

Stephen McFarland and Wesley Newton. *To Command the Sky: The Battle for Air Superiority over Germany, 1942-1944*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2006.

On par with some of the most interesting and well researched pieces regarding World War II, Stephen McFarland and Wesley Newton's *To Command the Sky: the Battle for Air Superiority over Germany, 1942-1944*, is a wonderful read that offers much to the historical field. McFarland, a distinguished professor at Auburn University, and Newton, a well-versed and noted historian, combined their knowledge and abilities to create a work that documents the importance of American air superiority and its effects on the outcome of the war, most notably that of the D-Day invasion at Normandy. By purposefully choosing to leave out topics such as the British contributions to Allied air superiority and the ethical matters of strategic bombing, the authors were able to concentrate on exactly how the American effort was molded and changed from a bomber- first mentality to one that realized the necessity of gaining air superiority. McFarland and Newton go further into the subject than most other researchers and flush out the exact events and shifts that allowed for the American Eighth, Ninth, and Fifteenth Air Forces to take command of the skies away from the German Luftwaffe. Finally, the authors discuss the importance of having air superiority over Germany and how it impacted the final years of the war as well as how the shift from a bomber-first strategy to one of gaining command of the skies altered the future of the Air Force and its doctrine.

Other than the fluid writing style that makes the book an enjoyable piece to read, the authors' meticulous attention to detail is a defining factor in why *To Command the Sky: the Battle for Air Superiority over Germany, 1942-1944* has been the beneficiary of so much praise. The authors' desire to inform the reader exactly how the American Air Force took command of the skies before the all-important D-

Day invasion on June 6, 1944, shows in their inclusion of facts that have been overlooked for decades. A prime example of this is when McFarland and Newton discuss the shift in gasoline mixtures that the American's utilized for better fuel economy and performance. Statistics and other data are given that demonstrate how the German Luftwaffe's choice to switch to synthetic fuel with an octane rating of 95-97 in an attempt to keep up with the American mixture with a rating of 100 actually limited their fighter planes' performance by noting how it decreased the quantity of available fuel and resulted in more overheated or stalled engines (pp. 57-58). The switch of fighter plane fuel is a small factor in the overall scope of World War II; however McFarland and Newton include it in their book in a way that impresses upon the reader the significance of the decision. The above example allows the reader to easily comprehend the authors' stated goal of explaining the significance of air superiority.

So just how important was American air superiority in determining the outcome of World War II? The authors go to great lengths to describe to the reader exactly how American fighter missions from 1942-1944 pushed the German air force back to a defensive position along the German border and away from the planned Allied offensive area. This in effect guaranteed that for the invasion of Normandy the only planes flying would be on the Allied side of the conflict. McFarland and Newton make much of this fact, pointing out that with the heavily concentrated placement of soldiers on the beaches, any German fighter planes allowed to make strafing runs would have caused incredible amounts of damage to the Allied ground forces on D-Day. The missions that were flown prior to the invasion at Normandy were numerous and often costly for the Allies, but nevertheless paved the way for eventual success by reducing the number of German fighters despite the fact that German indus-

trial centers continued pumping out large numbers of replacements. This fact was not lost on the authors as McFarland and Newton use this to point out the inability of the bomber-first strategy to win the war in Europe or even to achieve any of its major goals such as causing a shortage or cessation of production.

Overall, *To Command the Sky: the Battle for Air Superiority over Germany, 1942-1944* by Stephen McFarland and Wesley Newton is a strong example of a well-researched and superbly written historical piece. The authors succeed in their goal of describing the importance of the American ability to gain air superiority over the German Luftwaffe and the significance of the shift of the leadership's mentality from a staunchly bomber-first strategy to one that recognized the value of air dominance. The primary example of the D-Day invasion of Normandy and how it was such a success because of American control of the skies is well documented by the authors as well. In the end, this review of *To Command the Sky: the Battle for Air Superiority over Germany, 1942-1944* may come off as sounding too praiseworthy, but that is only due to the fact that the piece had no significant flaws to denote, which makes the book one that should be recommended for anyone interested in learning more about the history of air power in World War II.

CHRIS BOOTH

Alex Von Tunzelmann. *Red Heat: Conspiracy, Murder, and the Cold War in the Caribbean*. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 2011.

Perhaps the most memorable events of the Cold War come from the events in Cuba in the 1950s and 60s. The ongoing tension between the United States and Cuba has outlasted the Cold War itself and remains a pivotal point in the history of the era. Von Tunzelmann's *Red Heat: Conspiracy, Murder, and the Cold War in the Caribbean* is not only a detailed history of the relationship between

the Superpowers and the Caribbean, focusing on Cuba, but a scintillating tale that delivers on the title's promise. From the machinations of the United States in its ideological blind rage against Communism, to the antics of the players that would rival a modern romance novel, the story of the Cold War in the Caribbean is well cited and well told by Von Tunzelmann.

Conventional wisdom paints Fidel Castro as a hard-liner Communist despot who shoehorned himself into the role of dictator of Cuba with the help of the murderous terrorist Che Guevara. While this is true, it is only part of the story. The image of John F. Kennedy and his staff is traditionally painted as one of a modern day Camelot, with Kennedy's Arthur, the tragic character of wholesome American righteousness cut short in his prime. While this is also true from a particular point of view, this is also an image painted in the American Ministry of Propaganda that perpetuated the infallibility of Kennedy's legacy. The truth is not hard to find – but Von Tunzelmann aggregates the story peeling back the veneer to expose the ugly truth that makes all of the players look worse in the light of day.

As the new Cuban revolution sought to depose Fulgencio Batista y Zaldívar, men like Castro and Guevara were indeed on the front lines of the war, pushing for a Cuban government that represented the people, instead of foreign interests. However, as Batista's grip loosened, Von Tunzelmann points out that Castro and company were not the all-powerful Communist revolutionaries frequently portrayed in popular history; but rather the beneficiaries of circumstances. They were in the right place at the right time to fill a power vacuum and not the masters of *realpolitick* as so often portrayed. Further, she confirms what most serious students of Castro understand: he only turned to socialism, and ultimately Soviet sponsorship, after the American military bombed Cuba in support of Batis-

ta. Moreover, Castro only received that sponsorship as a personal dig by Nikita Sergeyevich Khrushchev directed at Kennedy, as Khrushchev felt slighted over the terrible crime of not being allowed to visit Disneyland. This insight is just one example of many that the author gives, showing that the story of revolutionary Cuba was as much about personality as it was ideology.

As an interesting aside, Von Tunzelmann introduces the reader to the vile, yet intriguing character of Che Guevara. Apparently not only was he a terrorist and a murderer; and one severely lacking in normal personal hygiene practices, but he also maintained a voracious appetite for relations with the opposite sex. Of course, Guevara is not the only player of the era with appetites for human companionship. Von Tunzelmann does not shy away from the iniquities of the Kennedy family or anyone else in the periphery. In fact, one could easily imagine a Showtime series like the *Borgias* set in the White House of the early 1960s.

Von Tunzelmann's story is not all sex and revolution though. More importantly, she focuses on the obsession that a drug-fueled Kennedy had with dispatching Castro, as well as the ever-present communist bogeyman that the United States battled throughout the Caribbean – largely by supporting the worst despots in modern history. According to Von Tunzelmann, American support of the François Duvalier and Rafael Leonidas Trujillo Molina dynasties in Haiti and the Dominican Republic respectively was specifically aimed at preventing another power vacuum that the communists personified by Fidel Castro. The sad fact is that the people of Hispaniola were no better off during the Cold War than the people of Cuba. In fact, one could argue the contrary quite easily. Once again, the author has shown that the machinations behind nations great and small were focused on personality and ideology as opposed to altruism.

Other interesting tidbits turn the entirety of the Cuban Missile Crisis on its head. According to Von Tunzelmann the “Farewell Letter” from Castro to Khrushchev was meant to assure the Soviets that the Cubans were ready and willing to side with the Soviets should war come. However, the translation made it seem that Castro was vowing a suicidal plan of hostility toward the United States and was ready to sacrifice all of Cuba in the name of glorious revolution. Khrushchev now saw Castro as a madman ready to start World War III. This is a decided departure from the typical historiography that paints the resolution of the crisis as a masterstroke of Kennedy diplomacy. It seems that the Soviets were more afraid of Castro sparking nuclear holocaust than they were of Kennedy’s blustering and concessions in Turkey.

In a seemingly counterintuitive move, Von Tunzelmann discounts the likelihood of conspiracy in the assassination of John F. Kennedy, especially conspiracy led or fostered by the Cubans and Soviets. Of course, they had the most to gain with the elimination of Kennedy, and both Castro and Khrushchev had personal distaste for the darling of Western media – but as Von Tunzelmann points out, the actual evidence gleaned in multiple investigations does not support the numerous theories that have surfaced and pointed the accusing finger at the united Red banners.

In analyzing the veracity of any historical writing, one must look first at the sources provided, and a detailed look at Von Tunzelmann’s citations shows that she was both meticulous and scholarly in her endeavor. Her sources are a good mix of primary and secondary sources that allow the reader to confirm the facts on which her analysis is based. Of course, the further from the subject matter in time that a writer conducts research, the more out of context of the times the point of view of the author. However, in an age of declassified documents and a Soviet Union that no longer exists, Von

Tunzelmann has been able to take advantage of a plethora of information that writers of the day would not have had the benefit of using.

Likewise, analysis itself must be logical, well founded and supported by the research. Many histories of the era have all of these factors in play, but historians that wrote in the aftermath of the events, or in the interceding years, were limited by their own perceptions and biases, along with a dearth of information from behind the scenes. The simple fact is that most of the private conversations of the time were classified or suppressed for other reasons and could not be taken into account. Thus, Von Tunzelmann's analysis could meet a considerable amount of criticism from those who are completely bought into more conventional analysis or those that are unwilling or unable to see new evidence in any other light than that supporting the altruism of the United States in its glorious war against the forces of communism.

This is not to say that Von Tunzelmann has written an anti-American tour-de-force. In fact, the honest historian will see that the Kennedy administration was doing what it thought was right, in the circumstances, for both the United States and the future of the Western Hemisphere. Unfortunately, the Kennedy Administration had a myopic view of communism and who communists were, as well as the impact of the spread of communism. Von Tunzelmann illustrates that they saw the strange bedfellows of brutal dictators as a necessary evil to check the greater evil of communism spreading to the New World. She shows that the United States, led by Kennedy and his men, would do almost anything -- including supporting dreadful criminals at home and abroad -- to protect the United States from this danger. One can hardly blame the President and his men for poor decisions based on ignorance -- but made with pure intentions.

Overall Von Tunzelmann's book is an enthralling read that provides both the serious student of the era and the casual reader with an accurate picture of the situation in the Caribbean in some of the most crucial days of the Cold War, while providing an entertaining story of intrigue, murder and sex. Indeed, what more could one want from a history? Levity aside, the book is well written and addresses many issues that needed reexamination in the light of the many sources that were unavailable in previous years. Perhaps most important is the accessibility of Von Tunzelmann's work, in that the importance of history cannot be held close and kept to the dusty halls of academia. The average reader can pick up the book and read cover to cover without being deluged with statistics and analysis that only other historians would find interesting.

E. MICHAEL DAVIS II

David McCullough. *1776*. New York: Simon & Schuster Paperbacks, 2005.

When discussing the theme of "revolutions of the world" perhaps no other revolution sticks out in Americans' minds quite as much as the American Revolution. The year of 1776 certainly stirred Americans into an action that impacted at least the New World and the British portion of the Old World.

David McCullough wrote a book about such a struggle. A glance at the front and back material reveals his book is popular, well-accepted, and received the accolade of the *Pulitzer Prize*. He has penned several other books related to this period, and others outside it as well.

A quick flip to the contents page will give the reader a chronological time line for the historic events that took place in that year. The contents page takes the reader through the announcement of the colonists' rebellion by the king, the mustering of untrained sol-



diers, the raising of a new American flag, the “Fateful Summer,” and the “Long Retreat” from New York after it was lost to the British, all in chronological order. McCullough’s book opens with a discourse on King George III, showing how King George preferred a more simplistic life managing royal farmlands, a picturesque life of a colonial in rural early America. McCullough draws a sharp contrast between the royal cavalcade as shown in the opening of the book to King George’s more unpretentious preference of dabbling about on his farms at Windsor in old farmer’s clothes in seemingly American fashion. McCullough explains this to reach a final note: King George declared the colonists in the New World under a state of rebellion, and Parliament must act accordingly. From this point on, the book’s setting is set strictly within the colonies.

As any American might say, the year 1776 was one of great importance and each year on the fourth day of the seventh month, fireworks light up the sky to celebrate the declaration of American independence from the British, which occurred in 1776. David McCullough’s *1776* focuses on the struggle during that year of both American and British forces in the colonies. He follows Commander-in-Chief George Washington, Generals Nathanael Green and Israel Putnam, other officers such as Adjutant General Joseph Reed, and rank-and-file soldiers like Joseph Plum Martin. A typical chapter in *1776* records interesting facts of famous names, tactical situations, dire straits and dilemmas of the Continental Army, and the desperate struggle of Washington to keep his army in order. His historical discourse is not limited to the Americans however; McCullough presents the British in understandable style. McCullough uses primary sources for both the British and American forces; McCullough achieves this by revealing the private thoughts of certain members of British chain of command taken from letters sent back to England by General Hugh, Lord Percy,

General Sir William Howe, Admiral Richard Lord Howe, General Sir Henry Clinton, and General Charles Lord Cornwallis. While there is a slightly more intense focus on the Americans' plight, McCullough saved space for the British.

The author does not singularly fixate on British and American militaries however; he constantly pictures Washington through his own letters as the general reporting back to Congress the actions of battle, state of the army, and more so often his reflections of the war to his family. Washington's business letters, often so quoted by the author are usually accompanied by one or more quotes from Washington and Congress's reaction to what Washington penned (for an example of this, see page 219 on Washington's report for the Battle of Harlem Heights). This and other accounts perhaps give more insight into the decisions or indecisions of the Continental Congress.

One of the most masterful aspects of *1776* is found in McCullough's ability to describe the stark reality of how fragile the cause really was. The author has no qualms or hesitation in describing the dilemma the Americans faced. McCullough makes the situation clear – a rabble in arms, drinkers, farmers, tanners, foundrymen, untrained men versus the world's largest and most powerful empire (chapter two, "Rabble in Arms"). On more than one occasion the author states that the situation is not a patriotic sense as the American Revolution is thought of to be, but he seeks to expose the hardships and fragile nature of the conflict by sharing the close shaves with destruction that Washington's army narrowly escaped.

It is evident by his style of writing and frequent quotations that his sources draw heavily from primary documentation. In his source notes section, McCullough has a list of corresponding abbreviations and subsequent notes. This reveals that an overwhelming majority of his sources are based on primary periodicals, journals, letters, and

archives. His style of writing is not monotonous but informative; intellectual, yet facile. The writing is free of jargon and wordiness, conveying the information in simple text. These are several strengths of the book.

*1776* includes source notes, an impressive bibliography, and an index for special topics, names, and events. There are a few maps showing the British plan of attack and siege of New York, portraits of Lord George Germain, Lord Frederick North, British parliamentary officials, Washington, Reed, Greene, General John Sullivan, and others; these add color to the book and give a face, even if by portrait only, to the reader.

This piece contributes to the field of history based on its sound scholarship and informative text – a must have for any interested reader concerning the American Revolution. As the events turned out, the story of the American Revolution would go on to even darker periods than those Washington suffered from his losses in New York, yet that is not part of McCullough's story of *1776*. In the end, his goal is met: to educate Americans of their revolutionary heritage and to completely uncover the courage, strengths, weaknesses, and shortcomings of the American heroes that changed the world. If considering for purchase, it is a valuable contributive piece of work for a greater understanding of the dire straits the Revolution of 1776 had for both sides, but history can be popularized and America has as many myths as any other country does. David McCullough's *1776* has been labeled popular history, and some do not recommend it for academic research projects. The author of this review disagrees somewhat, and thinks that it can be used for general knowledge and while there is detectable patriotic bias in the work, McCullough's facts are still proven with research.

JORDAN GRIFFITH

Christopher A. Snyder. *The Britons*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing. 2003. xvii + 330 pp.

In his preface, Christopher Snyder notes that at the time of the 1707 Act of Union the terms “Britons” and “British” became highly popular, reflecting an increasing fascination with early British myth, legend and history. This curiosity towards early heritage became attached to a wider interest in ancient Celtic culture, the resulting “history” of which was partly truthful and partly fanciful. In light of continued interest to this day and in spite of strides to correct mistakes of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, Snyder believes scholars and skeptics have not fully addressed the contributions of the ancient Britons to their descendants.

Snyder states his book is partially a deconstruction of the identity of the ancient inhabitants of Britain in order to examine their origins and legacy. He begins by addressing the ongoing debate of British vs. Celtic identity and ethnicity with regards to who, exactly, were the people of the island. He proposes his thesis by asking (1) whether these ancient people ever saw themselves as Britons, (2) were they ever a unified group with a single, identifiable culture, and (3) how were they distinct from their neighbors?

The first two questions were intended to test whether the identity of the island’s people was truly cohesive enough to be given the “Celtic” name. Snyder cites that some archaeologists of the European Iron Age have questioned whether the terms *Keltoi* and *Celtae*, the ancient Greek and Roman labels for the continental Celts, should also have been applied to the Iron Age people of the British Isles. Some argue that the Greeks and Romans inconsistent use of the terms (the Greeks especially had a habit to stereotype non-Greeks, lumping those “barbarians” under blanket ethnic names) may or may not have included the Britons. Additionally, others claim “Celtic” identity only began with philologists such as Edward Llyud,

who used the classical *Celtae* name to identify language groups—his Celtic language theory was published in the same year as the Act of Union.

Unsure of which way to swing, some scholars have gone the “politically correct” route by claiming skepticism of anything called Celtic. Medievalists, however, are not so eager to join this wave and continue to use the Celtic term. Snyder questions why the Celts have been targeted for criticism as a group when other “mongrel nations,” such as the Romans, English, French, Americans, and Russians, are not (p. 3). After this discussion, Snyder ends up using the “Britons” term even though his entire study applies to what amounts to the Celtic element in Britain. Along with this introduction, he then gives a brief description of his methodology and sources. He also admits that he is not covering much new ground, nor is he an expert in fields related to history (e.g., anthropology, archaeology), the perspectives of which are included in this work. An honest admission, but one that can make the reader a bit leery.

The core of the book takes the reader on a detailed survey of the history of the Britons from the Late Pre-Roman Iron Age (c.100 BC to AD 50) to current times. Snyder only mentions outside Celtic lands such as Ireland or pre-Roman Gaul when British activity interacts with them. The account begins at the point when the Britons become truly distinct, recognized by neighbors and with some unification militarily and politically. Though much of the evidence for this period is from archaeology and inscriptions, Snyder employs written sources that point out the effects the Roman conquest in Gaul had on Britain’s people leading up to Caesar’s expeditions, the Claudian conquest and the Roman occupation. A graphic demonstrates the varying degrees of influence from Roman and continental interaction on the islanders, but Snyder is careful not to generalize about any one area. He recognizes that the labels “Celt” or “Briton”

ignore tribal distinctions within the culture.

Two chapters cover the Roman occupation, the gradual withdrawal of the legions to try to quell problems on the continent, and the shift to local leadership. One point that appears to be new is the firming up of the date of AD 410 as the end of Roman control. Previous thought had waffled among several dates. Snyder also cites increasing caution among historians and archaeologists about calling all “signs of fire, demolitions and reconstruction” as suggestive of overwhelming foreign invasions or battles (p. 66). Current thought is moving towards gradual settlement instead. Moreover, in a morsel of new contextual interpretation, he posits that the role of the last Roman units stationed along Hadrian’s Wall were more like military police than deployed soldiers, and that once discharged from their duties (or having abandoned them), the men became part of the local population.

Chapters under the section “The Brittonic Age” cover the period most often identified as sub-Roman, post-Roman or Arthurian. Snyder dislikes these terms for the fifth and sixth centuries because he feels they are misleading, choosing instead “Brittonic,” the ethnic term writers used in that period. The era’s literary material is thin at best, consisting mainly of writings from Gildas, Patrick, two Gallic chronicles, and Constantius of Lyon’s *Life of Germanus of Auxerre*. All other historiography was written centuries later, preserved in Welsh works, Bede’s *Ecclesiastical History* and the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. Curiously, Snyder says epigraphic and archaeological evidence is also in short supply; however, he then spends quite a bit of effort examining both kinds.

The third section runs from the Anglo-Saxon conquest (c.600) to the Norman conquest (1066), a period when the individual Celtic “nations” become separated from each other due to Saxon, Irish, and Viking raids, settlement, and kingdom building. Here Snyder

includes Brittany and Galicia, established in what is now northwest France and western Spain respectively, due to their close connections to Britain since the Bronze Age. Mostly this is a straightforward survey of how the various regions took on their identities. Snyder employs historiography, supplemented and corroborated by archaeological and epigraphic evidence. For the expert in the field, a few minor but well known items that have been omitted might be concerning: he mentions the material disappearance of early churches because they were mostly made of wood and thatch, which is certainly possible, but some of those early churches could have been of stone as well. Quite often, disused stone buildings were dismantled and the stones used elsewhere. Next, he quotes from Gregory of Tours' *History of the Franks* that Brittany was "dominated by regional hereditary chieftains engaging in vicious feuds with one another and with the Merovingian Franks" (p. 152). This statement echoes the typical Celtic raid for plunder that enhanced a chieftain's wealth and status, a point that probably should have accompanied the quote. Another missing point is that the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* is typically silent on battles the Saxons lost—they always refused to admit their shame. Also, each time Snyder mentions the Welsh genealogies, he does not note their chronic manipulation by aristocrats in order to find an illustrious, heroic ancestor, such as Henry VIII who very much desired to have descended from King Arthur!

The concluding section, "Conquest, Survival and Revival," moves from the Norman Conquest to the present day. Though the Norman state quickly gave the impression of completely absorbing the Britons, a series of subsequent "Celtic revivals" occurred periodically beginning in the twelfth century that demonstrates the resilience of the Britons. Revivals were inspired by popular "histories," such as Geoffrey of Monmouth's 1136 *History of the Kings of Britain* and the antiquarian William Camden's 1607 *Brittania* as well as

Welsh nationalistic movements under Llywelyn Fawr and Llywelyn ap Gruffydd in the 1200s, or the outright rebellion of Owain Glyn Dŵr, begun in 1400. Even Napoleon tried to attempt a Gallic revival. The late nineteenth century also saw Tennyson's poetry and Pre-Raphaelite painters take up popular Celtic themes.

Regarding the renewed interest, Snyder gives a great deal of attention to the Welsh element. This is due to much of the knowledge of the Britons in the post-Norman era being preserved in Welsh historiography and literature, yet perhaps he has leaned too much on it, giving short shrift to the other elements and creating an imbalance in the work. He also expounds overly much on the Arthurian aspect—one which recurs often throughout the book and demonstrates Snyder's favoritism for the specialty on which he has written extensively elsewhere.

A general reader would need to have read additional material to understand some of the book's explanations. For an intermediate student with a solid background on the subject, the work makes a nice overview or it could suffice as a companion book to related studies. For the scholar, *The Britons* tries to incorporate too many elements outside the author's expertise in order to cover a scope that is too broad. The result does not offer enough depth to satisfy the thesis questions, the first two of which are never fully addressed.

KATHLEEN GULER

Axtell, James. *Beyond 1492: Encounters in Colonial North America*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1992.

James Axtell, historian and professor of history at the College of William and Mary, wrote and compiled this collection of essays in 1992, the 500th anniversary of Columbus's discovery of the western hemisphere. Axtell states in his preface "after 1492 the world became a very different place" and he is correct; the first contact be-



tween Columbus and the indigenous people he discovered changed the course of history (p. vii). Axtell examines the history of first contact and beyond from the perspectives of both Native Americans and Europeans. Three essays are from the point of view of Native Americans whose lands were invaded but whose first meetings with the Europeans were always peaceful. The other essays cover a wide variety of views of the explorers and colonists. Axtell covers the entire gambit from missionaries to settlers and traders, the triumphs and the tragedies. He also examines the extensive amount of material that was arriving on the scene for the 500th anniversary of Columbus's voyage of discovery.

Interestingly, Axtell is not out to assign blame to any of the parties involved, but he analyzes the contact through the eyes of the Indians, the Europeans and from a modern historian's view. Differing views of events that took place centuries earlier are still important in the modern era; it is imperative that we continue to attempt to forge a peaceful co-existence with that past. Axtell writes:

The quincentenary of Columbus's epochal voyage is a perfect time for the citizens of the "global village" he helped create to reassess the initiation, conduct, and long- and short-term results of those encounters. We need to learn to live together on an increasingly shrinking planet. One way is to avoid the mistakes of the past; another is to draw more positive lessons from past encounters which were not so lopsided that each side could not reap some advantages. It might be satisfying to drag Columbus and other European colonists before our moral bar and to condemn them for not living up to our more enlightened standards (whoever "we" are and however those standards are defined). But it is more important -- because more humanizing -- for us to understand the actors of the past in their full complexi-

ty and humanity, just as we would like to be appraised by future historians (pp. viii-ix).

Lessons need to be learned from the encounters in the past and Axtell re-enforces the lessons, using his years of teaching to write balanced narratives from each perspective.

Professor Axtell repudiates the stereotypes of the Europeans and the natives that they encountered. He also questions the long-standing opinion of using genocide, a word that in essence did not exist until the twentieth century, as a blanket term to discuss the deaths of hundreds of thousands of Native Americans. Axtell does not believe that the settlers and the governments set out upon a course of killing off the inhabitants of the Americas. The natives would have been far too valuable as forced labor. Many of the deaths of the indigenous peoples were caused inadvertently by diseases brought to the New World, from which they had no immunity.

Axtell's arguments are well researched and presented, as one would expect from an educator in his position. The text is very readable for both the academic and the public. It is informative, well documented and scholarly without being condescending.

KAY O'PRY-REYNOLDS

Carla Gardina Pestana. *Protestant Empire: Religion and the Making of the British Atlantic World*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009. viii + 311 pp.

In *Protestant Empire: Religion and the Making of the British Atlantic*, author Carla Pestana brings together Atlantic and religious history, combining the two subjects and regions into one. Pestana starts with the beginning of the sixteenth century, ca. 1500 A.D. in her quest to investigate both religious and Atlantic history. The underlying theme of *Protestant Empire* is the need to expand from Western

Europe through Protestantism. Through religious beliefs splintered into various sects, British Protestantism won out in many ways over staunch Catholicism of the period. Pestana uncovers the underlying factors that caused Western European leaders to explore around the Atlantic rim and the desire to advance Protestantism versus Catholicism.

Christian religion changed in the sixteenth century as a result of clashes with various foreign religious beliefs, according to Pestana. Various aspects from foreign religions were adapted into local customs and traditions and some parts of local tradition were allowed to be blended in with Christianity (p. 1). Other religions from Europe and other parts of the world were introduced as well; Judaism and Islam made their way into the Atlantic World. Thus a wide diversity of religious beliefs existed in the New World that followed, including Catholics, Protestants, followers of Judaism and Islam, as well as various splintered sects of Protestantism and local religious beliefs. Pestana shows how attempts were made to convert the locals to Christianity and the desire to see they were brought to the right version of faith (p. 10).

Pestana claims that what puzzled the British monarchs especially was why they were unable to mesh the peoples of their various realms together in one common religious adherence in the same manner as the Spanish kings had done through Catholicism. (p. 11). Pestana argues that the British monarchs attempted to exercise control through the use of the Church just as the Spaniards had done (p. 7). Pestana covers how the differences in Protestant denominations brought about less authoritarian observances than the Catholic faith had produced. People moved across the ocean and established new lines of religious belief and communication that molded Old World with New World beliefs. For Catholics, Pestana points out that the Church hierarchy would not allow such deviation from the

accepted norm.

In the beginning of *Protestant Empire* Pestana gets right to the heart of the matter, exploring the realm of religion in the world prior to the breakout of the British expansion, and with it the advent of Anglican Protestantism. Pestana points to the innumerable amount of religions and religious beliefs that were present in Western Europe as well as Western Africa and Eastern North America ca. 1500. She points out the vast differences in the practice of religion by Europeans to local tribesmen (pp. 16-18). The causes of grief, life and death are explored through the lens of various customs and beliefs, many times clashing with organized religion brought by the Europeans.

Pestana also delves into the practice of witchcraft; used quite often in the regions of Africa and the Caribbean (p. 25). Catholicism and Protestantism instituted a religious battle that demanded total removal of other religious beliefs, especially those considered demonic in nature. Pestana covers how the transition was supposed to affect people who were being transformed or brought to salvation through the Christian faith; and how confused Christian converts were when their new disciples failed to shed all the tenets of the old religions.

The struggle for the souls of people engendered a deep-seated hatred between Protestants and Catholics that included a political battle as well. Pestana does a fine job of examining the underlying motivation of the monarchs of England, France and Spain in their quest for more land. Not only was this a battle between Catholics and Protestants, there was internal strife in the Protestant camp as well. This turmoil would spill over into campaigns for land, gold and people as explorers took with them priests and missionaries of the various religious denominations who converted the native population, many times by force.

Pestana covers the various factors related to political and mili-

tary conflicts that actually had early American religious underpinnings to them such as King Phillip's War and Bacon's Rebellion (p. 129). She also ties in how Native Americans were dragged into the religious and political wars, each side using various tribes in an effort to make their version of Christianity seen as the only right and true faith. Many times natives would convert simply to avoid problems with the Europeans. Once the foreigners left, natives would return to their natural religious beliefs.

With transplanted religious cultures and entire groups, the New World set up a powder keg of religious strife and various conflicts broke out among the differing sects in Europe. Pestana navigates through the various aspects of religious tensions and trouble in Europe and how that translated to tensions and trouble abroad in the colonies. Pestana also discusses how various differences in beliefs through the Protestant denominations were cycled in and out of use by monarchs such as James I and Charles I of England. Pestana discusses the differences among the Protestant denominations that caused such a divergence of beliefs (pp. 35-37). These men were unable to fathom why Protestants could not mutually agree to follow the Church of England's articles of faith.

*Protestant Empire* also shows that conversion by Protestants was more difficult to achieve than conversion by Catholics. According to Pestana, this was due to the wide variety of beliefs popping up within the Protestant camp while Catholics held completely to one set of beliefs and doctrines. Two major areas of difference for Protestant and Catholic converts were marriage and the conversion experience itself. Pestana explores the differences between the two major faiths, and she states Protestants had a more difficult time accepting new converts due to their propensity to cling to some versions of an old life style (p. 71).

In chapter four of *Protestant Empire*, Pestana turns to a pivotal

period in British and Protestant history: the Restoration of 1660 that ended the long Civil War and stimulated the growth of diversity in the British Empire (pp. 100-127). During the Restoration period that followed, the crown adopted a more lenient policy, thus paving the way for greater tolerance and diversity among the sects of Protestantism (p. 101).

*Protestant Empire* also highlights England's pivotal Glorious Revolution of 1688. Pestana analyzes how the removal of Catholic James II in favor of his Protestant daughter Mary and son-in-law William of Orange, provided a boost to the Protestant cause (p. 128). The revolution would also help re-establish a long rivalry with Catholic France through the Atlantic World. The arrival of Dutch William of Orange on the throne of England gave the Low Countries a much-needed ally against Catholic France at home and abroad.

Pestana points out how the influx of people strengthened the hand England and later, the British Empire, in its ongoing struggle with Catholic France, which was finding itself with less and less friends. By the early eighteenth century, Britain was a firm bastion of Protestantism, with Protestant dissidents and emigrants traveling to both Britain and her colonies to escape Catholic persecution. The British continued to come out ahead in the religious war against France. With William on the throne of England, the Dutch now joined the struggle against Catholicism and the incursions of Catholic France.

Pestana also touches on the evangelicalism of the mid-eighteenth century, and how this further splintered the *Protestant Empire* while spreading the basic tenets of Protestantism (pp. 187-188). Though later decades of the eighteenth century would find the British colonies separating from Britain, the Protestant faith was securely inculcated within the hearts and minds of the colonists.

Pestana believes this would ensure a lasting bond between Britain and her former colonial possessions (p. 218).

Pestana finalizes *Protestant Empire* with a well-rounded perspective of the influence of British Protestantism in the Atlantic World. Pestana shows how, though Protestantism had a difficult time gaining inroads into the New World, it did end up fostering a diverse population of sectarian Protestants throughout the Atlantic World from North America to the Caribbean. Fueled by the fear of a return of Catholicism into Protestant realms, religious fervor evangelizing and proselytizing removed any doubt the Atlantic World would be largely anti-Catholic.

Pestana concludes the material succinctly; British Atlantic political boundaries encompassed three continents and a multitude of faiths. However, the regions were united by the common bonds of Protestantism, and would continue to cement together people and communities. *Protestant Empire* includes maps and visuals that give the reader a better sense of the direction of the book. Scholars and students will benefit from reading *Protestant Empire* because it lays out the entire scope with clarity and purpose.

KEN OZIAH

Max Boot. *Invisible Armies: An Epic History of Guerrilla Warfare from Ancient Times to the Present*. New York: Liveright Publishing Corporation, 2012.

Since the attacks of 9/11 and the world's response to Islamic terrorism and the growth of global terrorism, we've seen an exponential growth in the publication of books on terrorism. Many of these books suffer from a number of faults. Many are simply not very good. But we have seen few historical survey books on the subject. Boot's *Invisible Armies* is a bold foray into taking a well-conceived stab at covering most of the antecedents of terrorism,

and doing so in a readable fashion. Without doubt Boot has wildly succeeded to such a degree that this book belongs in many graduate level courses – and the briefcases and knapsacks of leaders everywhere.

Books on terrorism are exceedingly prevalent these days, so much so that they can make the best of us turn aghast at reading another. The chapters in *Invisible Armies* are small and though some feel breezy they engage the reader, and usually in well-crafted writing Boot makes his point about a given period well. These sixty-four chapters or mini-stories span from early uncivilized warfare to the present. His chapter on “Akkad and the Origins of Insurgency” in Mesopotamia 2334-2005 BC is simply fascinating. What Boot successfully manages to do is give form and substance to periods readers would otherwise ignore and instead gives a marker of the importance of this type of warfare through history. Boot is at his best when he subtly leads readers to understand that one end state of terrorism still poorly understood is its use to shape the political and social narrative.

However, there are some less than compelling areas. Boot sort of skips over or condenses some areas. The Philippines Insurrections, and U.S. intervention in Central America and the Caribbean get a “Cliffs Note” version, it seems. Even Vietnam is underplayed as Boot seems to focus only on the U.S. micro-management of the air campaign. Nor does he reference Graham Cosmos’s book *MACV: The Joint Command in the Years of Escalation, 1962-1967* and he underestimates Andrew J. Birtle’s *U.S. Army Counterinsurgency and Contingency Operations Doctrine 1942-1976*. Surprisingly Boot does not emphasize the totality of the Nazi rule that led to their inevitable counterinsurgency. The *untermensch* philosophy underpinning much of National Socialism found its ultimate expression in *Vernichtungskrieg* or war of annihilation. Boot should have devoted more to



this and the entire partisan war on the eastern front. In fact, ignoring the scope of this war is a bit mystifying. The danger here is in trying to shoe-horn this subject over the span of hundreds of years which can lead to some odd conclusions. Even at the end, Boot likes his readers to realize the definition of terrorism depends upon its historical context and the events shaping it.

Yet even with those valid criticisms, Boot's book is simply an indispensable read for the casual reader and scholar alike. His crafting of some different themes is disguised by its eminently readable style. Boot's style makes this foray both fascinating and full of perceptive insights that one might be surprised to find in a best seller. Overall the book makes the subject accessible. The major shortcoming is perhaps an overall emphasis on counterinsurgency vs. guerilla campaigns, but that is a minor quibble. It was a hard book to put down, and how often are readers faced with that cruel dilemma? This is simply a "must have" book in this era.

ROBERT SMITH

Anna Geifman. *Death Orders: The Vanguard of Modern Terrorism in Revolutionary Russia*. Oxford: Praeger, 2010.

Critical thinking scholars can rejoice; finally there is an empirical offering that ties together Russia's late nineteenth and early twentieth century terrorism experience with the calculated actions of modern terrorism. Anna Geifman writes neither dully nor anything less than factual as she provides a historical analysis of terrorism in revolutionary Russia. This psycho-historical writing rises above the majority of others that ponder Russia's radical traditions. Geifman then ups the intellectual ante, comparing Russia's past and present radicals to today's "terrorist" of the Middle East. Randall D. Law's *Terrorism: A History* and Matthew Carr's *The Infernal Machine: a history of terrorism*, offer a documented historical view of Russia's early anar-

chist/terrorist revolutionaries but not with the flair that Geifman presents in this writing. Geifman applies her research with intellect, erudition, and technical skills to suggest that although terrorist justifications vary according to the movements, they all carry a common feature; Geifman's words say it best when she writes the driving force for terrorists is a preoccupation with thanatophilia; love of death.

Just as Geifman's argument is compelling so is her expertise on her chosen subject. Her writings include *Thou Shalt kill: Revolutionary Terrorism in Russia 1894-1917* (Princeton University Press, 1993) and *Entangled in Terror: The Azeff Affair and the Russian Revolution* (Rowman & Littlefield Publishers Inc., 2000). Geifman is a professor of history at Boston University, teaching classes on the USSR, imperial Russia, psychohistory, and modern terrorism. There have been charges that Geifman's "love of death" argument is lacking because the Russian movement was "avowedly atheist" and the Islamic "fanatically devout." Such an argument is neither accurate nor defensible. Geifman's *Death Orders* is a historical account, graphic at times, but without religious suppositions other than her claim of the worship of death by terrorists. This death wish can be witnessed through both terrorists' and anarchists' writings and actions.

If any part of Geifman's argument is remiss it was a direct challenge to those who wish to excuse the orders of deaths by terrorist leaders who became state leaders. Certain Western intellectuals, due to either their love of communism or its hypnotizing effect on them, were unable to recognize the millions of victims under terrorist leadership. Instead of directly charging these "intellectuals" Geifman references the title of the French philosopher Raymond Aron's 1955 masterpiece, *L'Opium des intellectuels* where Marx belittles religion as the opium for the masses; she suggests that communism is the opium of the intellectuals. It is difficult to find an argument

throughout her text that is not worth considering for the critical thinker. The research conducted for *Death Orders* was abundant and characteristic of a scholar who leaves out political correctness and simply states the facts.

While nothing is perfect it is difficult to criticize the hypothesis laid out in full form. Thousands of excuses can be and have been made for terrorist killers. Societies worldwide have heard the callings of the Islamic radicals “Death for the sake of Allah!” Lenin and the Bolshevik leaders acclaimed “sacrificial death.” The constant in the terrorist repertoire is “love of death.” Geifman’s book should be read and re-read by students and teachers of terrorist history as well as all who attempt to define terrorism. The theme of death applies to the coercive ways of terrorist quest and Geifman provides the scholarly proof. *Death Orders* is a must-have book for anyone seeking knowledge of the terrorist quest. Without any ifs, ands, buts, or speculation there is an abundance of argument in *Death Orders*. This book is a must-read for anyone involved or simply interested in national security.

GEORGE W. THORNDYKE, JR.

Catherine Clinton. *Fanny Kemble’s Civil Wars*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

*Fanny Kemble’s Civil Wars* offers readers an intricate glimpse into the roles of upper-class society women during the nineteenth century, specifically the antebellum period in the United States. Catherine Clinton’s biography of Fanny Kemble explores her tumultuous life as a famous British stage actress-turned-abolitionist who, through her husband’s inheritance, became a plantation mistress of the second largest slaveholding empire in Georgia.

Utilizing the nearly-dozen memoirs that Kemble authored during her lifetime, as well as letters that Kemble wrote to her longtime

friend, Harriet St. Leger, Clinton chronicles the life of a complex, passionate woman, whose unconventional independence and outspoken nature often made her the center of controversy and complicated her relationships with those closest to her.

Born to the famous theatrical Kemble family in England, Francis Kemble, known as Fanny, entered the acting business as a young teenager to help salvage her family's dwindling fortune, putting aside her first love: writing. She took London society by storm during her stage debut in 1829 as Juliet in *Romeo and Juliet*. The critics raved about her performance, comparing it to that of her legendary aunt, Sarah Siddons. Her talent was evident in the sold-out performances for three solid seasons in London. Kemble became an overnight celebrity, but the financial burden of supporting her family took a toll on her. She confessed in a letter to St. Leger that she found the idea of acting "repugnant" (p. 42).

Her success brought her on tour to the United States in 1832, where Clinton describes the rocky relationship Kemble developed with American society. She consistently broke the rules of American etiquette, which she did not understand. Kemble made it very clear she was not impressed with the American cities or their residents, whom she described as "title sick as a banker's wife in England" (p. 52). But despite her initial distaste of America, she felt a certain affinity for Philadelphia, where she met and married her husband, Pierce Butler, in 1834.

Clinton's biography of Kemble reveals deep undertones of Southern antebellum marriage where the white male patriarch ruled unchallenged. From the beginning of their union, Kemble and Butler were ill-matched; her fierce independence and Butler's need to wield his power as the family patriarch caused deep divides in their union. Butler complained that her preference for her own views gave rise to a "sense of imagined oppression" and that she needed

to agree with him in “every regard” (p. 77). Only four months into their marriage, Kemble packed her bags and ran away from their Philadelphia home, only to return the same evening.

Throughout the book, Clinton continues to discuss Kemble’s struggles with the life that she chose with her new husband, Butler, who expected her to give up all of her interests and pleasures, while he continued indulging his own, including the company of other women. Soon after the birth of her first daughter, Sarah, she started to hint at her desire to leave the marriage, even if it meant giving up her child. Butler dismissed Kemble’s wishes, but as an attempt to find some sort of individual self-identity, she began to follow Philadelphia politics. Kemble was well-versed in politics and issues such as slavery; this newfound interest revived her spirit.

Philadelphia was a staging ground for the abolitionist movement. Kemble read anti-slavery essays from abolitionists like William Ellery Channing, and she responded with some of her own. This renewed her love of writing. While Clinton details the birth of Kemble’s abolitionist views, she also offers a brief historical overview of the abolitionist movement in Philadelphia.

Kemble may have been an abolitionist in her heart, but because of her husband wielding power over her, she did not express her sentiments in public. When her husband inherited the Butler plantation and became the second-largest slaveholder in Georgia, Kemble found herself in a precarious situation. Her anti-slavery leanings had always been a source of discontent in their marriage. In an effort to sway her opinion, Butler took her to his plantation along the Georgia Sea Islands in 1838-39, where she wrote her now-famous *Journal of a Residence on a Georgia Plantation*, which described the horrors of human bondage. Butler forbade her from publishing the journal (and her writing of it also alienated her daughters), but once their divorce was finalized and he no longer had influence in her deci-

sions, she published it in 1863, when slavery was on the brink of extinction. Any influence the *Journal* had on the American abolitionist movement was minimal, as it only circulated in her small circle of friends in Philadelphia. However, Clinton emphasizes the reception it received in Kemble's native home, where it influenced British politics and their decision to not become involved in the American Civil War.

Kemble's independent nature and tendency to do the unconventional came at a price, as Clinton's biography makes clear. *Fanny Kemble's Civil Wars* is a biography that any audience could both enjoy and learn from, especially those who are interested in antebellum history and women's studies. Clinton's study of Kemble reflects the struggle that many women faced during this time period: finding a place in the restrictive society of the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

MELANIE THORNTON