compromised denazification by employing from necessity not preference officials with controversial Nazi pasts.

British policies, Marshall concludes, constrained further by financial and military weaknesses at the war's end, by pressing world-wide commitments, and by American disapproval of radical innovations, neither actively promoted nor hindered the emergence of a new order. Explicit here is the book's underlying theme, a regret that both the British and the Germans let slip an opportunity to insure that post-war institutions would be fundamentally unlike those of either the Weimar Republic or the Nazi period.

Historians dealing with controversial recent events, especially those in periods like post-war Germany that still provoke emotional responses from participants as well as scholars, confront unresolvable problems of source material. Although the notes and bibliography indicate that Marshall has consulted an abundance of primary and secondary sources, printed as well as oral, British as well as German, she concedes the limitations of the materials used and specifies the documents closed to her, such as the Lower Saxony denazification proceedings. While the writing, albeit occasionally labored and awkward, is generally clear as is the organization, there are persistent and annoying errors (e.g. Trueman for Truman, p. 11).

Scholars and graduate students who specialize in recent German history will appreciate the factual details assembled for this case study of British occupation policies. Undergraduates will find the book less useful, largely because this narrowly conceived study is not set within the larger context of allied occupation policies and practices in Germany as a whole.

Pembroke State University

Robert W. Brown


The editors of America Firsthand believe that the "past is the present writ small." In this two-volume set designed as supplementary reading for the survey course, Robert Marcus and David Burner have dug deeply into the historical past to find diary entries, letters, speeches, government documents, and specialized excerpts from vintage literature and monographs to illustrate that life today bears some marked similarities to the generations of yesteryear.

Volume One, sub-titled From Settlement to Reconstruction, is composed of four parts: "Discovery and Early Settlement;" "From Colonies to Republic;" "The Growth of a New Nation;" and "Reform, Slavery, Civil War, and Reconstruction." While the sections (and corresponding time periods) are fairly standard, many of the readings, especially those that are more social than economic and political, are new and refreshing fare. Contrary to earlier textbooks, this anthology contains information on women (Mary Jemison, Harriet Robinson, Jane Lewis, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Harriet Tubman, Sojourner Truth); on Indians (Father Paul Le Jeune, King Philip, Black Hawk); on Blacks (Nat Turner, Frederick Douglass, Felix Haywood); on church and school (Caleb Bingham and Peter Cartwright); and, of course, traditional fare, such as great men (Christopher Columbus, John Smith, William Bradford, Cotton Mather, Tom Paine, George Washington).

Volume Two, entitled From Reconstruction to the Present, contains four sections: "Reconstruction and the Western Frontier;" "An Age of Economic Expansion;" "Roots of the Modern Era;" and "America Since 1945." With richer material to draw upon, the second half of America Firsthand is substantially longer than the first. In addition to items on women and minorities, this book contains documents on immigration (O.E. Rolvaag, Upton Sinclair), reform movements (Mother Jones, Jacob Riis, Lincoln Steffens, John F. Kennedy, Tom Hayden), and the downtrodden (the Grimes family, Otis G. Lynch, Jessie de la Cruz). The selections are generally edited for interest as well as length.

In conclusion, America Firsthand is an excellent addition to burgeoning lists of textual curricula for the freshman survey course. Both volumes give almost equal weight to the four divisions therein and a concerted effort has been made to illustrate history "from the bottom up" as opposed to "from the top down." Then, too, a serious attempt has been made to retain the context of those selections that have been shortened. The editors have also expended some time in creating discussion questions for each of the subdivisions, eliminating the need for an instructor's manual. Finally, the publishers selected community college, college, and university instructors, both men and women, from California to Texas and from Ohio to Arizona, to review the manuscript as a whole. This process, undoubtedly, identified some errors and fostered some public relations activity for future adoptions.
In the end, however, the major question concerning these volumes cannot be answered here. That question is, "Will the published reflections of many minds and personalities that made up the American character motivate modern students to view history as a discipline that offers viable insight and perspective into his or her world?"

Northern Arizona University


To this reviewer, Lawrence W. Levine's latest study represents cultural, intellectual, and social history at its best. In the introduction Levine recounts his growing awareness of the fact that the present hierarchical distinction between "highbrow" or "elite" culture and "lowlow" or "popular" culture is of relatively recent origin, dating only from the turn of the last century. For instance, during most of the nineteenth century Shakespeare was "part and parcel" of a "rich shared public culture." In theaters the Bard was presented, suitably altered to suit local dramatic and moral tastes, to a socially heterogeneous audience who freely expressed their views, verbally and in more physical ways. Various versions of Shakespeare were presented in large cities, small towns, river boats, and barrooms. Then a strange thing happened. Shakespeare was "purified"—"sacralized" is Levine's preferred term—and elevated above the masses. The "legitimized" Bard became part of "high culture" and a "cultural deity" rather than a cultural experience. He became, and remains, "theatrical spinach" to be taken because he is good for one's cultural development.

The same thing happened to opera, symphonic music, and the arts. It is difficult now to imagine the ubiquity of opera in the nineteenth century, but in those days street boys whistled operatic airs and soldiers marched to "La Traviata Quickstep." Travelling singers and instrumentalists like Jenny Lind and Ole Bull casually mixed American folk pieces with the most respected European compositions. Orchestras included the Katy-did Polka and a Beethoven symphony on the same program. Then, like drama, music became sacralized and elevated above the masses. "Serious" music, usually by European composers, required a carefully controlled setting, similar to a temple or church, and an appropriately reverent audience. At the same time museums moved from the "general and eclectic to the exclusive and specific." All this cultural elevation and segregation was accompanied by "sacred language and religious analogies." According to the new dispensation nothing fine could be popular and nothing popular could be fine. It was not so much that rigid barriers were erected between the two cultures: "The meaning of culture itself was being defined... The primary debate was less over who should enter the precincts of the art museum, the symphony hall, the opera house as what they should experience once they did enter, what the essential purpose of these temples of culture was in the first place." The purpose of sacralized art and music was, first, to purify and elevate culture itself, and, second, to improve the taste, cultivate virtue, and promote the spiritual growth of the masses, while in the process making them worthy citizens of the American republic. Levine shows how "arbiters of culture" like Henry Adams, Henry James, and Frederick Law Olmsted sought to promote social order in rapidly changing times, and to "civilize" the masses. He also notes a less than admirable desire for cultural exclusivity and more impersonal cultural trends.

This book could well serve as a textbook in nineteenth-century American cultural, social, and intellectual history. It fits in well with studies in American gentility (e.g. Stow Persons) and American republicanism (e.g. Gordon Wood). It reflects the rediscovery of popular culture, and provides insights into the current controversy over the "canon" of a liberal education. There is no doubt that Levine's sympathies lie with those who wish to modify the accent on a narrow range of elite "classics" by Western white males. Levine is not as much concerned with "high" standards as he is with shared cultural experiences. Although his book does little to resolve the problem of cultural standards in a mass society, it does provide a new perspective by showing that the elitist pedigree dates only from the turn of the last century.

Winston-Salem State University

Philip Reed Rulon
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To this reviewer, Lawrence W. Levine's latest study represents cultural, intellectual, and social history at its best. In the introduction Levine recounts his growing awareness of the fact that the present hierarchical distinction between "highbrow" or "elite" culture and "lowlow" or "popular" culture is of relatively recent origin, dating only from the turn of the last century. For instance, during most of the nineteenth century Shakespeare was "part and parcel" of a "rich shared public culture." In theaters the Bard was presented, suitably altered to suit local dramatic and moral tastes, to a socially heterogeneous audience who freely expressed their views, verbally and in more physical ways. Various versions of Shakespeare were presented in large cities, small towns, river boats, and barrooms. Then a strange thing happened. Shakespeare was "purified"—"sacralized" is Levine's preferred term—and elevated above the masses. The "legitimized" Bard became part of "high culture" and a "cultural deity" rather than a cultural experience. He became, and remains, "theatrical spinach" to be taken because he is good for one's cultural development.

The same thing happened to opera, symphonic music, and the arts. It is difficult now to imagine the ubiquity of opera in the nineteenth century, but in those days street boys whistled operatic airs and soldiers marched to "La Traviata Quickstep." Travelling singers and instrumentalists like Jenny Lind and Ole Bull casually mixed American folk pieces with the most respected European compositions. Orchestras included the Katy-did Polka and a Beethoven symphony on the same program. Then, like drama, music became sacralized and elevated above the masses. "Serious" music, usually by European composers, required a carefully controlled setting, similar to a temple or church, and an appropriately reverent audience. At the same time museums moved from the "general and eclectic to the exclusive and specific." All this cultural elevation and segregation was accompanied by "sacred language and religious analogies." According to the new dispensation nothing fine could be popular and nothing popular could be fine. It was not so much that rigid barriers were erected between the two cultures: "The meaning of culture itself was being defined... The primary debate was less over who should enter the precincts of the art museum, the symphony hall, the opera house as what they should experience once they did enter, what the essential purpose of these temples of culture was in the first place." The purpose of sacralized art and music was, first, to purify and elevate culture itself, and, second, to improve the taste, cultivate virtue, and promote the spiritual growth of the masses, while in the process making them worthy citizens of the American republic. Levine shows how "arbiters of culture" like Henry Adams, Henry James, and Frederick Law Olmsted sought to promote social order in rapidly changing times, and to "civilize" the masses. He also notes a less than admirable desire for cultural exclusivity and more impersonal cultural trends.

This book could well serve as a textbook in nineteenth-century American cultural, social, and intellectual history. It fits in well with studies in American gentility (e.g. Stow Persons) and American republicanism (e.g. Gordon Wood). It reflects the rediscovery of popular culture, and provides insights into the current controversy over the "canon" of a liberal education. There is no doubt that Levine's sympathies lie with those who wish to modify the accent on a narrow range of elite "classics" by Western white males. Levine is not as much concerned with "high" standards as he is with shared cultural experiences. Although his book does little to resolve the problem of cultural standards in a mass society, it does provide a new perspective by showing that the elitist pedigree dates only from the turn of the last century.
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