Finance" leaves much to be desired. Even the chapter's suggested readings are lacking in current citations; the "Notes" show no references after 1982.

If this is truly a second edition, then I would have expected that the authors would have made every attempt to extend the chapters that deal most specifically with current problems with a paragraph or two--not so. The only evidence that I can find that that was really done was in the chapter on "Multinational Corporations" where the one-half page cut of the Volkswagen plant at Westmoreland, Pennsylvania, has been replaced with a full-page rendering of the new Toyota plant in Georgetown, Kentucky. But even the added comments fall short of what one might expect given the explosive history of the Japanese economy since 1983.

On the whole, I find that this second edition is not what is implied by the phrase as I might define same. It is essentially the original volume with slight cosmetic changes that suggest something different, but isn't. On the other hand, I would still recommend the use of this text in the classroom. It is well-written, but coves the waterfront too loosely. I would have appreciated a true second edition of a text in a field that is becoming more and more popular. The publication of this edition suggests less control by the authors and more concern by the publisher in marketing something a second time around for increased profit rather than increased understanding and greater scholarship.

Northeastern University   Paul H. Tedesco

Altina L. Waller. *Feud: Hatfields, McCoys, and Social Change in Appalachia, 1860-1900.* Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1988. Pp. xiii, 313. Cloth, $32.50; paper, $12.50.

As Altina Waller notes in her introduction, for most Americans the Hatfield-McCoy feud conjures up "images of bearded mountaineers brandishing rifles and jugs of moonshine as they defend illegal stills from federal 'revenuers,' enforce 'shotgun' weddings, and lawlessly perpetuate inherited family grudges." Historians have generally reinforced this view, explaining this late nineteenth-century dispute as the natural product of premodern Appalachian culture, where irrational family loyalties, rampant lawlessness, and routine violence were the norm.

But in *Feud* Altina Waller brilliantly rescues the feudists and their world from popular stereotypes and historical misinterpretation. Instead of caricatures, Waller provides detailed and sympathetic treatments of protagonists such as "Old Ranel" McCoy, "Bad Frank" Phillips, and "Devil Anse" Hatfield. More than this, Waller *explains* the dispute. She convincingly argues that there were two distinct phases to the feud. Feud I (1878-82) was strictly a local affair. Here Waller demolishes much of the standard interpretation, making clear that: kinship was not the controlling variable, as economic ties and other factors resulted in McCoys on the Hatfield side, and vice-versa; the disputants (in keeping with their Appalachian neighbors) went to great lengths to secure legal remedies for their problems; and the violence that did occur (five killings in five years) was an aberration in Appalachian culture.

More important is Waller's discussion of Feud II (1887-1890). As the author demonstrates, this second phase was not primarily a local affair. In the 1880s the forces of industrial capitalism turned their attention to the rich resources of Appalachia. Seeking to hasten capitalist advance, local commercial elites and the governor of Kentucky committed themselves to making "eastern Kentucky 'safe' for development." As part of this program, and spurred on by a few grudge-nursing McCoy partisans (including one with connections to the governor's office), in 1887 the state of Kentucky offered rewards for capture of the Hatfields. The result was a revival of the dispute, but at a much more violent level, with house-burnings, bounty hunters, extralegal posses, and pitched battles. This intensified violence was initiated not by "primitive" and "uncivilized" mountaineers, but by invading modernizers. The latter were the winners of this famous feud, not the Hatfields nor even the McCoys (despite Kentucky's execution of one Hatfield supporter, and imprisonment of others). As Waller observes, the modernizers used the violence they created as an argument for further interventions and "drastic alterations in Appalachian culture." And the interventions and alterations came. In effect, the Hatfield-McCoy feud was just another episode in the "capitalist transformation" of the region, a transformation, Waller sadly concludes, that "inexorably has been accompanied by economic, social, and cultural exploitation" of the Appalachian people.

Feud is a complex work, and I have greatly over-simplified Waller's sophisticated argument. But in one area analysis is not so sophisticated: religion. In her first chapter Waller pronounces that the Appalachian people were quite religious, and, in fact, it was "these religious values which most cogently reveal the community's definition of itself and its relation to the world beyond the valley." Having said this, she then proceeds to devote all of three paragraphs to religion, with very little discussion of religion in the remainder of the book. In this cursory treatment Waller argues that the Primitive Baptist Calvinism of the mountaineers led them to be fatalistic, suspicious, and opposed to capitalism and personal economic advancement. Waller does not really prove this point, nor does she attempt to square her argument with the long historiographical tradition linking Calvinism with the rise of capitalism.

Religion aside, *Feud* is social history of the first order. Moreover, given Waller's engaging treatment of a fascinating topic, *Feud* could work very well in an upper-division social history or twentieth-century America course.

Messiah College   William Vance Trollinger, Jr.

Anthony Short. *The Origins of the Vietnam War*. London & New York: Longman, 1989. Pp. xv, 347. Paper, $14.95.

The Vietnam War is a "hot" course topic now and texts are being produced to meet the demand. Neglected for so long, the Vietnam conflict has now generated a host of combat memoirs as well as works dealing with the diplomatic side of the war, but has produced fewer studies of the early years of U.S. involvement. The natural questions for each new Vietnam text are: Is this book useful, and is it necessary?

Anthony Short's *Origins of the Vietnam War* is part of the Origins of Modern Wars series, that has already weighed in with some distinguished entries, such as James Joll's *Origins of the First World War*. Short defines his origins broadly, providing chapters on the early career of Ho Chi Minh, the French involvement and exodus, and the subsequent growth of U.S. involvement through 1965. The American involvement is broken down into a chapter on the period from 1952 to 1954 and another on the Geneva conference of 1954. These two chapters are followed by three chapters that cover the Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson years through 1965. Throughout, the author concentrates on the diplomatic maneuvering behind the conflict rather than on the purely military side of the war.

The author's purpose is to provide essentially a narrative of events rather than closely argued analytic treatment. In doing so he displays a command of the relevant secondary literature as well as the major printed document collections. Short, a reader in international relations at the University of Aberdeen, does not claim to break new ground, but he ties together the various French and American accounts of the early years of the American involvement. He points to John Foster Dulles's unwillingness to participate in a settlement of the first Vietnam war as sowing the seeds for the widening American involvement in the late 1950s, but he is also critical of the Geneva accords as being carelessly worded and poorly conceived. Short draws an analogy between the causes of the Vietnam war and the nineteenth-century wars of unification in Germany and Italy. Hence, the United States stood in the way of a people determined to unite their country, a nearly impossible task. This concluding point is an interesting one, but one that Short's narrative does not adequately address.

The *Origins of the Vietnam War* is a solid work, even if written in pedestrian style. What then is the audience? The author's style and his assumption of wider knowledge make the book unsuitable for beginning audiences unless they have extensive coaching along the way. A college history course dealing with the Vietnam War seems to be the most likely market. For those who want a text that ties together the diplomatic side of the French conflict and the early stages of the American effort *The Origins of the Vietnam War* fills the bill. It does not replace works such as Peter Dunn's *First Vietnam War*, but its wider coverage makes it more amenable to classroom application. The very strength of *The Origins of the Vietnam War*, its emphasis on diplomatic history, may leave some readers cold, who desire a more campaigns-and-battles orientation. Nonetheless, it is time to go