Both as history and for instruction, War in European History, 1660-1792 is extremely useful. In the last decade, Black has published several fuller treatments of European military history in the early modern period. Here, he condenses much of his previous work into a short, accessible volume presenting early modern European military history in useful and meaningful historiographical contexts. This volume gives the reader an overview of the state-of-scholarship of early modern military history as well as provides valuable bibliographic guidance to many sub-topics. In addition to being sound historically, the volume is an excellent resource for instructors.

Black’s main point is that the conventional view of European warfare from 1660-1792 is misleading. Falling between two supposedly more “formative and significant periods” of “military revolution” and the French Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars, this era is typically characterized as “limited in nature and indecisive in character and consequence” (p. 1). In terms of the character of warfare, Black argues, such thinking “underrates the ability of armies and navies of this period to fight in a determined fashion, fully using their resources, and to deliver victory” (p. 53). In terms of consequence, “this era represents key years in European and world history” (p. 2). Because of Russia’s and Austria’s success against the Ottoman Empire, the Eastern Question emerged; Britain gained decisive advantage on the seas and expanded its empire (the loss of the 13 colonies that formed the United States being the one major exception). To Black, these hugely consequential developments for European and world history render misleading the traditional characterization of warfare in this period.

The volume provides historiographical guidance to major questions. In chapter 1, “Europe in the World,” Black argues that, when fighting non-European powers, the period represents “continuation of the situation that existed in 1494-1660;” there were some successes and some failures when fighting non-Europeans (p. 5). British settlers overcame Native American resistance, “albeit with considerable difficulties and often incompletely” (p. 6). In chapter 2, “War and the State: Government, Knowledge, and Society,” he argues that “war and state building remained close in this era” (p. 9). Black’s emphasis is not on the growth of government and the creation of more effective bureaucratic systems, but on the ability of governments to win political support of major landowners and merchant oligarchs. With this support, governments’ armies could perform internal functions—typi-
cally associated today with the responsibilities of police forces—to further strengthen the state. Because European states began to have permanent forces, there was a shift in institutional character toward one valuing “consistency, regularity, and uniformity.” Information, especially printed, was crucial to this shift (p. 13).

In subsequent chapters on “dominance” on land, at sea, and outside Europe, as well as in a chapter on the nature of conflict, Black summarizes scholarship, addressing what we know and pointing out areas that need further research. These observations are especially helpful in understanding the degree to which generalizations of the period must be qualified. The chapter on dominance on land is organized country by country (France, Russia, Spain, and Austria) and could be very functional for undergraduates and perhaps high school students as they identify secondary literature on potential topics for papers. Chapter 4, “Dominance at Sea,” devotes considerable attention to the neglected topic of the Mediterranean as well as the better-known struggle for the Atlantic. In chapter 5, Black assesses the struggles between European powers outside of Europe. Chapter 6, on the nature of conflict, gives a vivid sense of battle conditions and how they changed during the course of war.

Black closes by returning to the theme that this era of European warfare was “limited and indecisive” and makes fully clear that he thinks neither of these adjectives is appropriate. With this examination of European history, he furthermore challenges the standard view that the American War for Independence signified the beginning of modern warfare. Finally, Black focuses attention on the policing role of armies at the end of the early modern period, noting that prejudices of historians against investigating uses of armed forces to suppress rebellion at home have left this topic lamentably under-researched. Although their primary focus was war with other European states, early modern navies and, especially, armies faced a variety of goals, resulting in different preparation levels for different circumstances. In this and many other ways, the period from 1660-1792 was one of continuity with the era preceding it; nonetheless, it was also characterized by important incremental change.

Grafton High School, Yorktown, Virginia

Robert A. Pierce


In recent years, historians developed the term “Long War” to help us conceptualize the seventy-five year period of the two world wars and the Cold War as one sustained era of conflict. Though there were intervals of superficial peace, the nationalistic and ideological rivalries that destabilized Europe throughout the period were never truly resolved until communism collapsed and the European Union provided a new stability. (Inconveniently, with the recent expropriation of the long war concept by commentators who see the U.S. war on terrorism and its Iraqi and Afghan variants as an open-ended era of conflict, the utility of the term to cover European history from 1914 to 1989 is now at risk.) A recent addition to the historical literature on the European long war is Richard Hall’s brief survey of this era of profound political instability, social disruption, and total warfare. But as a scholar whose focus has been on the Balkan region, Hall expands the long war on both ends, choosing to view the Balkan Wars that preceded World War One and the Balkan civil wars of the 1990s that succeeded the collapse of communism as the first and
last spasms of the explosive nationalism that was the basic source of all the conflict in between. He proceeds to develop this thesis in a remarkably concise and clearly written series of chronological chapters totaling less than 250 pages of text.

But there is a high cost to this concision. For instance, no introduction previews the themes of the book; instead Hall launches readers directly into the Balkan Wars from 1878 to 1914. By page two, the reader is being asked to keep track of the bewildering details of ever-changing alliances and episodic warfare involving both the Great Powers and the welter of nationalities seeking with varying degrees of success to create nation states in southeastern Europe. Fact is piled upon fact with virtually no broad explanation of underlying forces, and the reader can be forgiven for losing track of the forest in the midst of all the trees. When Hall emerges from the Balkan woods to treat the First World War as Act Two of the long war, most readers will of course be in more familiar territory. But here emerges another problem for this book. In covering the Great War in fifty pages, Hall cannot linger over the vivid details that catch the reader’s imagination or do more than hint at the broad underlying socio-economic, technological, and political variables that account for why one side won and the other lost. The same necessarily streamlined approach is found in the coverage of the interwar years, World War Two and the Cold War, and it explains why Hall does not have space for allowing readers more than brief glimpses of the major debates historians have had over how to explain and interpret these complex events. In particular, both the onset of the Cold War and its conclusion are accounted for in the simplest terms, with a narration of events that leaves the reader unenlightened as to the deeper forces at work. Most readers are likely to find this overview approach too bland, as if the history has had wrung out of it all the personalities, human details, and conflicting interpretations that usually make reading history so intriguing.

If Hall were offering a new interpretation of this crowded historical period, it would be understandable to summarize in so brisk a fashion the facts needed to make his case. But apart from giving the Balkan region a higher than normal status as an exemplar of the explosive kind of twentieth-century nationalism that destabilized the continent for so long, this volume offers nothing but standard interpretations in a conventional form. The major thesis of the book—that nationalism was the root of all evil in twentieth-century Europe—is clearly stated in the concluding chapter. But this is hardly breaking new ground.

Professional historians will find Hall’s book a competent narrative of familiar territory, but disappointingly weak on interpretive perspectives that might engage their interest. As for undergraduates assigned Consumed by War as a required text, I can only imagine how early in the process of reading it they would be agreeing with the throwaway line that history is just one darn fact after another. Few would be likely to persevere with such a dauntingly unrelenting chronology of events.

Northern Kentucky University

Jeffrey C. Williams


A letter written by Robert R. Moton (principal of Tuskegee Institute) to President Woodrow Wilson was reprinted in the May 1917 issue of The Crisis. In part it read “Notwithstanding the difficulties which my race faces in many parts of this country, some of which I called to your attention in my previous letter, I am writing to assure you that you and
the nation can count absolutely on the loyalty of the mass of the Negroes to our country and its people, North and South; and as in previous wars, you will find the Negro people rallying almost to a man to our flag” (The Crisis, May 1917, p. 37). That issue of The Crisis also included a photograph of “French African fighters” resting after their victory at Douaumont (The Crisis, May 1917, p. 29). The letter and photograph provide a glimpse into African Americans’ campaign to secure a place for black men in the war effort. The Crisis, like other black newspapers, proved to be an accessible recruitment vehicle. Even W. E. B. Du Bois, the great scholar and champion for black social, economic, and political rights, beseeched black men to “forget [momentarily] our special grievances” and “close ranks” with white men to fight for democracy abroad. Of course, he and others believed that participation in World War I would yield profound and tangible changes in black people’s domestic lives. They had miscalculated.

In her compelling manuscript, Freedom Struggles: African Americans and World War I, Adriane Lentz-Smith contextualizes the experiences of black soldiers heeding the call. She argues “The coming of the Great War both gave African Americans new weapons with which to fight and, by expanding and intensifying their struggle on fronts foreign as well as domestic, added to their already considerable burden” (p. 2). Many in the African American community deemed participation in World War I as necessary to combat white supremacy and claim full citizenship rights, and cast black soldiers as primary agents in the freedom struggle. On one hand, African American servicemen seized the opportunity to fight for citizenship rights and to assert their manhood through military service. On the other hand, white supremacists worked diligently to shape the experience of black men who donned the uniform.

Freedom Struggles is organized into seven chapters with an introduction and epilogue. In chapters one and two, Lentz-Smith constructs a narrative that places blacks within the context of a racially divided Jim Crow South. When African American soldiers arrived in cities such as Houston, they encountered white supremacists invested in maintaining the South’s racial hierarchy. Lentz-Smith captures aptly the outrage of white Houstonians denied the right to control fully the public and private lives of black servicemen. Therefore, when a black soldier of the 24th Infantry stationed at Camp Logan intervened in the arrest of a defenseless black woman, the gates that provided African American soldiers with a modicum of protection came tumbling down—however, it was not whites penetrating the barrier dividing local whites and black military men. It was African American men who reacted violently toward those who heaped abuses upon them by “mercilessly” killing white Houstonians. In the end, black male participants in the 1917 Houston riot would pay the ultimate price for “using manhood to claim citizenship” (p. 45).

In chapters three, four, and five, Lentz-Smith moves rhythmically from America’s segregated South to Europe, where proponents of segregation decried that “French women ruined Negroes.” African American soldiers like Rayford Logan openly and defiantly courted white French women, and such relationships, according to the author, “bolstered their masculinity” and highlighted the United States Army’s inability to transport Jim Crow across the Atlantic. Hence, African American soldiers’ experience in France allowed them to imagine “life unfettered by segregation” (p. 108). Chapters six and seven chronicle African Americans’ postwar lives. Black servicemen returned from war and lashed out against Jim Crow, but African Americans quickly realized that their support and participation in the Great War failed to produce a “New Negro.” However, war did provide them with a “new theater … to wage old battles over nation and state, color and access, power and rights” (p. 208).

Lentz-Smith’s work complements recent studies that chronicle how military service shaped and reshaped notions of black manhood. Her work is accessible and appropriate
for undergraduate and graduate students, especially those enrolled in courses that consider the early 20th century, African Americans, World War I, and Civil Rights history.

Gettysburg College Sharita Jacobs Thompson


When a high school teacher told me recently that she showed *Gone with the Wind*—the entire film—to “teach” the Civil War, her uncritical acceptance of commercial films as effective secondary sources struck me as naïve. Early in my own high school history teaching career, I took the opposite approach, showing Hollywood films like *The Patriot* mostly to criticize their historical inaccuracies. Eventually, I came to realize that my debunking approach to these films was as problematic as my colleague’s uncritical use of them. I came to see that commercial films could serve useful, constructive academic purposes if the teacher thoughtfully contextualized their use. *Teaching History with Film* fills a gap in social studies education literature by offering this kind of balanced approach to the use of Hollywood films in the secondary history-social studies classroom, an approach that assumes such films can serve several pedagogical purposes if used carefully. The title does not clearly indicate that the book focuses almost entirely on Hollywood films, not documentary films.

The book is divided into five parts, each of which contains two chapters. Part I offers an overview of the book. It consists of an introduction that previews the structure and contents of the book and another that explores challenges in using film to teach history, such as considering film as a historical text and selecting films appropriately. Parts II through V deal successively with various functions of film in the history classroom: to develop “empathy” or perspective-taking as either an emotional or a cognitive skill, to develop interpretive skills, to teach about controversial issues, and “to visualize the past and film as historical narrative.” These functions of film are nicely contextualized within the burgeoning literature on disciplinary approaches to teaching history-social science represented by Keith Barton, Linda Levstik, Peter Seixas, Sam Wineburg, and others. After the final chapter, which considers the ways film offers a narrative of the past that may differ from conventional textbook narratives, the book ends somewhat abruptly without a concluding chapter.

Each chapter in parts II through V centers on a classroom “case,” not a case study in the technical research-based sense, but a close examination of actual teaching practice. The authors caution that these cases are not normative or exhaustive of the possible approaches to teaching with film. Nonetheless, the careful examination of actual instruction that the chapters provide turns about to be a great strength, one of the reasons this book should be a great success among secondary teachers and college education instructors alike. The authors describe each case in enough detail to allow readers to envision how the featured teacher used particular films—the demographics of the school, the type of class, the unit in which the film was used, and the particular way in which the film or films were used. More attention to the teachers’ own words would better reveal the thinking behind their planning and their reactions to instruction. It would be especially helpful to know how they might teach the unit next time after reflecting on the instruction as described in the book. Each chapter incorporates a number of useful documents within the case, including unit plan
charts, filmographies, student handouts, and essay prompts. After this “thick description” of practice, the authors analyze the teacher’s use of film, suggesting both strengths and weaknesses in his or her approach. They close each chapter with general suggestions about how to use film to address the particular historical skill addressed in that chapter.

There are a couple of weaknesses in this otherwise excellent book. The first is organizational. The authors’ choice to present each case as an example of a particular type of historical skill (to create empathy, to develop critical thinking) is problematic, as most cases represent several skills—something the authors acknowledge in the introduction. It might be better to present each case on its own terms and then debrief it in terms of all of the historical skills it addresses. The second weakness has more to do with the substance of the book. It does not present a wide enough range of models. There are few examples of middle school classrooms, and even fewer examples of world history instruction. Furthermore, most of the classes featured in the book are electives, not the required survey courses where standards severely constrain teacher practice. In standards-driven classes, teachers would have great difficulty finding time to show even a single full-length Hollywood film. The book would have been much more effective if it had wrestled with this issue vigorously, for example by profiling teachers who use film segments successfully, rather than only describing teachers who screen entire films.

Despite these concerns, however, Teaching History with Film provides useful guidelines for a thoughtful, sophisticated use of film to serve a range of instructional purposes in the secondary classroom. In doing so, it offers teachers and education faculty a helpful resource in effectively using a medium that has long been a staple of the history classroom.

California State University, Long Beach

David Neumann


Debra Meyers and Burke Miller, editors of Inequity in Education: A Historical Perspective, have compiled a volume of essays by a number of writers highlighting “some of the difficulties that underserved groups have faced” (p. 6) in the history of American education. It should be noted this book is not a detailed narrative of America’s educational history—rather, it offers a “glimpse into the important issues that have defined its evolution” while also exploring the “historical foundations of problems facing our schools today” (p. 6).

Burke Miller writes a useful introductory overview of American educational history which is then followed by twelve essays focused on various educational issues. Joshua Garrison’s initial essay presents a valuable historiographical account of how historians have written the history of American education. He points out that Bernard Bailyn’s Education in the Forming of American Society is the opening salvo in the ongoing debate about the approach historians have utilized to explain education’s role in forming American society and culture. The early contributions of Ellwood Cubberly and the outstanding work of Lawrence Cremin are described as linking educational history to the broader American historical narrative. Cremin’s perspective suggests that “the moral of educational history is the common school triumphant, and with it the republic” (p. 12). Garrison then brings into the debate more recent critiques by educational historians including Michael Katz, Sol Cohen, and others who take issue with Cremin’s views. Revisionists like Cohen and Colin Greer disagree with Cremin’s conclusions that American schools promoted opportunity
Garrison’s essay prepares the reader well for the subsequent essays, which include one on women’s education, another on orphan “training” in nineteenth-century New York City. Others focus on racial issues, vocational education, and more recent issues such as expansion of Christian day schools and home schooling. All of the essays are interesting reading, although in a volume like this, some topics are more engaging and useful than others. Sarah Adelman’s study of New York City orphanages (1830-1890) was fascinating detailing how orphanages generally prepared children for their futures as adults. Orphanage managers created institutions that restricted “children’s contact with the world outside asylum walls—the children lived, ate, played and went to school within the asylum, interacting only with asylum staff and other inmates” (p. 80). Yet the asylum schools were plagued with significant teacher turnover, poor facilities, and discipline problems. Contrasted with that picture was the New York Hebrew Orphan Asylum, which did not “seek to entirely isolate children, nor did it assume these children were necessarily destined to remain in the class into which they were born” (p. 90). The Hebrew Asylum integrated children into the larger community through attendance “at public school” and extended “opportunities beyond the most basic skills” (p. 90). Adelman argues that experience offered “the viability of an alternate path in educating asylum children” (p. 90).

Another thoughtful essay is focused on schools in Monongalia County, West Virginia, deep in the coal mining region of the Mountaineer State. Written by Connie Parks Rice, this essay analyzes the struggle of African-American parents, educators, and leaders to achieve equal education for minority children in one of America’s poorest rural areas. One black teacher, Dewey Fox, helped lead the struggle to provide equal educational opportunities for African-American children. In 1933, minority teachers, led by Fox, petitioned for a central black high school that “would make higher education more available to black students throughout the county” (p. 171). The WPA allotted $57,619 for construction of the high school and on May 27, 1938, First Lady Eleanor Roosevelt dedicated the school. For Dewey Fox, that day was the “highlight” of his life (p. 171).

All twelve well-written essays cannot be summarized here. Suffice to say they cover a multitude of topics. One excellent concept the editors included is a list of “Questions to Consider” at the end of each essay which may serve as the basis for generating classroom discussion and analysis by instructors and students in undergraduate and graduate courses. The editors also provide excerpts from primary source documents that relate to the issues examined in each essay. Those documents offer further information and research material that students can utilize to enrich their knowledge of these significant topics.

Teachers seeking a supplement to a course textbook for introductory classes in educational history or educational foundations will find this a useful collection of essays. They capture the essence of many challenges that “underserved groups” have faced in the history of our nation.

Southern Connecticut State University
Jon E. Purmont


Hilary J. Moss offers a unique glimpse into the construction of American citizenship in the antebellum period through the careful examination of three Northern Cities: Baltimore,
New Haven, and Boston. Moss proposes that as education became a right of citizenship and a medium through which citizenship could be disseminated, African Americans were increasingly isolated from this experience. Moss’s insistence on race as a necessary component to understanding the common school movement furthers Carl Kaestle’s work that emphasizes republicanism, Protestantism, and capitalism as contributing factors. The rise of the common school and its program of creating responsible and intelligent citizens naturally precluded African Americans who lacked access to citizenship and its benefits. As African Americans began to demand education, often creating separate institutions of learning, resistance from whites escalated. It was only in cases where white citizens felt that the racial hierarchy could remain unchallenged were African Americans allowed education, albeit without the accompanying expectations of citizenship.

The juxtaposition of the three case studies offers a wonderfully intricate point of comparison. In New Haven, free African Americans received the greatest hostilities toward black education. The legacy of Puritan education for all, in order to create good Christians capable of reading scriptures, soon gave way to overt violence and aggression after 1827. Moss asserts this can be explained by the transition from blacks demanding education in order to go back to Africa to requiring education in order to be good black American citizens. This emphasis on citizenship, combined with rising factions of abolitionists in the North, threatened Connecticut whites’ sense of stability and need for a codified racial hierarchy. Boston, as a study, echoes this point. As free African Americans living in Boston began to demand education, believing “that their liberty depended upon an ability to assert American identity,” white Bostonians balked (p. 130). Baltimore, home to the largest free African American population in the United States in the antebellum period, and located in a slave-holding state, provided the greatest access for African American education. Unthreatened by educated African Americans, Baltimore’s white residents did not resist African American schools or demands for education because they thought it was economically advantageous. Skilled and educated free African Americans provided an affordable and useful employable work force. Furthermore, the diversity of Baltimore and its increasingly large free population helped the communities to more easily disguise runaway slaves.

This monograph, an extraordinary contribution to studies of education and free blacks in the antebellum period, demands that historians look at public schools in the pre-war period as a site of identity construction. The notion of citizenship, so important after the American Revolution, relied upon schools to transmit the message of American citizenship. The conflation of the dual purposes of civic responsibility and education excluded free African Americans who lacked claims to citizenship. Excluding African Americans from public schools allowed whites to define who were American citizens, and more importantly, who were not. The politics of exclusion allowed white Americans to implement and defend a racial hierarchy that relied heavily upon assumptions of African American ignorance and illiteracy.

Strong writing, clear organization, and prodigious research makes this an accessible and volume for historians and educators alike. For those studying the evolution of American education, Moss offers useful and insightful commentary. The difficulties in defining the purposes and programs of American education combined with the real lived experience require looking at this history from all angles, including race. Historians of the antebellum period will find confirmation of white insecurity in the face of the shifting racial paradigms and increased calls for citizenship on the eve of the American Civil War. Overall, Moss makes valid and well-supported points that greatly contribute to the fields of education and American history.

College of Charleston

Sandra Slater
Mark Wahlgren Summers’ *A Dangerous Stir* is, in many ways, a work of traditional political history. Those looking for history from below will be disappointed. Instead, the book’s focus is the politics of Washington with public opinion represented largely through the voice of newspaper editors. The subject matter, Reconstruction politics, is also among the most thoroughly tilled fields in U.S. history. Nonetheless, by focusing on the role of “unreasonable, sometimes unreasoning, fear” in political discourse, Summers finds something new and fresh to say about the politics of Reconstruction. Republican Reconstruction policies, he argues, were driven by a widespread and exaggerated sense that “four years of war had thrown the normal constitutional process dangerously out of kilter—indeed, so dangerously that the republic itself lay in peril.” Northerners, he maintains, embraced the idea of equal citizenship not on moral grounds, but as a necessary step to preserve the republic and forestall the threat of renewed civil war. Once these fears subsided, northern support for civil rights enforcement in the South waned. Republican Reconstruction ended, he maintains, not because it had failed, but because most northerners believed that it had achieved its central goal—the goal of preserving the republic.

Teachers and scholars of Reconstruction, particularly those with an interest in national politics, will find Summers’ work provocative. Its direct usefulness in the secondary or undergraduate classroom, however, will be limited. The author’s thickly detailed account of Reconstruction politics assumes significant prior knowledge. In fact, Summers’ work is framed largely as the retelling of a familiar story. Those acquainted with figures such as President Andrew Johnson and with a basic understanding of Reconstruction-era party politics will find much to reflect upon. Those who lack such background, including the vast majority of our students even at the advanced undergraduate level, will find themselves lost in a mountain of unfamiliar details.

Summers’ book is intended, in part, as a riposte to those, such as Kenneth Stampp and Eric Foner, who stress the potentially transformative effect of Republican Reconstruction policies. Most Americans, Summers points out, had little taste for revolutionary change. In fact, radical change and renewed civil strife were precisely what most Americans, North and South, wished to avoid. Demagogic fear-mongering by partisan Republicans, who warned of conspiratorial plots by unrepentant rebels, might temporarily rally northern support for vigorous Reconstruction policies, but in the end, for Summers, such tactics were destructive and the policies they supported unsustainable. According to Summers, the heroes of the story are the northern moderates, who understood that fear-based politics and the demonization of partisan opponents was itself a threat to the republic. “Reconstruction on terms fitting our own ideas of justice was attainable, for a price; but the price may have well been a republic likely to endure,” he writes.

While Summers effectively documents the exaggerated conspiratorial tone adopted by both Democratic and Republican politicians during Reconstruction, he understates the degree to which “unreasonable” fears rested on a real material basis. Though neither former Confederates nor their northern Democratic allies had much taste for renewed civil war, four years of conflict had indeed demolished the existing constitutional order. A simple return to the republic as it had been, minus slavery, was thus impossible. In such an uncertain environment, a degree of fear was not simply warranted, but also natural. While most Americans (or most white Americans, at least) may have preferred simply to move on, the profound issues raised by war and emancipation could not be evaded, hence the desperate quality of much Reconstruction politics. Particularly justified were...
the anxieties of former slaves (and their white allies), who quite rightly feared that their promised freedom might take the form of a semi-slave status. Indeed, the greatest weakness of Summers’ work is the scant attention given the perspectives of former slaves. While northern fears for the survival of the republic might be exaggerated, black fears of their exclusion from that republic were not, and as scholars of African American history have demonstrated, the refusal of former slaves to simply accept a servile status played a central role in shaping Reconstruction politics. Nevertheless, Summers has given us much to think about, particularly the role that the fear of civil strife played in both generating and undermining northern support for equal citizenship in the years that followed emancipation.

University of Wisconsin-Superior

Joel M. Sipress


_The Tube Has Spoken_ is a collection of essays on “reality television” by scholars in history, literature, and media and cultural studies. But its principal editors are historians, and they claim that their contributors were encouraged to “approach” the subject with historical questions in mind. The aim of the book is to deepen our understanding of the genre by assessing its role in contributing to “national memory” and “individual and collective identity.” The programs that its contributors discuss include Australian, Canadian, and British shows as well as American ones, and its transnational perspective is one of the book’s most interesting features.

The first section, “Reality TV as Social Experiment,” is a general overview of the genre. It features essays on perhaps the first example for reality television, Alan Funt’s _Candid Camera_, as well as more recent competitive-themed programs such as the British version of _Big Brother_, a controversial British cooking show, and _The Biggest Loser_. The second section focuses on the genre’s treatment of family life. Its highlight is an essay on the landmark PBS series _An American Family_ (1973) which documented the tribulations of the Louds, an upper-middle-class Southern California family caught up in the social and cultural upheavals of the early 1970s. The final section is the most stimulating and rewarding. Examining reality shows that present “living history,” it concludes with a fascinating essay by a documentary filmmaker, Aurora Scheelings, who worked on an Australian living-history program.

Not surprisingly, the essays in this book vary widely in approach and quality. I was most impressed with the ones on living history—perhaps because I was unaware of most of the programs they discuss and, as a historian, was intrigued by the premise of having ordinary people “experience” life in the past. I found Scheelings’ contribution most interesting of all, largely because it shed a welcome light on the techniques and processes that are employed to craft reality programs. Fred Nadis’s essay on _Candid Camera_ was also informative, revealing the assumptions that inspired Funt’s choice of subjects and some of the pathbreaking methods that he used to make the show appealing to viewers. In general, however, the essays in this book foreground neither the production nor the consumption of reality television programs. Rather than rigorous histories, most of the essays are better classified as analytic “readings” of reality TV, an emphasis that unfortunately limits their usefulness as well as their readability and makes the book unsuitable
for the undergraduate or high school classroom. This is true even of those that address interesting subjects like PBS’s *An American Family*. After reading about the series, I was struck by how much more I wanted to know about the creation of the program and disconcerted that the authors, Laurie Rupert and Sayanti Guguly Puckett, had neglected to discuss important contextual factors—about the show’s origins, production, and reception—in favor of providing a summary of its main plot themes. More disappointing were the essays on *The Biggest Loser* and *Kid Nation*, which were bogged down by the usual cultural studies jargon. Although they attempt to deconstruct the “normalizing” and “hegemonic” agendas that lay behind these seemingly trivial entertainment programs, they say nothing about why such programs are on the air or why real people respond to them in varied and quite unpredictable ways. The texts allow the writers to show us their “moves,” but as historians, we must not marvel at how well they perform them as they reach conclusions that are preordained and unquestioned.

Reality television is an important form of commercial popular culture and has been around longer than one might assume. Blurring the line between fact and fiction, and between scripted and unscripted programming, it has become very popular with viewers throughout the world. For the history classroom, *The Tube Has Spoken* is not a very good introduction to the subject. Too many of the essays assume a prior knowledge of television and film studies, and at no point are we provided with a history of the genre that might allow readers to appreciate its connections to other kinds of television shows or the reasons why such programs have become so ubiquitous. One can only hope that when such a volume finally appears, it will convey some of the drama and liveliness of the best programs in the field—and be written in a style that is more historically engaging.

*California State University, Long Beach*  
Charles L. Ponce de Leon


Part of the title is a good description of England’s King Charles II and part of it is not. Over five hundred pages of this book cover in detail the period 1660 to 1670, when Charles II tried to stabilize his rule after being restored to the throne. As for the gambling part, the author never effectively makes that case. The restored Charles himself reputedly stated that, after spending fifteen years of his life in exile, he did not wish to go on his travels again. Especially in these early years, he gambled reluctantly, if at all. Rather, the king coped with events—war, plague, and fire—he could not to shape them. The areas in which he tried to do some shaping, like religious toleration and government finance, produced some judicious probing, but not high-stakes gambles.

It is true that at the very end of this period, Charles did take a major gamble. The man who was the supreme governor of the Church of England secretly promised Louis XIV of France that he would convert to Roman Catholicism. If that promise had ever became public, Charles might well have gone on his travels again. Ironically, the author downplays this major risk and in effect characterizes it as not much of a gamble.

So, gambler or no gambler, who would benefit learning about Charles II from this book? It would undoubtedly work best with college-level students who have some background in seventeenth-century English history. To help them along, the style of writing is assured, direct, and easy to read. In terms of subject matter, this is a life and times study of Charles. Periodically, he fades nearly completely out of sight, such as when the author spends two
chapters explaining the development of the Royal Society. This is not to say that chapters that focus on Charles are lacking. The author has several good ones that examine both his personal and political life. For teaching students about the era, this wide-angle approach is certainly more useful than one focusing only on Charles’s actions.

Having said all these positive things about this book, it has features that might well give pause before assigning it. The first is that there is nothing new here. The vast majority of the sources are printed primary works, such as the Pepys and Evelyn diaries. Too many scholars have used these sources for too many years for new findings to emerge by relying primarily on them.

The next frustrating aspect of this book is occasional carelessness and factual inaccuracy. Just a few examples should suffice here. Charles could not “confiscate all land, and … levy taxes on all who walked upon it” (p. 53). No English king in his right mind could or would. Nor did Star Chamber, a judicial committee of the Privy Council, have the power to levy taxes (p. 77).

Finally, for someone who uses language so skillfully, some word definitions caused the author problems. The term “tarpaulin,” applied to a naval officer, refers to one who achieved command through talent, as opposed to the gentlemen officer who gained it by virtue of class privilege. The difference between them has little or nothing to do with the source of their patronage (p. 318).

With respect to parliament, the king could dissolve the whole body, Lords and Commons. Then, before they could meet again, the king had to issue writs for elections to the Commons and new personal writs of summons to the Lords. Alternatively, the king could prorogue the parliament, meaning he temporarily adjourned both Houses. Then, these same people would meet again at some future date. Despite what the author states, in 1668, the king did not dissolve the Commons (pp. 448-449). The so-called Cavalier Parliament sat for another ten years.

If readability and viewing the king in the context of his court society are the primary concerns, this book should serve nicely. If total accuracy and historical innovation are more important, find another book.

Emeritus, Indiana University South Bend

Roy Schreiber


Only since the second half of the twentieth century have some historians begun to integrate peace research into scholarship as a legitimate alternative perspective on the past. Previously, to the extent that pacifists, peace advocates, and peace movements were even included in historical monographs and textbooks, they were generally treated negatively—denounced as misguided idealists or even traitorous. Nevertheless, increasing citizen involvement in matters related to war and peace provides students and scholars with a valuable resource for historical analysis. To assist curious minds, adding to the growing body of peace history literature in this regard is Nigel Young’s impressive and massive *International Encyclopedia of Peace*.

His edited work represents the most comprehensive and all-encompassing reference on almost every aspect of peace published to date. It is a stunning achievement given its depth and breadth. Every school and university library should purchase this work, if for no other reason than to acquaint students with the tireless efforts of thousands of
global citizens, government officials, and organizations who pushed for a peaceful world order and greater human understanding. While it is true that students are more familiar with wars and military figures, Young’s encyclopedia brings to light a largely forgotten aspect: that throughout history, the clock hours of peace have existed far longer than that of war.

The four-volume set represents the high-water mark of the interdisciplinary field of Peace Studies. The over 850 entries cover philosophical, historical, theoretical, and political issues involving efforts to resolve international conflicts. What is most useful for teachers and students is the text’s arrangement. All entries are listed alphabetically, cross-referenced, well-written, and concise. Longer essays address topics such as art and war, nuclear disarmament, conflict resolution and peace studies, the American civil rights movement, conscientious objection, children in war and peace, gender and war, eco-pacifism, and many other interesting topics. A bibliography is appended to each entry for further reading; a topical outline of entries is also provided. In addition, to make the work more attractive to students and teachers is a select list of key documents, important terms in peace research, and selected notable references. Such additions will certainly assist high school students as well as college students interested in writing research papers on the topic of war and peace. Such finding aids are indispensable to assisting those who are not familiar with the emerging field of peace studies from a global perspective.

In terms of entries, there are essays on individuals such as John Dewey, Martin Luther King, Jr., César Chávez, Dorothy Day, Albert Camus, Albert Einstein, Dag Hammarskjöld, Rosa Luxemburg, Leo Tolstoy, and Bertrand Russell, among others. Major events include the Cuban Missile Crisis, Dayton Accords, Kellogg-Briand Pact, Helsinki Accords, South Africa and ending apartheid, and the Good Friday Agreements. Notable organizations such as the League of Nations, United Nations, the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom, and the International Committee of the Red Cross are also included. Controversial issues such as terrorism, war crimes, the use of landmines and efforts to ban them, and ethnic cleansing round out the reference’s comprehensive nature.

Naturally, it is possible to quibble over some topics that were not included: Elihu Burritt and the League of Universal Brotherhood, the post-World War I workers’ education movement and anti-war actions undertaken by Brookwood Labor College in the United States, Alfred Love’s Universal Peace Union, and the Lake Mohonk Arbitration Conferences of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Nevertheless, such omissions pale by comparison to the coverage of topics that are addressed—academic, scientific, and scholarly approaches to peace, arms control and disarmament (treaties and agreements), conflict analysis and negotiation, contemporary threats to peace, globalization and resources, activists and theorists, international law and human rights, nonviolent theory and practice, peace organizations, peace culture in the arts and literature, peace ideas and ethics, peace movements, women and gender issues, and peace and world religions. In these four volumes, peace scholars and students interested in learning more about the instruments of peace will not be disappointed. Young’s encyclopedia represented the benchmark in references addressing the issues of war and peace. It will not be surpassed and only can be added to in the years ahead.

Molloy College

Charles F. Howlett
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