

## Comptes rendus / Book Reviews 261

Together with its many positive points, the collection has a certain tendency to give the protagonist role entirely to industrial workers, and above all to those who showed left-wing organizational tendencies. Except for some allusions to the resistance by Frías Corredor in Huesca, the rural world is barely mentioned as a specific labour area; nor is there reference to the existence of conservative movements. In a way, the references to change and transformation are given more importance than the evident references to continuity, although this does appear in texts such as that by Martínez Gallego, which deals with the survival of many guild activities in mid-nineteenth-century Valencia, or in the texts by Uría and Frías. The cultural creation of a worker identity in Spain had its roots in the rural and traditional bedrock, which, to a great extent, conditioned and delayed alternative forms of organization and social identity. Seeing this as a delaying phenomenon does not mean that it should not be considered as an important part of future historiographical analysis, however. This is not a defect of this book, but rather of the whole historiography, which, in spite of everything, has advanced at breakneck speed after many years of standstill and dependency. An illustration of this advance can be found in this anthology by Piqueras and Sanz Rozalén.

Francisco J. Caspistegui  
*University of Navarre, Spain*

WEISBERGER R. William, Dennis UPCHICK, and David L. ANDERSON — *Profiles of Revolutionaries in Atlantic History, 1700–1850*. Boulder, CO: Social Science Monographs (distributed by Columbia University Press, New York), 2007. Pp. 338.

For historians of the Atlantic World or those searching for a genuine introduction to the subtheme of the revolutionary “Atlantic History,” this book will disappoint. The connections to recent Atlantic World scholarship remain confined to the title; nowhere is there any acknowledgement of the thorny chronological and geographic boundaries of Atlantic history, of the clash between nationalist and socio-cultural interpretations of Atlantic identities (French, British, or Iberian “Atlantics,” Black/African Diaspora, “Red,” “Green,” or Moravian Atlantics), or any attempt to situate the revolutionaries profiled here within the emerging tripartite framework of Atlantic history outlined by David Armitage. As the introduction by R. William Weisberger clearly reveals, this is Atlantic history by assertion only.

This is a shame, since the collection has much to recommend it as a more traditional, encyclopaedic introduction to canonic figures in the “long revolutionary century” from the late Scientific Revolution c. 1715 to the nationalist and republican uprisings in 1848. Although the articles are uneven in stylistic quality and length and include some rather bizarre choices (a two-page profile of Molly Pitcher?), as is true of most such collections, the editors have done a good job

of uniting a generally solid core of scholars covering a diverse array of leaders. The works collectively suggest the centrality of republican nationalism in Europe and the Americas, while reinforcing the role of the early United States as both national model and revolutionary midwife.

At their best, several of the essays offer not only intelligent reappraisals of their subjects, but comment on the tension between a presumed universalism of a nationalist, republican revolutionary ideology and the compromises and inconsistencies resulting from particular actions in particular places. On the American side of the Atlantic, William Pencak presents Ben Franklin as a “jester figure” (p. 58) who relied in his writing on marginalized characters such as elderly women (“Silence Dogood”), free black artisans (“Blackamore”), and of course unlettered yet sage farmers (“Poor Richard”) to expose the mistreatment of women, the hypocrisy of religious figures, and the pomposity of social elites. In Pencak’s view, Franklin sought not to undermine colonial American society, but to strengthen it; accordingly, he presents Franklin less as revolutionary figure and more in the Bailyn-esque (if one might coin a phrase) tradition of the American Revolution as purifying movement, a return to first moral and political principles. David Geggus, renowned for his nearly 40 articles on revolutionary Haiti, has crafted a smart, short, engaging analysis that follows the rise of Toussaint L’Ouverture from coachman to wily military commander and architect of an independent Haiti-in-the-making. In the process, Geggus analyses the many controversies over the “real” Toussaint and the “air of mystery he deliberately cultivated” (p. 127). While being an attempt to set the record straight on L’Ouverture at one level, the essay works even better as meditation on the perils of making definitive pronouncements on the actions of public figures. Finally, Joan Supplee traces the European background of Argentine liberator José Francisco de San Martín, noting among other things his genius for applying lessons transatlantically (such as his “ability to train American soldiers in European cavalry techniques” (p. 166), which proved instrumental in gaining Argentina’s independence.

On the European side of the Atlantic, Benjamin Reilly analyses the life of French revolutionary ideologue and diplomat Jacques-Pierre Brissot in a long but thoughtful essay to discover the “roots of [his] ill-fated diplomacy” (p. 187). Reilly’s goal is to determine whether Brissot’s policy disasters (notably in thrusting an unprepared France into war with the First Coalition in 1792) emanated from his own ideological commitment or were more symptomatic of what François Furet derided as the “Manichean” tendency in revolutionary discourse. Reilly charts a middle path, suggesting that “Brissot’s accusations reflected, as much as initiated, wider revolutionary trends” (p. 212). Seymour Drescher reprises his earlier scholarship on Alexis de Tocqueville with a fairly brief contribution on the French Assemblyman’s unsuccessful attempt to inject populist American republican practices, such as bicameralism, into the constitution for the Second Republic (1848–1852). In the end, de Tocqueville could not convince his fellow politicians of the benefits of trusting the majority, thereby condemning France to the “cycle of violent alterations between revolution and despotism” (p. 297). Steven B. Várdy profiles another lonely voice in the republican

wilderness, nineteenth-century Hungarian political agitator Louis Kossuth, and charts his attempt to win moral support and financial backing among the ultra-nationalist “Young America” movement during his famous American tour of 1852. By supporting largely pro-slavery Southern expansionists and seeking to sidestep the explosive issue of slavery, Kossuth became a “double-faced hypocrite” (p. 313) and alienated his ideologically more “natural” allies, anti-slavery proponents such as W. L. Garrison and H. W. Beecher.

Less successful are the essays by Richard A. Rutyna on George Washington, Edward T. Brett on Mexican independence leader Father Miguel Hidalgo, Roy E. Goodman on early American publisher Hezekiah Niles, Anthony X. Sutherland on Irish editor John Mitchel, or Weisberger on Polish revolutionary Jerry Czartoryski. These essays tend more toward the celebratory rather than the explanatory and, with the exception of Goodman, present their subjects largely denuded of any larger Atlantic connections. In a world apart are the essays by Lord Byron specialist Jonathan Gross and by Lauren G. Leighton on Russian Decembrist Alexander Pushkin. The former is a smart examination of how print culture in the Napoleonic era emerged as a “wing of social action” (p. 218) through the pens of poets such as Byron; the latter is a bewildering piece that asks whether Pushkin was a “real Mason” (he apparently was) and seems a strange addition to this collection by any measure. The initial essay by Weisberger on English scientist and “accomplished Newtonian demonstrator” (p. 32) John T. Desaguliers is a rather tedious and purely descriptive piece that tells us much about the physics behind public demonstrations of Newton’s revolutionary theories; it does not demonstrate how the public, on either side of the Atlantic, theorized Newton as a revolutionary (although there is a brief reference to his influence on Franklin on page 51).

It is frankly difficult to imagine the target audience for this work. The book is too advanced to serve as a solid, wide-ranging reference or brief introduction for undergraduates or the larger reading public, yet is not consistently rigorous in terms of scholarship, or cohesive enough, to stand as a set of scholarly essays to help professional academics. *Profiles of Revolutionaries in Atlantic History* in many ways shows both the promises and frustrations of Atlantic World history; its strongest contribution is perhaps to demonstrate the magnitude of the problem of interpreting revolutionary movements within an Atlantic context.

Kenneth Banks  
*University of Ottawa*

ZIPF, Catherine W. — *Professional Pursuits: Women and the American Arts and Crafts Movement*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2007. Pp. 229.

One of the first challenges of women’s history is locating women who played significant roles in the past. A second challenge is to integrate their lives and stories fully into the existing historical record. Catherine W. Zipf’s *Professional Pursuits*: