

## Reviews

*Little Rock: Race and Resistance at Central High School*, by Karen Anderson. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2010. 330 pages. \$35.00, cloth.

The effort of the NAACP and the “Little Rock Nine” to integrate all-white Central High School in Little Rock, Arkansas in 1957 in the first high-profile challenge to enforcement of *Brown v. Board of Education* has become one of the most iconic moments in the history of the civil rights movement, indeed in twentieth-century America. Unfortunately, in attaining iconic status, this event has often become two-dimensional to students, with heroes triumphing over villains in a straightforward narrative of progress. In *Little Rock: Race and Resistance*, Karen Anderson offers a nuanced portrayal of this key moment that reveals the complex motives and decisions of actors on both sides as they navigated the social, political, and legal structures of Little Rock. By avoiding a triumphalist narrative, Anderson’s account provides three-dimensional depth to this tumultuous event. In so doing, it sheds light on interwoven tensions of race, class, and gender in civil rights struggles and American history more generally.

Though *Little Rock* addresses Constitutional and legal issues, it focuses on social relations between participants and meanings they attributed to events. Invoking key constructs of social historians, Anderson essentially argues that Little Rock and its aftermath are best understood not simply through the lens of race, but through those of class, gender, and sexuality as well. While often seen as monolithic by outsiders, the white community of Little Rock was often divided along class lines in its response to integration efforts. “Moderates,” generally composed of the business and professional classes, tended to favor gradual, token integration of black students into all-white schools in compliance with federal mandates. Poor and working-class whites, by contrast, were more likely to reject any attempt at integration, often resorting to virulently racist language and violence that more genteel whites found distasteful. Lower-class whites pointed out that they were the ones whose children would actually attend school with African Americans, while wealthier whites sent their children to suburban schools intentionally zoned to retain segregated populations. Gender and sexuality factored into this volatile mix of race and class. In an era of heightened adult anxiety about teen sexuality—particularly among girls—the integration of Central High School prompted fears of sexual intimacy across racial lines. The gendered nature of this fear is evidenced by the fact that whites’ discussion focused on possible romance between white girls and African American boys; there was considerably less concern about whites being attracted to African American girls. Finally, the Little Rock school board’s decision to close Central High School in 1958 to forestall continued

attendance by African Americans prompted differing responses from moderate whites that fell along gendered lines. Activists who advocated reopening the schools, even at the cost of accepting integration, were largely women. Their husbands often avoided taking such controversial public stances, fearing social and economic reprisals by staunch segregationists. Division within families sometimes became quite literal as children—both African American and white—moved away from home to continue their education with friends and relatives while awaiting resolution of the conflict.

From the perspective of instructors, *Little Rock* offers a complex portrait of a justly famous incident that challenges typical binaries that fail to justly portray civil rights history. First, as discussed above, the book complicates notions of a monolithic white community. Instead, it reveals tensions based on wealth and class (and often geography), as well as on gender and age. Second, it demonstrates that activism was not practiced by just African Americans or even the virtuous, as moderate and explicitly racist whites engaged in diverse forms of civic engagement. Third, though the book focuses more on social patterns than on politics proper, it nonetheless reveals the inadequacy of a federalist divide between nation and state power to explain the politics of Little Rock. The controversy included divisions *within* the state, between state and local officials, and between the school board members and other local authorities. Finally, and most importantly for students, *Little Rock* demonstrates the inadequacy of the simplistic heroic narrative of civil rights struggles that many students bring to the classroom. The struggle for equal treatment took its toll on African Americans (as well as some moderate whites) and enjoyed a short-term victory that proved largely Pyrrhic in the end. *Little Rock* offers a vivid portrait of this tumultuous chapter in civil rights history through the eyes of participants on both sides while offering the sober assessment that having justice on one's side is no guarantee of success.

*California State University, Long Beach*

David Neumann

*The Long Shadow of the Civil War: Southern Dissent and Its Legacies*, by Victoria E. Bynum. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2010. 240 pages. \$35.00, cloth.

The South during the Civil War was anything but unified over secession and slavery. Rural pockets of anti-secessionist, pro-Union feelings existed throughout the war from 1861 to 1865. For those whites refusing to support the Confederacy or avoiding service in its armies, life for them and their families could be a living hell, not infrequently resulting in their murder. For multiracial families, life during this time could be even worse. Victoria E. Bynum, a Professor of history at Texas State University, paints a vivid portrait of the lives of some of these peoples living in the North Carolina Piedmont, the Mississippi Piney Woods region, and the Big Thicket region of Texas. These case studies are personal stories of human struggle for survival as well as steadfast adherence to moral and religious principals.

Bynum sheds new light on an overlooked aspect of the Civil War, not well-known to most students of that conflict, especially secondary school students and teachers. In fact, the antebellum South attracted more than a few families opposed to slavery, most notably Mennonites, Dunkers, and Quakers. Multiracial families emerged too in these regions, and are still there today. By comparing and contrasting the three regions in her study, the author is able to present common threads of Southern Unionism. In this respect, Bynum

weaves individual and family sentiments into community thought and makes comparisons of the communities established in these geographically distinct regions. The result is an excellent profile of life and community within a hostile human environment, shedding new light, insight, and scholarly interpretation on the American Civil War. In many cases, the author transcends the experiences of the descendants of these families to the present day. This work is a significant contribution to Civil War history and the social sciences disciplines overall.

Although the scholarly prose will be most appropriate for college students, the book, in this reviewer's estimation, has significant value for the high school teacher. Slower learners and those with reading deficiencies might find it difficult, but average to above-average learners should find it rewarding if the teacher views the material as a set of case studies to be compared and contrasted. Questions regarding the similarities and dissimilarities of the individuals, families, and communities examined in the book would be very appropriate. The book can serve as a springboard for a study of the elements and dynamics of morality, race, and religion. History teachers of the senior high school level will certainly find additional topics for both oral and written expression for either group or individualized class projects. This reviewer highly recommends this book for ages sixteen to one hundred.

*Metropolitan State College of Denver*

John H. Monnett

*Uncle Sam Wants You: World War I and the Making of The Modern American Citizen*, by Christopher Capozzola. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010. 352 pages. \$35.00, cloth.

*Uncle Sam Wants You* traces World War I's transformative effects in shaping the "modern American citizen" and the American state. Capozzola contends that prior to U.S. involvement in that conflagration, the federal government possessed only limited powers, while the concept of civil liberties was ill-defined at best. The nineteen-month period of direct American engagement in WWI altered the role of both government and various private organizations, resulted in "a culture of coercive voluntarism" (p. 8), and produced a panoply of violence and repression along with a nation that "looked a little like" a lawless "police state" (p. 12) or a giant Elks Club. Much of this resulted from improvisational developments rather than any conspiratorial design to subvert American liberties and extend government's reach. In the process, the administration of Woodrow Wilson did not monopolize "legitimate violence" (p. 13), but nevertheless helped it to proliferate. That led to a new battle regarding the rights Americans possessed, while producing a more powerful state, which the radical critic Randolph Bourne warned might eventuate. The federal, state, and local governments, aided by voluntary associations, meanwhile targeted socialists, labor activists, war critics, and prostitutes, among others. The termination of the war left in its wake legacies of violence, voluntarism, an expanded state, and a quest on the part of a few determined sorts to safeguard the civil liberties imperiled by those very legacies.

For teachers of American history, political science, or constitutional law, *Uncle Sam Wants You* can serve multifold purposes. The complexity of the subject matter and the author's treatment, although facilely handled, suggests that a college-age student audience is most fitting. Teachers from middle school through graduate instruction could benefit by examining the issues Capozzola highlights. Those include a look at the role

of government, particularly at the federal level, in the everyday lives of Americans as WWI approached, unfolded, and ended. This is particularly appropriate given the ongoing battles over this very topic, but a contemporaneous emphasis is hardly needed, given its inherent importance. Similarly, an exploration of voluntary associations, including those inclined to heavy-handed approaches, would be instructive in attempting to understand their part in establishing and maintaining community standards. Useful too would be an emphasis regarding social conformity as it involved WWI-era dissidents or pariahs, ranging from draft resisters and political radicals to ladies of the evening or Americans with hyphenated names, particularly German ones. Spurred on by federal officials, who later sometimes became concerned that matters threatened to get out of hand, voluntary groups engaged in brutal assaults on their fellow citizens or immigrants. Eventually, well-connected individuals in the newly formed National Civil Liberties Bureau, including Crystal Eastman and Roger Nash Baldwin, attempted to prevent first conscientious objectors and then others from suffering wholesale violations of First Amendment rights. Both students and teachers would benefit from Capozzola's discussion of federal power during wartime, the government's uneasy employment of private groups to serve as enforcers of public morality and civic responsibility, and civil liberties considerations.

This impressively researched volume can be added to the growing literature on World War I-era political and constitutional history, which includes the earlier seminal work of William Preston, Paul Murphy, Samuel Walker, David Rabban, and Robert Justin Goldstein. Capozzola may have overemphasized the war's impact on leavening associational violence in favor of state-sponsored control, and the cultivating of a "national culture of voluntarism" (p. 22). No matter, his explication of the 1917 Selective Service Act's impact and the opposition to the draft is quite good, as is that of the "damnable dilemma" confronted by the 367,000 African Americans who served in the Jim Crowed-U.S. military. Capozzola also does a fine job looking at "slacker raiding" (p. 41), the clash between conscientious objectors and antiobjectionists, and the irony of absolutists standing as "some of twentieth-century America's first modern citizens" (p. 81) in asserting the primacy of individual rights. Other solid offerings include a look at women and coercive voluntarism, which leads to a discussion of suffragettes, and the increasingly felt need to police the home front, where social control was transmuted into "a political obligation" (p. 123). Capozzola presents a fine dissection of Bisbee, Arizona, where a culture of coercion resulted in blatant vigilantism. Political freedom and civil liberties appeared increasingly imperiled once the United States entered the war, and again the author delivers in his treatment of Jane Addams, the Espionage Act, the Sedition Act, the suppression of *The Jeffersonian* and *The Masses*, postwar Supreme Court rulings regarding the First Amendment, and residents of German ancestry.

California State University, Chico

Robert C. Cottrell

*Short Role-playing Simulations for US History Classrooms, 4<sup>th</sup> ed.* and *Short Role-playing Simulations for World History Classrooms, 4<sup>th</sup> ed.*, by Richard Di Giacomo. San Jose, CA: Magnifico Publications, 2008. 127 pages and 122 pages, \$17.50 each, spiral.

Dewey knew it. Good teachers know it. Real, authentic learning happens best when students are engaged in the material and, most importantly, when they get a chance to *do* something rather than simply passively receive information. Teachers who try to get their

students more actively involved in their learning often struggle to find materials that really work. Simulations, when attempted, are usually limited to a familiar repertoire: a stock market game, re-enactments of trench warfare (often involving overturned desks and paper wads thrown across the classroom), or possibly an exercise to demonstrate the difference between pre-industrial craftsmanship and the introduction of the assembly line.

Veteran teacher Richard Di Giacomo's extensive collection of simulations and role-playing games, offered in two volumes for the U.S. and world history classroom, are written to help teachers add to their reserve of new strategies. Di Giacomo offers an impressive variety of simulations designed to help students step into history and experience some of the decision-making and unscripted possibilities that real people in history may have also experienced. Activities include "Taking Colonies," "Strike Simulation," "Cold War Simulation," "Medieval Conversation," trials of Christopher Columbus and Martin Luther, "French Revolution Simulation," and a "Great Powers Game (W.W.I.)." Both volumes also include a section of "what if" questions, which invite students to consider a wide variety of historical possibilities. What if the Mayflower had sunk? What if Hitler had been successful as an artist? What if Nat Turner's Rebellion had succeeded? What if the Stock Market had not crashed? These are only a sample of the hundreds of intriguing questions Di Giacomo offers to spark classroom discussions or inspire creative, thoughtful essays.

Di Giacomo's books include quotes from people who enthusiastically endorse the effectiveness of his games. Former students comment that these experiences were the most fun they had in history, and that these were the lessons they remember the best. An anonymous teacher writes: "My students loved the game. They didn't want to stop!" Indeed, it is easy to see how many students would find these simulations to be the kind of classroom activity they would enjoy the most.

Valuable as they are, however, Di Giacomo's simulations could benefit from more detailed "how to" instructions to help less-experienced teachers use what he has created. Although each simulation and game contains extensive descriptions to set the scene and introduce the characters, novice teachers may still be left wondering what to do or exactly how to play. Each simulation does come with a set of instructions, but they are often vague when it comes to structuring the activity itself. Teachers who really want to venture into the world of using games and simulations would benefit from detailed, step-by-step suggestions for seating arrangements, specific roles for all students, timing for each segment, transitions, and strategies for making sure that all students remain engaged throughout the length of the lesson. In addition, these volumes would be even stronger with specific scaffolds for English Language Learners, inclusion students, and others who need more help being successful and staying actively engaged. Without these supports, marginal students may very well end up being passive observers of a smaller, more active group. Additional structure would also help teachers facilitate the activities while avoiding off-task behavior or other classroom management problems. Teachers will also need to frontload the historical context of each simulation. In some activities where Di Giacomo has not already done so, teachers will need to provide a debriefing session which will help students identify the important similarities and differences between what they simulated in class and what actually happened in history.

Di Giacomo, who has written several other books to help teachers bring history to life, should be applauded for his efforts to share his passion for engaging students in their learning. Teachers who have experience using simulations should have little problem adapting selections from these collections to their own classroom. Di Giacomo invites teachers who are eager to give his simulations a try to contact him if they have suggestions or need additional help to make their experience more successful.

*How Rome Fell: Death of a Superpower*, by Adrian Goldsworthy. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2009. 531 pages. \$32.50, cloth.

In Oxford-educated historian Adrian Goldsworthy's fascinating and readable *How Rome Fell*, the empire's collapse was not sudden, inevitable, or total. Rome was sacked by barbarian armies in 410 and 455, but powerful Western Roman armies were still taking the field into the 460s. Even after the last Western emperor was deposed in 476, emperors calling themselves "Roman" continued to rule from Constantinople. Ultimately, the Western Empire was divvied up among a patchwork of rival barbarian kingdoms, but this was not the inevitable consequence of invincible barbarian hordes. Barbarian armies were usually smallish in size and frequently used by emperors as mercenaries or even allies. Far from wanting to destroy the empire, barbarian leaders wanted to enjoy profitable pieces of it and sought imperial trappings to support their rule.

So if the barbarians were not irresistible, why did Rome eventually fall? Referencing Edward Gibbon, Goldsworthy suggests that the better question is why the empire lasted so long. Answering this big question requires looking "more closely at both the internal and external problems faced by the Roman Empire," writes Goldsworthy. "By the end of the sixth century the world was profoundly and permanently different ... This book is about how this came about" (p. 23). Goldsworthy concludes that internal political conflict lay at the root of Rome's decline. Once Roman armies realized they could make (and break) emperors wholly on their own, the threat of civil war was a constant specter. In their desire for security, emperors relied increasingly on officers drawn from the larger secondary class of wealthy citizens (*equites*). Ironically, this policy resulted in more, not fewer, potential claimants to the imperial purple. Instead of just having to worry about a few hundred senators, any high-ranking army officer could hope to be recognized as a *Caesar* or *Augustus* by force. As it became more dangerous to entrust large armies to Roman officers, emperors turned to leaders of barbarian origin who did not possess sufficient status to claim the title themselves. When barbarian armies were not needed to fight Roman civil wars, they were in a position to raid or even seize neglected territories. By the 400s, successive losses of provinces rich in taxes and personnel permanently crippled the Western imperial regime.

Beyond considerable informational value for high school world history, Goldsworthy's approach models two important qualities for reformed history education. His book is a useful example of how to balance thematic and chronological organization of content. The narrative largely follows a chronological order from the 100s to the 600s C.E., which keeps the daunting parade of details and events cogently arranged and makes causal connections. However, each chapter also revolves around a new theme central to the period. Chapter 2 ("The Secret of Empire") both chronologically covers key events of the late 100s to early 200s and develops the theme of increasing military dominance of the imperial position. Chapter 3 ("Imperial Women") both chronologically covers the mid-200s and explores the theme of the changing nature of imperial governance. Chapter 18 ("Sunset on an Outpost of Empire") offers a focused thematic look at Roman Britain that still generally fits within the book's broader chronological organization.

Equally valuable is how Goldsworthy models transparency about the limitations of evidence. His account admits where evidence is uncertain and conflicting interpretations exist. For example, throughout the book, he acknowledges the evidentiary limits of any claims involving the empire's population demographics: "There is no reliable figure for this at any period, since the numbers given in the sources are vague, sometimes contradictory ... My own suspicion—and it is no more than that—is that the figure will gradually be raised as more and more archaeological evidence accumulates" (pp. 41-42).

The interpretive and tentative nature of historical knowledge is effectively demonstrated when limits of evidence are acknowledged and explored, instead of settling for gross oversimplification.

*How Rome Fell* has a few weaknesses. Goldsworthy's conclusion and epilogue about "morals" that ancient Rome offers the world today feel obligatory and equivocal—not surprising given that his book opens with a critique of historians who have tried to compare the U.S. to the Roman Empire. The book is liberally illustrated with maps, charts, and photographs, but they are of uneven value. More maps illustrating the changes in the empire described in his narrative would be more useful than, for example, a map of Saxon Shore forts (p. 342). Despite minor weakness, *How Rome Fell* is an excellent, approachable new account of the late Roman world.

*The Pennsylvania State University*

Scott Alan Metzger

*The Lincoln Assassination: Crime and Punishment, Myth and Memory*, edited by Harold Holzer, Craig L. Symonds, and Frank J. Williams. New York: Fordham University Press, 2010. 259 pages. \$27.95, cloth.

Based upon papers delivered at the 2005 meetings of the Lincoln Forum, this collection succeeds where some books based on conferences stumble. The pieces fit together remarkably well, telling a complex story from multiple perspectives and in an array of voices.

The editors have wisely opted to move beyond the bounds of the familiar format for collections, including previously published material and allowing the nine essays to range in length and scope. The first essay, written by editors Holzer and Williams, sets the stage with a summary of the events leading to the assassination of Abraham Lincoln in Ford's Theater, followed by a close reading of the multiple images depicting the famous deathbed scene in the Petersen House across the street. Based upon their 1998 monograph, the authors have included a wonderful array of illustrations, demonstrating how contemporary artists stretched the modest room into a space large enough to accommodate as many as forty-eight mourners. Richard E. Sloan picks up the story where Holzer and Williams leave off. In another copiously illustrated essay, Sloan details how New York City cloaked itself in black and honored the fallen president as his body lay in state at City Hall and then his funeral car passed through city streets lined with mourners. These first two essays provide the reader with wonderful visual imagery, setting the tone for the volume. (Fordham University Press is to be commended for including over 50 illustrations.)

The next six essays shift our attention from national mourning to the complex legal issues that followed the assassination. Here, again, the pieces fit together snugly, as the editors have brought together an ideal cast of authors who have wrestled with these events, often for decades. Thomas P. Lowry mines his massive database on Union courts-martial to demonstrate that a surprising number of Union soldiers and sailors ran into serious trouble for expressing some pleasure at the assassination. Elizabeth Leonard, who has previously published on the assassination and its aftermath, dips into her current research to offer a fascinating portrait of Judge Advocate General Joseph Holt, who was charged with bringing the conspirators to justice. Lincoln scholar and retired Chief Justice of the Rhode Island Supreme Court, Frank Williams, brings a jurist's eye to the legal proceedings. One of the most controversial issues in 1865 concerned whether the accused should be tried in civil court or by a military tribunal. As Williams notes, such thorny jurisdictional and procedural issues continue to attract public debate today.

Thomas R. Turner, whose *Beware the People Weeping* (1982) is the classic study of the cultural impact of the Lincoln assassination, offers some interesting musings on how authors have too often studied assassinations without a proper concern for context. As if to answer Turner's call, Edward Steers, Jr.—who has written widely on the assassination, including a study of the famed Dr. Mudd—summarizes the trial proceedings and offers a strenuous defense of the military commission, while John Wilkes Booth biographer Michael W. Kauffman adds a clever analysis of how Booth manipulated the rules of evidence to lure fellow conspirators into his web while ensuring their continuing silence.

The editors have chosen to close the volume by reproducing a piece from over a half-century ago. Richard Nelson Current's "The Martyr and the Myth" first appeared in 1958, and yet the celebrated Lincoln scholar's words still seem fresh and on point. Current begins by imagining an alternative history, where Booth only wounded Lincoln and the martyr-president actually served out his second term, often battling radicals within his own party. But of course, Booth did create a martyr and the assassination spawned a host of rumors and myths. Current guides the reader through some of the more outrageous claims before turning to the controversial cases of Mary Surratt and Dr. Samuel A. Mudd. In 1958, Current concluded that both probably got a raw deal, but—in a refreshing illustration that perhaps we do really learn new things over time—he adds a brief note that in light of Steers' research on the Maryland doctor, he is now convinced that Mudd was guilty.

That one conclusion aside, this is really more a volume of strong opinions and new perspectives, rather than a compendium of hard truths. It is also a fine testimony to a fascinating array of authors—only a few who are academic historians—who gathered in Gettysburg in 2005 to talk about their passion.

University of Florida

J. Matthew Gallman

*Vietnam's Second Front: Domestic Politics, the Republican Party, and the War*, by Andrew Johns. Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 2010. 434 pages. \$40.00, cloth.

Most recent historians of the Vietnam War have at least noted that domestic political considerations have influenced the policy of American presidents toward Vietnam. Andrew Johns, an Assistant Professor of History at Brigham Young University, is the first to focus a monograph almost entirely on this proposition. Indeed, Johns concludes that Presidents Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon made their choices in Vietnam "based to a significant degree on [their] assessment of the likely political outcome" that such choices might engender (p. 339). Unlike most studies of the war, Johns also devotes considerable attention to the Republican Party's response to the Vietnam policy crafted by Democratic presidents between 1961 and 1969.

An expansion of Johns' doctoral dissertation, *Vietnam's Second Front* is exhaustively researched. The author travelled to thirty-six archival collections, consulted some ninety newspapers and periodicals, and plowed through several hundred books and articles. The result is a masterful and well-written analysis of the powerful role played by domestic politics in foreign policy decision making. To put it simply, in the 1960s, the three presidents walked a fine line trying both to prevent a communist victory in South Vietnam and placate often conflicting perceived political pressures.

The most interesting and path-breaking sections of the work deal with the role of the Republican Party, especially during the Johnson Administration. Johns weaves a complex tapestry showing that the GOP faced a difficult task when fashioning a response to what was in many ways a Democratic Party war. Put simply, the Republicans did not speak with one voice. The responses ranged from a broadly anti-war position taken by senators like Mark Hatfield (R-Oregon) to unstinting support of President Johnson by Senate Minority Leader Everett Dirksen (R-Illinois) to the shifting positions of Richard Nixon, who tried both to support the goals of the war while complaining about the means by which it was being fought. Most fascinating was former President Dwight Eisenhower's approach: he publicly supported President Johnson's policy while privately excoriating what he saw as LBJ's tactical timidity. (Johns also makes clear that Democrats did not speak with one voice either. Indeed, the anti-war impulses among members of LBJ's own party were considerably louder and more numerous than in the GOP.)

Johns certainly does a fine job in proving his main thesis: that domestic politics did have an impact on policy decision in regard to the Vietnam War. Exactly *how large* the impact was is not so clear. Perhaps such things cannot be quantified, and Johns is wise not to attempt to do so. Less wise perhaps is his failure to discuss the events at Kent State and the famous "peace is at hand" comment by Henry Kissinger during the 1972 election campaign, both of which had strong domestic political implications. Moreover, some readers might find the fact that he opens each chapter with an appropriate Greek myth a bit of a stylistic stretch. Finally, some historians of the war might wish the title of the work had been *The Vietnam War's Second Front*. Vietnam, after all, is a country, not a war. These minor criticisms aside, *Vietnam's Second Front* is a major contribution to the study of the Vietnam War.

As for teachability, although it is very engagingly written, the book's subject matter is too complex for secondary school and lower-level college history classes. It might make a nice addition to the supplementary reading list for an upper-level undergraduate course on the Vietnam War or even a U.S. since 1945 class, especially ones in which the connections between war and politics are a focus. I think its most appropriate audience would be graduate students and perhaps undergraduate history majors taking a specialized seminar on "War and Politics" or something similar. In any event, an instructor of undergraduate history courses can certainly find interesting lecture/discussion material in the book.

Ball State University

Anthony O. Edmonds

*Belzec*, directed by Guillaume Moscovitz. 100 minutes. Menemsha Films, 2010, video. \$29.95, DVD.

"A glorious page in our history that has never been written and shall never be written." These words were spoken by Heinrich Himmler, Adolf Hitler's Reichsführer, outlining and promoting the extermination of European Jewry, the details of which were to remain unrecorded. Thanks to Guillaume Moscovitz, significant details of this dark chapter in history are, indeed, recorded and made available through his production of *Belzec*. This 2010 production in both French and Polish with English subtitles, exposes the story of a Nazi death camp, Belzec, located in rural Poland on the outskirts of a small village. The Nazis operated Belzec (*Belzec*, Anglicized) from March through December of 1942, and were instrumental in exterminating approximately 600,000 Jews (the exact number is unknown).

Moscovitz's film exposes the secrets of the Nazi murder of innocent Jews in a death camp not as well-known as Sobibor and Treblinka. He accomplishes this task through his interviews of several witnesses. One, whose letter is narrated at the beginning of the film, emotionally describes the loss of his family in Belzec. Another describes the construction of the camp, for which he and others living in the area were recruited to assist. Still another recalls captured Jews arriving by train from Ukraine, Germany, Austria, and Czechoslovakia, and attests to their subsequent executions by shooting and gassing. Witnesses acknowledge their initial suspicions regarding the camp's purpose and the fear they experienced in refusing to ask questions regarding what was occurring inside its walls, and openly reveal the sights, sounds, and smells that emerged from the camp.

Unlike other Holocaust films, *Belzec* does not employ original black and white footage taken by the Nazis during Jewish internment or by the Allies after liberation. Neither does it concentrate strictly on chronological events outlining the Holocaust from beginning to end. Instead, the film-maker juxtaposes images of a natural and serene landscape of trees and grass, accompanied by sounds of the wind blowing, and of birds chirping, as witnesses provide their testimony of a very different setting in time. This natural landscape, the footprint for the actual camp, forces the viewer to ponder how such inhuman activity could once have occurred where only peace and tranquility now exist. Witnesses describe how, after the extermination process ended, the Nazis burned the bodies, buried the ashes, and dismantled the camp, disguising its location with a cover of small trees. Now, after several decades, these trees, tall and imposing, mask the unholy truth. But this truth was revealed when, below those trees, *the grass turned white*.

Internment survivor witnesses provide an especially startling dialogue. One of the only four survivors describes her two years of hiding in a small hollow space beneath a woodpile, where a young woman periodically supplied her with morsels of food, a jar in which to relieve herself, and the faith and encouragement to survive. She explains how, by her inability to communicate with anyone for the duration of her hiding, she had come to fear human beings, had lost her power of speech, and forgotten the very appearance of the blue sky of day and the evening stars of night.

*Belzec* is most appropriate for senior high school and undergraduate college students. The French and Polish narration moves quickly along with the corresponding English captions, and note-taking might prove a challenge to students who choose to record factual information rather than general impressions. The testimony of the witnesses along with their expressions and other body language will draw the attention of students and serve to convey not just a historical documentary, but a moving and very human story. This film is different from the usual that exhibit Hitler's speeches, marching soldiers, torchlight parades, and images of captives peering through barbed wire fences. It will leave an impression on students through its images of a natural landscape devoid of human beings, although hundreds of thousands of unknown victims perished there. It is a cemetery without markers. Instructors might choose to show their students selected segments rather than the entire film, since it is one hundred minutes in length.

The end of *Belzec* highlights the legal proceedings that occurred intermittently for several years, focusing on the Nazi leaders who administered the camp, and the judicial sentencing carried out against them. Students are sure to react to those results and voice them in class discussion upon completion of viewing. Through *Belzec*, Moscovitz has effectively proven Himmler wrong. Indeed, through his witnesses, he has helped to reveal a "page in our history that has never been written and shall never be written." Based on the testimony of those witnesses, a memorial at the Belzec Death Camp was inaugurated on June 3, 2004.

*History Meets Fiction*, by Beverley Southgate. Harlow, U.K.: Pearson Education, Ltd., 2009. 215 pages. £14.99, paper.

*History Meets Fiction* is an indispensable work both for those who enjoy the study of the methodology and theory of History and those who ask how such an interest can enhance the understanding and teaching of the discipline. Southgate's subject, as his title suggests, is the boundary or borderline that separates and links fiction and history.

Southgate notes that recent trends in historical practice, such as docudramas, novelized biographies, and non-fiction novels, have blurred the traditional distinction between fact and fiction. In his earlier works, such as *History: What and Why* (1996) and *Postmodernism in History* (2003), Southgate, Reader Emeritus at the University of Hertfordshire, welcomes such a blurring. Yet, in his postscript to *History Meets Fiction*, he confesses that his continuing research has led him to believe that there still is a difference between the two—but it is not as many understand it. Rather than suggesting that fact is truer than fiction, he acknowledges that historical research can give authenticity to accounts of the past, in much the same way as courts of law make rulings or individuals make judgments based on evidence. Southgate argues that historians, in order to make sense of the past, need to do the same; i.e., make an operative conclusion based on the evidence while acknowledging its limitations and tentativeness—in other words, create a narrative of the past in much the same way as a novelist creates a story.

The bulk of this provocative work is not as theoretical or abstract as its topic may suggest. Southgate grounds his analysis with cogent references to writers of fiction, including, among others, Shakespeare, Charles Dickens, Virginia Woolf, Don DeLillo, Marcel Proust, and Daphne du Maurier, as well as to historians and philosophers from Aristotle through Fernand Braudel, Natalie Davis, R. G. Collingwood, Simon Schama, and Hayden White. The value of this work, however, lies in the case studies Southgate presents that investigate the relationship between history and fiction.

Some of the particular works he analyzes in depth are: Graham Swift's *Waterland* (1983), Penelope Lively's *Moon Tiger* (1998) and *Cleopatra's Sister* (1993), Leo Tolstoy's *War and Peace* (1868), and Tim O'Brien's *In the Lake of the Woods* (1995). Although not a work of fiction, Daniel Mendelsohn's *The Lost: A Search for Six of the Six Million* (2007) expands Southgate's argument that we can never find the "truth" of history; but, with fiction's imagination and empathy along with History's corroboration of evidence, we can expand our historical understanding.

In addition to its content, a strength of this work is Southgate's clear writing style and presentation, which includes an abstract for each chapter. The book also features photographs, an extensive bibliography, and index. *History Meets Fiction* would be an appropriate text for most History Theory or Intellectual History courses. History teachers will benefit from the novels and other materials Southgate suggests that could be incorporated into their lesson plans or syllabi. The work as a whole should be welcomed by historians and history teachers who embrace their discipline with enthusiasm for new ideas, interpretations, and teaching approaches.

California State University, Long Beach

Linda Kelly Alkana

*Bethlehem Steel: Builder and Arsenal of America*, by Kenneth Warren. Pittsburgh, PA: Pittsburgh University Press, 2008. 322 pages. \$24.95, paper.

In the interest of full disclosure, I should start this review by stating that I grew up with Bethlehem Steel. My grandfather was a steelworker for the company, and I lived near the Lebanon, Pennsylvania plant. My alma mater, Lehigh University of Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, had a symbiotic relationship with Bethlehem Steel, receiving funding from and providing graduates to the corporation. So, I looked forward to reading *Bethlehem Steel: Builder and Arsenal of America* by Kenneth Warren. However, I found the work to be a frustrating read, at the same time being overly detailed and incomplete.

Warren breaks down the history of Bethlehem Steel into three major sections. The first recounts the rise of the Bethlehem Iron Company in 1857 and the iron and steel industry of the late nineteenth century. Section two reviews the rise of Bethlehem Steel, from its sale to Charles Schwab and its incorporation to its industrial height in the early 1950s, when it was second only to U.S. Steel. This was done under the leadership of Eugene Grace, who spent sixty years with the company. The final section recounts the decline of Bethlehem Steel, which derived from its inability to adapt to the challenges of domestic mini-mills and foreign steel.

For Warren, a historical geographer, the three deciding factors at play in the rise and fall of Bethlehem Steel were (not surprisingly) geography, the market, and leadership. Throughout the book, he details the advantages and disadvantages held by Bethlehem and other companies because of physical location, especially in regards to access to raw materials and shipping routes. Warren also goes to some length to show the development of the iron and steel industry: the products in demand, different firms, technological developments, etc. What set Bethlehem apart and shaped its fate, according to Warren, was its leadership. Through the drive and insight of Schwab and Grace, the corporation was able to overcome its geographic handicaps and position itself to ride rising waves in the market, especially in the fields of armaments and shipbuilding. However, by the time of the passing of the old guard, the leadership had become hidebound and inbred, unwilling to face the fact that the industry and the market was leaving Bethlehem Steel behind. Warren concludes that Bethlehem Steel was a victim of its previous success.

However, despite his argument that management decisions drove and eventually brought down Bethlehem Steel, Warren spends little time detailing the men and their thinking behind those decisions. Instead, Warren gives us minutia on steel production. From a "three-high rail mill" to "duplexing," the reader gets it all and usually without an explanation. Further, for Warren, labor played no role in the success of Bethlehem Steel. Labor's only contribution to Bethlehem Steel was to hasten its downfall by asking for wage increases and demanding pensions. Many steelworkers might have a problem with this interpretation. Also, Warren takes no account of the realities of plant operations in the localities. Did not local incentives or pressures to build plants and maintain operations play a role in managerial decisions and the fate of the corporation?

How can this book be used in the classroom? Except in a graduate course or in an undergraduate course focused on the steel industry, I would not recommend assigning the entire book. It will be a dull and frustrating read for the typical undergraduate even if the instructor supplies a glossary of terms. I certainly think sections of the book can be used to illustrate the rise and decline of a heavy industry: what factors lead to success or failure. Section three of Warren's book has the best narrative and the least minutia and could be assigned as a look at the decline of the corporation. The book is also full of facts and figures that an instructor could use in the course of lecturing.

Ultimately, the problem with Warren's book is that his structuralist approach is not sufficient to explain what is essentially a tragic, human story. It is a story of leaders

who think hard, take risks, and, in the end, become arrogant. It is a story of exploited steelworkers whose unionization won them so much, it consequently ends in Bethlehem's demise. It is a story of local communities that no doubt beg to get a Bethlehem Steel plant only to be economically devastated when it disappears. In the end, the reality of the rise and fall of Bethlehem Steel is far messier than Warren admits.

*Historical Resource Center, Bureau of Engraving and Printing*

Franklin Noll

Attention all providers of  
history education resources:

# Advertise in *The History Teacher*

For as little as \$175, your ads could reach more than 6,000  
history educators and administrators in universities,  
community colleges and secondary schools!

**Rates:**

Full page, text section: \$250

Half page, text section: \$175

Inside front or inside back cover (full page only): \$300

Back cover (full page only): \$350

**Deadlines:**

May - Reservation, Mar. 1 / Art, Mar. 15

August - Reservation, June 1 / Art, June 15

November - Reservation, Sept. 1 / Art, Sept. 15

February - Reservation, Dec. 1 / Art, Dec. 15

*All ads black and white and must be submitted camera-ready.*

*Insertion orders via post or e-mail.*

— SPECIAL OFFER FOR FIRST-TIME ADVERTISERS —

**Free 2nd placement with purchase of 1st ad**

*Same type ad or smaller.; Inside covers excluded from free placement.*

*Mention this offer upon reservation to receive placement.*

**For more information, contact:**

Elisa Herrera, Director

Society for History Education, Inc.

CSULB - 1250 Bellflower Blvd., Long Beach, CA 90840-1601

PHONE: (562) 985-2573 • FAX: (562) 985-5431 • E-MAIL: [info@thehistoryteacher.org](mailto:info@thehistoryteacher.org)

WEB: [www.thehistoryteacher.org](http://www.thehistoryteacher.org)