

stituents, Chicago's immigrants scrutinized their identities and allegiances. Conflicts over women's representation at the fair are highlighted in Ganz's discussion of historian and women's rights activist, Mary Beard, whose speech lambasted historians and the Fair for falsifying the record of world progress by failing to acknowledge women's contributions. Anglo- and Euro-American organizers targeted European ethnic groups as participants and attendees for the fair, failing to pursue African Americans and Mexicans (whose migration from the American South and Southwest had increased dramatically during the 1920s) but the African American community, allocated very few resources in the fair, ultimately gained recognition for Jean Baptiste Pont Du Sable, whose father, from a French Quebec mercantile family and mother, a black slave, was Chicago's founder.

In the end, Ganz's main argument shines through – that while the fair was supposed to illustrate the idea of progress and optimism through cooperative exhibits based on science and technology, it was Sally Rand, the rags-to-riches Missouri girl, who brought home the message that things get better. In the midst of the Depression, fairgoers took home her message in the Tru-View souvenir filmstrip that captured her bubble dance. Whenever they picked it up, they were reminded of the opening frame – just as the bubble gracefully rises, falls, floats away, and returns, so too would hopes, dreams, and ambitions.

Marlene Shore
York University

Ian Hesketh, *Of Apes and Ancestors: Evolution, Christianity, and the Oxford Debate* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009).

This is not exactly a bad book, but I am really not quite sure why it was written. The topic is the famous debate between “Soapy Sam” Wilberforce, then Bishop of Oxford, and Thomas Henry Huxley, Darwin's “bulldog,” at the British Association for the Advancement of Science at Oxford in 1860. This event has been written about so often you might well wonder what else there is to say on the subject. Judging by this book, the answer is: “not much.”

The author begins by introducing the main characters, starting with Charles Darwin, who was as it happens absent from Oxford since he was off having one of his water cures for his ongoing ailments. One might perhaps have expected an overview of the *Origin of Species*, published late in 1859, since after all this was the book that sparked the Oxford encounter. However, the focus rather is on the historical introduction that Darwin introduced to later editions – perhaps an odd choice, but I think basically to introduce the reader to the growing controversy over the work, and especially to the opposition of the leading anatomist Richard Owen.

Then in successive chapters we meet Bishop Wilberforce, the leader of the high church faction of the Anglican establishment, Thomas Henry Huxley, by the time of the *Origin* a man who was already making himself a force in Victorian science and education and a strong opponent of Owen, and Joseph Hooker, the botanist and great friend of Darwin and enthusiastic supporter of evolution through selection. The author writes clearly and people new to the field will find that the pocket pictures are helpful and nicely drawn.

We move on to the details of the debate itself, followed by an analysis showing that a lot of exaggeration was to come in later years as the various participants played up their own roles and successes, sometimes at the expense of total veracity. This is not new territory, because already others (who, to be fair, are referenced) have shown that the encounter was certainly not as one-sided as the evolutionists loved to tell in later years – a distortion which certainly had long legs because, when I did Victorian history at school back in the 1950s, I was treated to a wonderful account of professors slaying bishops in the name of reason and evidence.

Finally, there is a brief reference to the ongoing debates about science and religion, especially as we find today in the attacks being made on Christian belief by the so-called “new atheists.” My own feeling is that it is a pity that these two or three pages had not been expanded and made the *raison d'être* of the book. It could have been really interesting and informative to compare the clashes back in the 1860s with the clashes today. Are we just seeing in Richard Dawkins a replay of Thomas Henry Huxley, or is there something new going on now? I guess the author just didn't want to put history to this kind of use. Historians of science are terrified of making mention of the present, fearing that they will be accused of the dreadful sin of “Whiggishness,” that is of writing history in order to put a gloss on the present. I am not sure that looking at the present through the lens of the past is in fact always trying to privilege the present. Whether it is or not, I am still left with my initial question. Since there is nothing new, why bother to write the book?

Michael Ruse
Florida State University

Robert Service, *Trotsky: A Biography* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2009).

This biography of Trotsky by a Professor of Russian History at Oxford University joins his other publications on Communism. Illustrated with maps and photographs, *Trotsky: A Biography* draws from an autobiography, letters, party and military correspondence, confidential speeches, and medical records. This book is a substantial contribution to an intriguing historical figure committed to