

and attractive, but it hardly engages the complicated issues of the reliability of the Nahmanides perspective on the events of 1263. Rather, the Nahmanides perspective is very much privileged. Thus, for example, the lengthy speech that Nahmanides portrays himself as giving at the beginning of the second day of the proceedings, and which includes criticisms of Christianity that are hard to imagine being uttered in this public setting, is simply included in the graphic depiction without comment (29).

I have emerged from this encounter with graphic history unconvinced that this new technique of presenting history advances the cause of sophistication. On the other hand, it has alternative virtues. Like graphic novels, graphic history has the capacity to evoke deep interest and involvement on the part of the reader/viewer. The Caputo/Clarke presentation of the 1263 events at Barcelona has the potential to arouse student attention and to set the stage for rich classroom activity. Indeed, Part V seems to be oriented toward teachers and students who might be using the volume. Graphic history is clearly in its infancy, and much evolution will surely take place. Graphic history may well turn out to be of valuable classroom use, attracting students to immerse themselves in important historical events, and utilizing their heightened interest to urge and guide them toward deeper understanding of these events. The present early effort seems to me to have this potential, and I very much hope that educators will explore this utilization.

Robert Chazan  
New York University

**Kim Scipes, ed., *Building Global Labor Solidarity in a Time of Accelerating Globalization* (Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2016). 296pp. Paperback \$19.00.**

The industrial and political force of the labour movement throughout much of the world has been decimated by the twin forces of globalization and neoliberalism. How this could be turned around is attracting much critical reflection, and Kim Scipes's edited collection *Building Global Labor Solidarity in a Time of Accelerating Globalization* is a product of this. It brings together some of the contributions to a forum organized by the journal *Working USA* that were not published in the 2014 special issue of the journal. The collection seeks to highlight strategic initiatives, such as "rank and file" moves to forge cross-border solidarity links or the emergence of social movement unionism connecting with new social movements fighting racism and sexism, to contribute to meeting the challenge of overcoming the labour movement's malaise.

In introducing the reach of the studies of these initiatives, Scipes expands his *Working USA* essay seeking to position these within the tradition of labour internationalism, especially as represented in the work of Peter Waterman. But in arguing that contemporary initiatives need to be distinguished from those characterized as reflective of labour internationalism, Scipes argues that the more recent developments represent a watershed in the history of labour organizing and are better defined in terms of the ascendancy of *global* labour solidarity. In part, this is because such organizing endeavors are now more likely to be engaging with other new social movements. These include those struggling around gender, race, ethnicity, and environmental concerns. It also recognizes how they are organized across different spatial planes, from the global, the national through to the local. And it emphasizes the more autonomously-organized and vibrant labour movements in the global South assuming a leading role on the international stage. Crucial to acknowledging this transformation is recognizing that global labour solidarity has emerged as a response to globalization and neoliberalism, a social and political antidote to the contemporary manifestation of imperialism.

Integral to this call for a theoretical understanding of the new internationalism is that theorizing global labour solidarity provides an “illuminative” list of elements that go into, or which are necessary for, the making of global labour solidarity (46–47). The list is not exhaustive, and for Scipes the list includes workers at the local level cooperating across borders, sharing information, providing support for those social movements fighting for changes to the social order in the targeted country, and; replicating progressive changes in the home country. However, while highlighting the potential promise of solidarity initiatives that break with the recent history of an ossified and weakened trade unionism, the notion of a list of criteria to be met as the bases of such solidarity seems somewhat mechanistic and programmatic. It is overly prescriptive and belies the subjective nature and diversity of social and political struggle. It presents as though the union of progressive labour with new social movements is unproblematic. The theorizing proposition downplays the very real challenges that present in the process of uniting different social forces and how the particular priorities that frame the organizing and politicking preoccupations of the respective movements can frustrate or stand in the way of building global labour solidarity. Continued collaboration requires the parties to be constantly revisiting the bases and terms of the movements uniting in common cause, and the terms of the alliances have to be reconciled with the respective movement’s mandates, priorities, the personalities who are the energy forces driving the movements, and their capacity to devote resources to maintaining the collaborative projects.

As Katherine Nastovski argues, focusing on international solidarity building in Canada in the 1970s and 1980s, there is a long history of Canadian workers organizing against the conservative, nationalist grain building worker-to-

worker international solidarity. Essays by Jenny Jungehülsing, David Bacon, and Bruno Dobrusin underscore Scipes' thesis of a watershed in the labour movement that has become more engaged with social movements and organizing to look beyond a limited focus on industrial bargaining deals with management. Jungehülsing identifies labour migration as affording the potential for international solidarity, with transnational ties strengthening the sense of cross-border "felt solidarity"; Bacon outlines a long history of Mexican migrant worker struggles across the U.S.-Mexico border that continues; Dobrusin details the rebuilding of progressive labour movements across Latin America, collaborating in building transnational opposition to neoliberalism and free trade. In one chapter, Scipes revisits his analysis of the Philippines KMW, testimony to an enduring, though sometimes precarious, solidaristic labour movement. In their contribution, Timothy Ryan and Michael Zweig report on the shift in the AFL-CIO's internationalist project, jettisoning its endorsement of successive U.S. administrations' efforts to suppress the organization of independent and progressive trade unions and adopting a more progressive role through the offices of the Solidarity Center assisting independent union organizing. These stories do not pretend to theorize global labour solidarity, but they do provide insights into the possibilities and limitations of international labour collaboration in the endeavor to check the excesses of global capitalism.

Certainly, the union of different movements in global labour solidarity likely results in a more robust appreciation of the panorama of exploitative and degrading effects that globalization and neoliberalism have imposed on communities across the globe. The effects reach beyond the dramatic transformation in employment and workplace relations to encompass many other facets of our social life. Scipes's theorizing of the nature of the imperialist behemoth and what has impelled the beast does provide critical insights into framing the reach of its destructive force. This also underscores the merits in advocating collaboration among and campaigning networks by labour and social movements. However, I contend that the foundations of collaborative global labour solidarity campaigns cannot be so readily theorized as Scipes maintains. Rather, the conditions that bring labour and other social movements together are contingent. They are subject to the different and multiple ways in which the destructive pressures that the forces of globalization and neoliberalism impose on communities, how these are experienced and understood, and how these are may ignite a commonality of purpose that aligns a labour movement with other social movements to challenge the behemoth's hegemony. The forms the alliances take, how democratically and inclusively they are structured, the strategies pursued and their sustainability, are not so much theoretical but empirical questions. The successes and failures of collaborative endeavors that give voice to global labour solidarity, the lessons to be learned, are to be gleaned from the experiences of actual concrete initiatives. It is the richness of the stories of the concrete struggles and their diverse forms in

*Building Global Labor Solidarity* that, I suggest, one must turn to appreciate the import of and the challenges that arise in building global labour solidarity.

Stuart Rosewarne  
The University of Sydney

**James Kirby, *Historians and the Church of England: Religion and Historical Scholarship, 1870–1920* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016). 257pp. Hardcover \$100.00.**

Historians now take seriously historical scholarship's polemical potential for the Church of England's proponents and opponents. Peter Lake, Anthony Milton, Justin Champion, Jean-Louis Quantin, Rob Iliffe, and Brian Young have written particularly fine studies for the early modern period. They have shown that while early modern historians of religion deployed evidence in increasingly sophisticated ways, historical erudition got deployed for inherently polemical ends. It is not, though, as if nineteenth-century historians have missed that their own era's historians produced scholarly, yet polemical, histories of the English Church. So, the first thing that James Kirby had to do in his admirable *Historians of the Church of England: Religion and Historical Scholarship, 1870–1920*, was to explain what differentiates his study from those of Duncan Forbes, John Burrow, Christopher Parker, Michael Bentley, and others. Kirby reckons that earlier work on nineteenth-century religious histories has mostly been insufficiently contextualized intellectual history; his book, though, aims "to contribute not only to the history of ideas (religious and historiographical), but also the histories of scholarship, universities, and the Church of England as an institution" (9).

*Historians of the Church of England* focuses on the histories produced by late Victorian Anglicans about the English Church. While acknowledging that Nonconformists, Roman Catholics, and a host of other non-Anglicans wrote polemical religious histories between 1870 and 1920, Kirby keeps his sights on Anglican historians and on intra-Anglican historical debate. In the process, he tries to explain why, who, how, where, and what religious history got produced by Anglicans during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The reason why late nineteenth-century Anglicans produced historical scholarship is clear: well into the next century, history remained the primary site of religious debate. It is a commonplace that Anglicans value history, since reason, faith, and tradition are held to be the three-legged stool atop which Anglicanism rests. Historical scholarship is a way to ascertain and understand that putative Anglican tradition; historical scholarship might even create Anglican tradition. Three other things gave the past salience for the late nineteenth-century Anglican present. Firstly, the Reformation was, among other things, an attempt to restore the English Church