

very ugly and the proponents quite reasonable. Vividly written with wonderful analysis, this chapter sits alongside the one on King's character as gems.

Jesse Jackson sought civil rights advancements and personal publicity in equal measures. Accused by rivals of hogging the limelight, he kept the cause of civil rights and the treatment of the poor in the public eye. By getting corporations to provide jobs to blacks, he might also have inadvertently contributed to the destruction of the inner cities. Chappell effectively explores this erratic leader. With photographs, he also explodes the myth that he lied about cradling King's head in Memphis. The chapter might work well in a discussion of sources and fake news.

The final chapter leaves the reader hoping for more of Chappell's writing. It is a brilliant discussion of King's failures to be faithful to his wife and his plagiarizing of a massive part of his doctoral dissertation. Chappell dismisses the arguments that these were minor character flaws of human behavior. It is a chapter that is worth anthologizing in a King collection.

*Waking from the Dream* is highly recommended for upper-division undergraduates and graduate students. The flaws are minor. Introducing Jackson as the first African American to make a serious run for the presidency dismisses Shirley Chisholm's 1972 bid. Chappell misses an opportunity to take a deeper look at Coretta Scott King. The material on the NBPC and a coalition for full employment might also only connect with students who have rich understanding of politics. Fortunately, the chapters on the Civil Rights Act of 1968, the King holiday, Jesse Jackson, and King's character have broader appeal, with the latter three being outstanding choices for classroom discussion.

Miami University of Ohio Regional Campuses

Caryn E. Neumann

**Holger Hoock. *Scars of Independence: America's Violent Birth*. New York: Crown, 2017. Pp. 576. Cloth, \$30.00.**

In an impressive new book, Holger Hoock has put the Revolutionary War back into the American Revolution. Americans, Hoock argues, have, for several reasons, long minimized the violence associated with their war for independence. Much of the violence was committed by, or against, Loyalists, a group largely forgotten in the nineteenth century and for much of the twentieth. Compared to later conflicts, casualty figures from the Revolutionary War seemed small in absolute terms, but Holger points out that as a percentage of the population, nearly five times more Americans died in the Revolution than died in World War II, and the death rate among American prisoners of war was the highest of all American wars. The Anglo-American rapprochement that began to take shape after the Civil War created a new motive to sanitize the Revolution, and when the United States entered World War I on the side of the British in 1917, any

allusions to British violence against American Patriots become "politically toxic" (405). World War II and the Cold War only reinforced the trend.

Hook begins his narrative with the abuse of American Loyalists before and in the early stages of the Revolution. In January 1774, for example, a Boston mob tarred and feathered a minor customs official, John Malcolm; it was a far more gruesome ordeal than modern readers might realize. By comparison, George Washington, as commander of the Continental Army, fares well in Hook's hands. Washington tried to observe the rules of war and to prevent his soldiers from plundering civilian property. The notorious Hessians, German mercenaries employed by the British, were, according to Hook, no worse than British regulars. Their "atrocities appear to have been the exception rather than the rule" (118-19). On the frontier, meanwhile, pro-British Native Americans scalped and tortured white settlers, while Continental and state officials engaged in what later generations would call ethnic cleansing.

British generals suffer by comparison to Washington. Especially egregious was the treatment of American prisoners of war, many of whom were confined to overcrowded prison ships off the coast of British-held New York City. The limits of supply lines that stretched across the Atlantic Ocean created logistical challenges for the British, but their treatment of prisoners was nevertheless barbaric. Death rates on New York prison ships, Hook calculates, rarely fell below 50 percent and might have reached as high as 70 percent during hot summers. By comparison, American military personnel captured during the Korean War, who experienced some of the worst conditions ever endured by American POWs, suffered a 38 percent death rate. Hook concludes that "it is safe to assume that roughly half of all the Patriots under arms who died in the Revolutionary War died in British prisons and on prison ships" (227).

British cruelty proved counterproductive and allowed the Patriots to seize the moral high ground. It undermined enthusiasm for the war effort in Britain and compromised British efforts to win support in America. It did, however, prompt a post-war soul-searching in Britain that helped provide impetus for the anti-slavery movement and for the reform of British rule in India.

Some critics might accuse Hook of overstatement. He admits "we will never be able to quantify the violence that American Loyalists endured" (54). Reports of widespread sexual assaults by British soldiers often proved difficult to verify. Hook includes a contemporary British print of a woman being tarred and feathered by an American mob, although he acknowledges no evidence existed of any such incident. Yet the sheer brutality of the war is shocking; torture and mutilation were not uncommon. German-born and British-educated, Hook, who now teaches at the University of Pittsburgh, brings about as much objectivity to his topic as one historian could be expected to muster.

*Scars of Independence* is one of the most important books on the American Revolution to appear in recent years. Advanced students and history buffs should find it engaging, while specialists should find it enlightening. Hook has provided a much



needed and prodigiously researched supplement to contemporary historiography that has tended to focus on social and intellectual history at the expense of the often gory history of war.

Barton College

Jeff Broadwater

**Charles Fountain. *The Betrayal: The 1919 World Series and the Birth of Modern Baseball*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016. Pp. 247. Cloth, \$21.69.**

Given the mountain of mythology, paired with the incomplete historical evidence and self-interested disinformation surrounding the Black Sox Scandal, Charles Fountain's attempt to divine the truth of the fixing of the 1919 World Series in *The Betrayal: The 1919 World Series and the Birth of Modern Baseball* is a daunting task. His insistence on historical context, his unwillingness to cling to comfortable myth, along with his exhaustive research have succeeded in producing a well-written, accessible book that provides more clarity than has existed previously for understanding this seminal event in the history of baseball and American society.

Having shed much light on the event, Fountain cautions the reader that many of the occurrences in the scandal cannot be completely determined because they are clouded by fading memory, incomplete records, and in the self-interested lies of players, gamblers, owners, their lawyers, and other figures of baseball's establishment at the time. And that is most likely what the leaders of baseball wanted. What Fountain makes abundantly clear is that those in charge of the game in the two decades prior to the scandal simply looked the other way when confronted with fixes of baseball games. For example, he quotes Jack Taylor, Chicago Cubs' 21-game winner in 1903, with openly admitting to the press that he threw games in the profitable postseason intercity series with the White Sox: "Why should I have won? I got \$100 from Hart [owner of the Cubs] for winning, and I got \$500 for losing" (10). An investigation by the baseball commission cleared Taylor of fixing games. For Fountain, this lack of corrective action in 1903, and more, led directly to the Black Sox Scandal of 1919.

Complicating attempts to attain complete accuracy of this story is the mythology surrounding the scandal that has evolved over the many decades. Of particular note in generating dubious myths are the book and movie of the same title, *Eight Men Out*. Both Eliot Asinof's 1963 book and John Sayles' 1989 film, while compelling tales, take liberties with the facts. Both the book and the film maintain that star White Sox pitcher Ed Cicotte's motivation for throwing games in the 1919 World Series was allegedly because Sox owner Charles Comiskey deliberately held Cicotte out of games in 1917 to prevent him attaining his 30<sup>th</sup> victory and avoid paying him a promised \$10,000 bonus for his 30<sup>th</sup> win. This never happened. In fact, a quick consultation with *baseball-reference.com* reveals that Cicotte pitched eight games in September of 1917