the policy of vigilant containment that Cold Warriors such as Henry Jackson advocated” (p. 159). In advancing a rather stark version of the Cold War, Kaufman notes that “what we have learned from the Soviet archives indicates that the Soviet Union was neither a defensive nor a traditional imperial entity” (pp. 61–62). Yet documents from those archives have yielded more ambiguous interpretations, as Eyal Press, for example, observed in the April 1998 issue of *Lingua Franca*. Moreover, Kaufman may embrace a bit too easily the distinction that Jackson and others drew between “less-repressive right-wing authoritarian allies” and “more repressive left-wing totalitarian adversaries such as the Soviet Union” (pp. 369–370).

However much one might disagree with Kaufman’s views on the Cold War or his distaste for the New Politics of a George McGovern, this biography is no mere polemic. Kaufman is a conscientious scholar. He quite fairly sums up the positions of Jackson’s critics. And he astutely conveys a sense of Jackson’s outlook, character, and importance. Jackson emerges as a man of integrity, conviction, and political savvy. Despite his bland personality, he became arguably the most popular politician ever from Washington. As one of the “gold dust twins” in obtaining federal money for that state, he and Warren Magnuson constituted one of the most effective duos in the Senate (p. 113). Ultimately, Kaufman helps to locate Jackson within the context of profound political change that marked the U.S. between the 1940s and 1980s and shows how Jackson provided a bridge into the camp of Ronald Reagan: “Many Reagan Democrats . . . began as Jackson Democrats” (p. 6). Kaufman’s assessment of Jackson’s domestic politics is somewhat more guarded. While noting Jackson’s important contributions to policies concerning the environment, energy policy, civil rights, and a welfare safety net, the author regrets that “Jackson unduly mistrusted private markets” (p. 7).

*Henry M. Jackson* is an impressive biography, well argued and informative. Jackson’s critics must reckon with it. It is a significant contribution to the growing debate over the Cold War and the welfare state.

*Washington State University*  
LeROY ASHBY
In this important critique of U.S. colonial policy in the Philippines, Frank Golay offers a detailed narrative of how Americans set out to turn their colony into an economic dependency and how, with the collaboration of Manuel Quezon (Philippine Commonwealth President) and other Filipino leaders, they succeeded in this effort.

Golay’s thesis is that Americans, beginning with William Howard Taft, guaranteed that the Philippines would become an economic dependency of the United States. “Duty-free access to the American market for Philippine exports was a goal Taft would pursue tenaciously as civil governor and secretary of war and would finally achieve as president” (p. 99). By making the Philippine elite dependent on American tariff preferences for their sugar and other agricultural export products, they compromised those leaders, turning them into collaborators who postured for independence even as they fostered continued dependency. When independence did come, it was not because Filipino leaders demanded it but rather because congressional Democrats, led by Senator Millard Tydings (supported by President Franklin D. Roosevelt), vowed to achieve American “freedom from the colony” (p. 443). Undeterred, Quezon spent the rest of his life politicking for continued economic and military dependency, and he ultimately succeeded in assembling a powerful coalition, comprised of General Douglas MacArthur, the departments of War and Interior, High Commissioner Paul V. McNutt, Congressman Jasper Bell, newspaperman Roy Howard, Manila Americans, and the Philippine elite to ensure that Taft’s policy of economic dependency would not be abandoned even after political independence. Quezon died in 1944, replaced by Sergio Osmeña and then Manuel Roxas, but this coalition eventually won the day, with the result that the Philippines remained an economic and military dependency of the United States for decades.

This book is must reading for all students of the Philippine-American “special relationship.” Its thesis is not new, as readers of Theodore Friend, Between Two Empires, H. W. Brands, Bound to Empire, and even Stanley Karnow, In Our Image, will note. But this is a much more penetrating analysis of the politics of dependency than any other monograph on American colonialism in the Philippines.
Frank Golay, who died in 1990 before completing the final manuscript draft, was an economist who specialized in Philippine economic development. One of the lasting contributions of this volume will be its meticulously researched and lucidly narrated analysis of the formulation, refinement, and implementation of American colonial economic policy between 1898 and 1946. It moves back and forth between policy debates in Washington (and, inside Washington, between the House and Senate—Golay says that “Philippine policy was made in Congress” [p. 99], the War Department, and the White House), and in Manila (where Quezon became more and more adept at manipulating American governors—especially Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., and Frank Murphy, and High Commissioner McNutt). Thanks to Golay’s close attention to detail in these complex debates and to his virtuosity in clarifying the individual political agendas of their many participants, the reader is treated to a compelling narrative of political intrigue (Quezon with just about everybody), petty back-stabbing (Interior Secretary Harold Ickes versus High Commissioner Francis Sayre), and military blundering (MacArthur, whose egotism is described as “unbounded” [p. 441] and whose plan to defend the colony is dismissed as a “military fiasco” [p. 427]). Readers who want to think well of American colonialism will not find much idealism and high-mindedness in this withering indictment of American policymakers and their Philippine collaborators.

There are a few limitations to this study, many of which can be attributed to the incomplete nature of the manuscript at the time of Golay’s death. There are no introductory or concluding chapters providing a theoretical overview, and individual chapters also lack introductions and conclusions; readers just have to plunge in and figure out for themselves what it all adds up to. The author also failed to edit out unnecessary material, so that there are times when the narrative is dictated not by theme or theory but rather by whatever Philippine topic Congress happened to be debating on a given day!

Other limitations are less a matter of editing. Given the central role played by Manuel Quezon in the narrative, it is unfortunate that the author did not use the Quezon Papers. His research, in fact, is limited entirely to archives and libraries in the United States; he depends more on secondary sources and on correspondence found in American letter files for information on Philippine domestic politics. The study is also focused entirely on Washington and Manila, with little or no assessment of how policies played out in the Philippine provinces, towns, and villages. Finally, Golay con-
centrates on the politics of economic policy across time, at the expense of social policy, education, or the American colonial impact on gender roles.

With the above limitations noted, this work reflects an extraordinary amount of precise and exhaustive research in the Congressional Record, the National Archives (especially the Bureau of Insular Affairs and the Modern Military Records section), relevant presidential papers, the papers of each governor-general and high commissioner and of General MacArthur, and the papers of other significant policymakers. It is no wonder that it took staff at the University of Wisconsin’s Southeast Asian Publications Program three years to check all of Golay’s citations. That program’s staff, together with Alfred McCoy, Chair of the Southeast Asian Publications Committee, are to be commended on producing the most important contribution yet to our understanding of American colonial policy and its impact on Philippine dependency.

University of Northern Colorado

RONALD K. EDGERTON


“Ask students what they know about the [Philippine] war,” Brian Linn writes, “and they will respond with a few clichés: the howling wilderness; the water cure; civilize ’em with a Krag” (p. 322). One suspects a more likely response would be, “What war was that?” But no matter. Textbook treatments of the war tend to present a few notorious episodes—J. Franklin Bell’s concentration policy in Batangas, Jacob Smith’s “perhaps apocryphal, directives to kill everyone over ten” (p. 306) on Samar—as representative of what the U.S. Army did in the Philippines from February 1899 to July 1902.

Linn attempts a broader, more balanced account of the conflict. His knowledge of official documents and manuscript collections is impressive and revealing. He draws useful distinctions between volunteers and regulars who served in the islands and demonstrates their repeated ability to outfight their Filipino opponents. He argues that a “remarkably competent” (p. 327) officer corps provided imaginative and flexible leadership in dealing with the war’s challenges.

Americans did treat Filipinos harshly. The relentless accretion of phrases like “retaliatory practices” (p. 249), “barrios and towns . . . destroyed” (p. 285), “intense efforts at food deprivation” (p.
302), “destruction of crops” (p. 309), and so on makes clear that the army’s willingness to apply “the hard hand of war” (p. 285) played a significant part in the American victory, especially once the war entered its guerrilla phase.

The author intended a history “that covered both sides equally,” but a trip to the Philippines convinced him “that the Filipino side must await another scholar” (p. x). Still, Linn uses the Philippine Insurgent Records and other sources to assay Filipino strengths and weaknesses. Not for the first time, revolutionary leader Emilio Aguinaldo comes off as short-sighted and incompetent. Filipino officers were as apt to fight amongst themselves as fight the enemy. The army’s success at isolating guerrillas from supplies forced the “insurgents” to adopt severe measures that turned their countrymen against them. Linn notes that, without substantial support from Filipinos, an American expeditionary force that averaged about 24,000 combat troops could hardly have won a war waged over such an extensive and difficult terrain.

Linn’s concern is military operations, and other topics get short shrift. Readers interested in what motivated thousands of Americans to fight in the war will find nothing here. Disease killed three times as many soldiers as did combat, but while Linn acknowledges the problems caused by cholera, typhoid, and other diseases, he has little to say about the army’s attempts to deal with them.

Finally, Linn would have been better served to let his research speak for itself and not spar with those whose work he does not respect. He ridicules historian Stuart Creighton Miller’s labeling of the (in)famous Major Littleton Waller as an “honorable warrior” (p. 319), when what Miller fully wrote was that Waller was “a much more honorable warrior” than senior officers who, Miller claimed, had gotten away with crimes as bad as those attributed to Waller (“Benevolent Assimilation” [1982], p. 227). This is but one example of an unfortunate tendency that mars an otherwise deeply researched and insightful contribution that enhances our understanding of the war.

James Madison University

RICHARD MEIXSEL


Richard Stewart’s Leper Priest of Moloka‘i: The Father Damien Story is a fascinating examination of the life of the cleric who rose to
world fame during the late nineteenth century. At once a moving spiritual biography and a chronicle of the medical investigation into the causes of leprosy, Stewart’s work is well-written and thoroughly researched. It also stands as a credible social and political history of the era, providing a useful account of the segregation policy that would forcibly remove lepers to Kalaupapa, the isolated peninsula on the north coast of Moloka‘i beginning in 1865.

Arriving in the islands in 1864, Damien labored as a mission priest for the Catholic order of the Sacred Heart on the island of Hawai‘i for almost a decade before volunteering for a temporary assignment to minister to the squalid settlement at Kalaupapa. A robust young man, Damien ably handled the daunting tasks assigned to him on the “Big Island.” In the vast, mountainous stretches of Puna and Kohala-Hamakua, Damien would develop and then refine the skills that he would later need to cope with the immense challenges on Moloka‘i.

Stewart does a fine job describing the young priest’s growing interest and expertise in ministering to the sick, his lengthy treks between isolated hamlets, and his therapeutic “escape”: building small chapels with his own hands. Of rough-and-ready peasant stock, Damien took an instant liking to Native Hawaiians. He entered into their thatched huts, “joining the family circle seated around the communal calabash full of poi” (p. 52), and he professed admiration for their lack of materialism. As Stewart points out, the young Belgian priest differed in many ways from the Protestant Congregationalist missionaries in his attitudes and actions toward Hawaiians. Yet one of Damien’s most invaluable qualities was his ability to befriend and learn from Protestants such as Charles Wetmore, a Congregational missionary doctor in Hilo, and Rudolph Meyer, a Moloka‘i rancher and an early superintendent of the leper settlement.

*Leper Priest* is a more in-depth examination of Damien’s life than Gavan Daws’s 1973 biography *Holy Man: Father Damien of Molokai*. While *Holy Man* is more compellingly written, it often glosses over or completely ignores crucial elements of Damien’s story such as his years on the Big Island and his friendship with Wetmore. And although Stewart is apt to offer verbatim quotations from the letters of Damien and others, Daws is more likely to contribute elegant summaries of the ways in which medicine, politics, and religion intersected in nineteenth-century Hawai‘i.

Stewart is more sensitive in his descriptions of indigenous Hawaiian spirituality compared to Daws and other earlier Western chroniclers of Hawaiian history. Noting Damien’s ongoing antago-
nism to Hawaiian beliefs, practices such as the *hula* (sacred dance) and the traditional priests (the *kahuna*), Stewart makes it clear that attitudes have changed in the last century. (Among other transformations, he reports on Pope John Paul II’s appreciative reception of a *hula* performance after the beatification of Damien in 1995.)

One of the few shortcomings of Stewart’s biography is its tendency toward hagiography, which might be expected considering that the first steps to Damien’s canonization have recently been completed. But the Belgian was also a fallible human being, as Stewart often makes clear, so the author’s imaginative invocations of Damien’s spiritual ecstasies (especially evident in the first half of the book) are somewhat repetitious. As word of Damien’s self-sacrifice and good works spread through the islands and then beyond with the help of authors such as Charles Warren Stoddard and Robert Louis Stevenson, the humble priest became a *cause célèbre*. In the second half of the biography, Stewart takes advantage (perhaps too much so) of the voluminous writings about Damien, providing lengthy excerpts from correspondence, diaries, and articles. One result of this overabundance of primary sources is that the narrative bogs down, and a fast-moving, absorbing story slows considerably. Still, *Leper Priest* offers several new insights about Father Damien as well as Hawai‘i in the late nineteenth century.

*Ramapo College*  

FRANK KARPIEL


Noriko Kawamura seeks to explain why relations between Japan and the United States were fraught with tensions during World War I. Although the author partially blames miscommunication and misperception for those tensions, her framework, which is reminiscent of the argument used by Akira Iriye in his *Power and Culture*, clearly suggests that Japanese-American relations were strained during World War I primarily because of a clash of ideologies and cultures. On one side was the “universalism and the unilateralism inherent in Wilsonian idealistic internationalism,” in which Wilson viewed his Fourteen Points as universal principles that could be “applied . . . to the East Asian situation without truly understanding the realities in that region” (p. 5). On the other side was Japan’s incipient particularistic regionalism and the pluralism
based on its own assessment of power relations in East Asia and its strong sense of nationalism and racial identity. Japan’s foreign policy was “regionalistic” because it sought hegemony in East Asia, and it was particularistic because Japanese increasingly “questioned universal applicability of the Western standards to the Asian situation” (p. 6).

Envisioning a future war between the white and yellow races and an “Asia for the Asians,” Japan took advantage of the imperialist vacuum in Asia created by the war to grab Germany’s leasehold in Shandong, China, as well as German-controlled islands in the Pacific. In 1915 Japan tried to make China a protectorate by imposing the Twenty-One Demands. Complicating Japan’s pursuit of regionalism and particularism was Wilsonianism. The Twenty-One Demands episode was a “turning point” because Wilson tried to halt Japan’s attempt at regional hegemony by upholding the principles of the Open Door and the independence of China to the extent that Japan was forced to drop its harshest demands. The suspicions engendered by that episode turned to rivalry when Wilson and Japan competed to lead China into World War I because the former opposed the latter’s attempt to ensure political and economic predominance over China. Both sides were unable to reconcile Japanese-American differences, and the joint Siberian intervention created further mistrust because Wilsonian universalism refused to accord Japan the status of regional leader. Japanese imperialism, in the guise of an Asian Monroe Doctrine, clashed with Wilsonian idealism again at the Paris Peace Conference. Japan wanted racial equality and legitimization of its hold on Shandong, but Wilson tried to deny Japan its claim there without fully understanding the forces driving Japanese expansion into China.

The book’s strength is its shedding of new light on the domestic sources underpinning Japan’s “regionalism,” although it does not equal or supersede Frederick R. Dickinson’s War and National Reinvention. In fact, one would prefer that the author had concentrated more time and space focusing on the views of Japan’s policymakers because her framework does not provide a fresh perspective on Wilsonianism. A fuller discussion of Wilsonianism, contrasted with the so-called “realism” of Elihu Root or Theodore Roosevelt, would have helped the reader to understand the alternatives available, and possibly explain, if the argument could be sustained, why an American President of the realist strain would have better reduced the “turbulence” between both nations.

Embry-Riddle University

STEPHEN G. CRAFT

The Chinese-American confrontations of the 1950s have been a major focus of scholarly attention during the last two decades. In the 1980s scholars drew upon newly available U.S. archival documents to examine and analyze the formation of Washington’s policy during the Korean War and the two Taiwan Strait crises of 1954–1955 and 1958. During the 1990s the partial opening of Chinese archives has led to the publication of a number of important studies that focus on the motives and calculations of Mao Zedong in those confrontations.

Drawing primarily upon American archives and the Chinese documents published in the Cold War International History Project Bulletin, Appu Soman examines American nuclear diplomacy against China from 1950 to 1958. Although his study sheds new light on some controversial issues of the period, it breaks relatively little new ground. Regarding the role of nuclear diplomacy in American decision making, Soman convincingly demonstrates that nuclear weapons enabled American presidents to make critical choices of intervention that, in the absence of such weapons, they would have been hard pressed to take. President Truman was able to stand firm during the difficult moments of the Korean War mainly because in the last resort he could employ nuclear weapons to save U.S. forces from destruction. Atomic weapons provided President Eisenhower a similar hedge against disaster in the Taiwan Strait crises as well as a guarantee that China would not escalate the fighting during the conflicts. Moral considerations, according to Soman, played no role in the Eisenhower administration’s decision concerning the use of nuclear weapons.

In evaluating the effects of the American nuclear diplomacy, Soman’s conclusions are perceptive. While Washington’s policy succeeded in preventing the loss of the offshore islands, it forced China to develop its own nuclear weapons program. Thus, the long-term cost of driving China to become a nuclear power outweighed the short-term benefit of preserving the strategically insignificant offshore islands for the Nationalists. Taking issue with scholars who argue that a desire to drive a wedge between China and the Soviet Union motivated the Eisenhower administration’s policy toward Beijing, Soman contends that it was largely domestic political reasons—the Republican Party’s ideology, John Foster Dulles’s personal beliefs, the effects of McCarthyism and the China Lobby—that drove the American policy.
There are a few slips in the book. Historian Robert Ferrell is referred to as Herbert Ferrell. Chinese Defense Minister Peng Dehuai is spelled as Peng Dehui, and Russian historians Zubok and Pleshakov are spelled as Zubock and Pleshkov.

In sum, Soman has produced a clearly written account based on a commendably thorough trawl through the American archives and extensive reading in the secondary literature. It is a useful study of American nuclear diplomacy against China during the 1950s. But the scholarly ground has already been so thoroughly trodden that Soman could hardly have hoped to write a work of great originality.

Auburn University at Montgomery

QIANG ZHAI


Fewer than 1,000 American servicemen were captured during the Vietnam War, but they soon learned that prisoners taken in an undeclared war are guaranteed no rights or protection. The North Vietnamese and Viet Cong classified captured Americans as criminals, subjected them to unremitting degradation, and exploited them for political purposes. Locked in an unequal struggle against a superpower, Communist leaders felt justified in converting American prisoners of war into weapons for psychological and propaganda warfare.

The torments suffered by American POWs in the Vietnam War have been chronicled in authoritative fashion by Stuart I. Rochester and Frederick Kiley in *Honor Bound: The History of American Prisoners of War in Southeast Asia, 1961–1973*, which was released in 1998 by the Historical Office of the Office of the Secretary of Defense. Published by the same agency, *The Long Road Home: U.S. Prisoner of War Policy and Planning in Southeast Asia* is intended as a companion volume to *Honor Bound*. It shifts the scene from the joyless cells of the “Hanoi Hilton” to various offices and meeting rooms in Washington, D.C. In that setting, politicians, bureaucrats, and military officers struggled to find ways to ameliorate the abuse of American POWs and obtain their release.

The prisoner of war issue caught the U.S. government poorly prepared. It almost seemed as if American policymakers failed to realize that escalating the Vietnam War would lead to some of their servicemen falling into enemy hands. Since U.S. intervention
in Southeast Asia did not result from a declaration of war, primary responsibility for POW affairs belonged to the State Department, which officially referred to captured Americans as “detainees.” This absurd practice persisted until mid-1966, and it typified the cautious, ineffective manner with which the State Department behaved.

Washington did not begin to take significant action regarding the POW issue until 1969, when President Richard M. Nixon installed Melvin R. Laird as Secretary of Defense. Laird was a skilled politician with a strong personal interest in the fate of captured American servicemen and those missing in action. Impatient with the polite fumbling of the State Department, Laird placed real pressure on the Communists by launching a “Go Public Campaign.” He and his subordinates appealed to international opinion by exposing the fact that the North Vietnamese did not treat their prisoners according to the Geneva Convention nor even release a complete list of the Americans they held. Laird persuaded Nixon to insist on the release of all POWs as a mandatory condition for the final withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam in the Paris Peace Accords. Finally, Laird supplied information and both moral and material support to POW families. This was not only a compassionate gesture, but also a shrewd political move that kept the POWs’ wives from growing frustrated and criticizing the Nixon Administration’s handling of the war.

The Long Road Home is an exhaustively researched and judiciously written study with a much wider scope than can be covered adequately in a 500-word review. As an official history sponsored by the Defense Department, the book’s attempt to make a hero out of Melvin Laird may seem suspect, but the former secretary’s unflagging commitment to the POWs and their families justifies a positive assessment. The Long Road Home is a worthy companion to Honor Bound. Together, these two books present a comprehensive picture of the POW experience in a war that still haunts and divides the American people.

Temple University

GREGORY J. W. URWIN


Several authors have used the same title or a variation in examining different aspects of Buddhist religious experiences in
the United States. Some have focused on Japanese immigrants and their major religious institution; others have examined the effects of an early Buddhist conference in the United States, and still others have centered their attention on the recent convert and refugee communities of Buddhists. Seager’s work, as part of the Columbia University Press series on religion, is an even-handed and well-written overview of this world religion and its place within the United States.

Divided into three sections, the book starts with an introduction to the Buddhist religion and its early historical roots in this country. The second section, “Major Traditions,” begins with Jodo Shinshu Buddhism as started by and sustained for over 100 years by the early Japanese immigrants and their successors in the Buddhist Churches of America. The history of the American converts to American Nichiren and Zen Buddhism is thoughtfully introduced with its many paths and inherent complexities. Although adherents to these two branches of Buddhism are also found among Japanese Americans, convert Americans have a century-long history that culminates in a dramatic growth in their numbers from the 1950s forward. Convert Buddhists, now estimated to be from 100,000 to 800,000 persons, constitute a new lifeline of this religion in the United States. The third tradition is represented by the refugees and immigrants especially from Southeast Asia. Arriving for the most part after the 1970s, they represent the Theravada Buddhist denomination.

While Asian countries may be classified according to particular Buddhist traditions, the presence of these three groups makes it difficult to define simply what American Buddhism is. The book’s third section exemplifies this difficulty, showing that the concern and conflicts over gender, social action, and inter-Buddhist relations have created a complex and unique American religion.

Buddhism in America faces a basic dilemma as a world religion transplanted into a Judeo-Christian religious environment. With America’s religion represented by Christianity and its secular world permeated by a civil religion, Buddhism represents a foreign religious tradition. Still, for various reasons, as presented convincingly by Seager, it is gaining recognition and acceptance. Even with a short collective history, the numbers of Buddhists in the United States are now estimated to be between 2 to 3 million adherents.

Seager’s work is not meant to be comprehensive. It is a fine introduction to the many complex issues and questions that
Buddhists face as they gain acceptance into a new religious milieu. It is a very useful and valuable volume on the history and reasons for the popularity of Buddhism in America.

University of Washington

TETSUDEN KASHIMA