

late nineteenth and twentieth centuries, emphasizing in particular the concept of women in the academy and the birth and growth of feminism. The focus on women writing history gets somewhat lost in her discussion of women breaking down academic barriers, and her discussion of feminism is much more in line with a feminist theory text than a work about women as writers of history. Many of the writers she references, such as Betty Freidan, Shulamith Firestone, and Robin Morgan, did not set out to write women's history as such, but Spongberg does cover much ground in a concise text, and includes prominent historians such as Gerda Lerner, Joan Kelly-Gadol, and Joan Wallach Scott.

Despite the fact that her ambitious study could probably have spanned several volumes, Spongberg presents a good, solid introductory text to women's studies and the idea of women in history, perfect for undergraduates or any student new to the topic. It would be ideal for an intro to a women's studies class, or even a course on women's narrative. How to use it in a traditional history survey is slightly problematic, since it covers so many time periods and nations. A better use would be in a women's history course; however, since there is so much material on the modern period, it could be easily adapted to fit the second half of United States history.

Floyd College

Laura Musselwhite

William Stafford. *John Stuart Mill*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999. Pp. viii, 155. Cloth, \$45.00; ISBN 0-312-21632-7.

John Stuart Mill, his philosophy, and his politics have always been of interest to intellectual historians, political historians, and even gender historians. Long-term projects of collecting and publishing his papers have been among the most impressive academic achievements of recent decades. Yet Mill suffers from neglect in many college history courses. While his ideas might appear in lectures, and certainly his early and consistent championing of women's rights ensures that he will be mentioned in modern European and Western Civilization contexts, it is rare to find his thought analyzed deeply except in the most specialized courses.

It is with refreshing frankness that William Stafford addresses the question of Mill's place in the curriculum in the very beginning of his introduction. Volumes upon volumes have been written on Mill, so why the need for another one? Further, where does someone like Mill fit into a greatly broadened and diversified history curriculum, with less and less emphasis on "traditional subjects" such as intellectual history and British history? In short, is this a book to assign in your history courses?

Not surprisingly, Stafford argues that a detailed study of Mill has enduring value, given that he wrestled with some of the most important questions of modern society then and now. The author stakes his claim to originality, however, by arguing that Mill has "all too often been assessed anachronistically, ripped out of the context of his time." Stafford places Mill in his nineteenth-century context, with all its attending

preoccupations and presumptions; examining Mill *in situ* provides Stafford with the ammunition for the claim that Mill's relevance should be sustained.

The book is mainly taken up with chapters that look at Mill's philosophy (and his other writings) in chunks, beginning with his *Autobiography*, then progressing to analyses of *The Logic*, *The Principles of Political Economy*, *Utilitarianism*, and *On Liberty*. He then finishes with a chapter on Mill's more overtly political works and on his time as a member of Parliament. Every chapter is extremely well informed about Mill's work and the commentaries on it and presents a clear and compelling analysis of Mill's thinking. In a word, this is an excellent short study of Mill and his work.

The difficulty for history teachers is how to fit this volume (and Mill in general) into their reading lists. It would fit well in an upper-division course on the history of ideas, one where it can be assumed that students know some of the basic philosophical terms used here without definition. It could also find a home in a course on modern British history, but even here it might be too focused to prove very useful in class or popular with students. Below the level of these courses, however, there would be little chance of finding much value in this book. Writing for a mainly British audience, Stafford is able to assume that readers will understand his references to events in nineteenth-century British history. This probably would not be the case for North American students taking survey courses. There are simply too many important allusions to parliamentary reform, political economy, Benthamism, Saint-Simonism, and others that will leave first- and second-year undergraduates confused. Trying to introduce these concepts to students before the book is read (or while they are reading it) would almost certainly take so much time that two weeks of a Western Civilization class would have to be devoted to Mill. Therefore, this study, while excellent, should mainly be confined to advanced courses in specific subjects and should probably not be risked in introductory or survey courses.

Penn State New Kensington

Joseph Coohill

Jeremy Black, ed. *European Warfare: 1815-2000*. New York: Palgrave, 2002. Pp. vii, 247. Paper, \$22.95; ISBN 0-333-78668-8.

Expect this work to change the thinking of anyone who regards military intelligence as an oxymoron. The purpose of this book is to expand military history from a survey-level cocoon of strategy and tactics to a broader range of more sophisticated political and technological considerations. It is about "the ideas and practices of the military and of military force over modern times, understood as the past two centuries."

Politically, military warfare transpired from nation fighting nation at the beginning of the past two centuries to a new globalization in the postmodern age when it is more reasonable to advance national welfare by increasing productivity than by expanding the extent of territory controlled. Productivity is multilateral, multinational, and interconnected. National wars are not. Nations now, therefore, fight small wars rather than disrupt the global economy.