

other writers ignored or were afraid to deal with. By constructing representations of sexual violence against black women through a “domestic discourse that began from the point of rape’s unspeakability,” these writers, according to Gunning, were able to explore a number of issues surrounding white violence that had gone largely unquestioned: “the fact that only white women are figured as victims of rape; the narrow representation of mob violence as solely the lynching of black men; the contested representation of black women themselves; [and] the internal contradiction faced by black communities in their own attempts to confront lynching and rape” (80).

As a means toward fulfilling her project of representing turn-of-the-century literary debates over race, rape, and lynching as a truly interracial and intergender “memory-making” (138), and as a first step toward uncovering how white women participated in these debates in literature, Gunning turns in chapter four to the works of Kate Chopin. Focusing on Chopin’s stories and first novel, *At Fault*, Gunning demonstrates that while the Southern author does not actively resist white supremacist thought, she nevertheless extends debates over racial violence by challenging some of the myths at the core of white supremacist ideology. Gunning points out, for example, that in *At Fault* Chopin fails to condemn white violence (121), but unlike advocates of white supremacy such as Thomas Dixon, she rejected the fusion of “the objectified and disempowered white female body with the nation” (121) and deconstructed “white supremacy’s myth of the black rapist in order to free her white women characters from restrictive political roles” (125).

Race, Rape, and Lynching is a provocative and important contribution to recent efforts by scholars to blur traditional and often arbitrary divisions within American literary studies as a means of exploring the kinds of intertextual dialogues about race that occurred as black and white men and women attempted to make sense of their social, political, and cultural milieu through literature. Clearly written and scrupulously researched, Gunning’s study is essential reading for anyone who wishes to better understand the red record of racial violence that occurred in this nation at the turn-of-the-century.

Westfield State College

Christopher C. De Santis

RANDOLPH BOURNE AND THE POLITICS OF CULTURAL RADICALISM. By Leslie J. Vaughan. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas. 1997.

At birth Randolph Bourne (1886-1918), the American cultural critic, had his face twisted and scarred by a physician’s forceps, and at age four he contracted spinal tuberculosis and was left hunchbacked, barrel-chested, and stunted in height. Though he was accepted by Princeton in 1903, his uncle, a lawyer who was supporting his mother and her four children, refused to pay for his education, saying that with Bourne’s appearance he could not succeed in a profession. After six unhappy years during which Bourne was often unemployed, he applied to Columbia and received a full academic scholarship. He was editor of the *Columbia Monthly* by his second year at the university, and in May 1922 he published an article “The Two Generations” in the *Atlantic Monthly*. By the time Bourne graduated, from a four-year program leading to a master’s degree in political science, he had published seven articles there.

After returning from a one-year traveling fellowship in western Europe in 1914, Bourne got a job as a contributing editor at the *New Republic*. Between the return and his death he published extensively on American education and society and wrote in opposition to American intervention and participation in World War I. Bourne’s anti-war articles in

Seven Arts led the sponsor of the journal to terminate her support, and by 1917 the *New Republic* seems to have confined him to articles on education and to book reviews (89, 231-23). John Dewey—who had directed Bourne’s master’s thesis at Columbia, had greatly influenced his ideas on education, and had helped him get his editorship on the *New Republic*—supported American intervention; when Bourne attacked his stance on the war, Dewey arranged to have him removed as an editor of the *Dial*. A few weeks after being dismissed, Bourne died of influenza.

Leslie J. Vaughan has written a critical exposition and analysis of Bourne’s main ideas, with relevant descriptions of the social, political, and cultural scene in Bourne’s time. She has written too about historians’ and other commentators’ judgments of Bourne. In her discussions, she has called attention to points at which Bourne anticipated theories of later critics, and also to her own employment of ideas of Michel Foucault, Jacques Lacan, and others.

Among Bourne’s memorable views, we note two that Vaughan discusses. During the phase of “preparedness” before the United States entered the war, Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson attacked dual national loyalties. In this atmosphere of intolerance, Vaughan writes, melting-pot assimilationists sought to counter paranoid Anglo-conformists. Horace Kallen, a University of Wisconsin professor who differed with both groups, published an article “Democracy versus the Melting Pot” in 1915, setting forth the ideal of an ethnically diverse nation. He employed the metaphor of American culture as an orchestra, with a harmony produced by different ethnic and cultural identities. Subsequently Bourne published “Trans-National America,” in the July 1916 *Atlantic Monthly*, and “The Jew and Trans-National America,” in the December 1916 *Menorah Journal*. Bourne’s idea differed from that of Kallen. For Bourne, America’s cultural identity lay in the future: “American,” he wrote, “shall be what the immigrant will have a hand in making it” (136).

Another of Vaughan’s views was in stark opposition to John Dewey’s: that liberals could turn the war to democratic ends. Bourne argued: “If the war is too strong for you to prevent, how is it going to be weak enough for you to control and mould to your liberal purposes” (105)?

In Bourne’s “A War Diary” (*Seven Arts*, September 1917), he wrote: “One keeps healthily in wartime not by a series of religious and political consultations that something good is coming out of it all, but by a vigorous assertion of values in which the war had no part” (142). Of his view here, Vaughan writes: “Bourne’s position ‘below the battle’ . . . was another form of political engagement, a way to free oneself from hegemonic certainties that block genuine debate, preclude alternatives to politics-as-usual, and prevent democratic change” (6).

Vaughan’s study is fragmented and cluttered; if she had omitted much peripheral material, her main points would have stood out more clearly; but her perceptions are keen and most readers will profit from the book.

University of Kansas

Melvin Landsberg

GASTONIA 1929: The Story of the Loray Mill Strike. By John A. Salmond. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. 1995.

In the spring and summer of 1929, thousands of North Carolina textile mill workers faced company gunmen, corrupt legal police and county sheriffs, and the National Guard