

by poverty, inferior education and race and sex discrimination at nearly every turn. In the wake of President Clinton's so-called "welfare reform," which Orleck notes ended FDR's "belief that a civilized society provides a safety net for its poorest and most vulnerable", and in light of increasing privatization of functions once deemed the responsibility of government, policy-makers, politicians and activists would do well to acquaint themselves with the history of a federally subsidized program that worked (305). For these and so many more reasons, Orleck's first-rate study is a must-read, not just for scholars, but for all those concerned with gender equality as well as racial and economic justice.

Christina Greene
University of Wisconsin, Madison

Cynthia A. Young, *Soul Power: Culture, Radicalism, and the Making of a U.S. Third World Left* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006).

Soul Power is an intriguing book, and contributes to a broader historical understanding of the U.S. New Left which does not privilege white student activism and posits a critique of empire as formative rather than a late development. It functions as a series of case studies: a 1960 delegation to Cuba which shaped the perspectives of three figures key to Black Power (Harold Cruse, LeRoi Jones, Robert F. Williams); the cultural activism of the Local 1199 union of hospital workers in New York city from the late 1950s on; the development of first Newsreel and then Third World Newsreel as radical film collectives; Angela Davis' praxis as a black Marxist; the L.A. Rebellion of black and African filmmakers in the 1970s, many of whom (Julie Dash, Charles Burnett, Haile Gerima) remain important figures today.

Cynthia Young posits that each of these instances or institutions contribute to the development of a 'United States Third World Left', parallel to but distinct from various other movements like the white student left and the Black Power movement. This is a challenging proposition, since Third-Worldism in Young's account is notably nonracialized—several of the groups she studies are white-led, like 1199 and Newsreel, so what matters is not experience or even standpoint but discourse.

Some of these investigations are more innovative than others. Those focusing on institutions like 1199 and the filmmakers, which have rarely been integrated into the larger 'movement', underline the importance of cultural work, and the New Left's complex web of residual and emerging formations. Conversely, Young's treatments of familiar figures like Angela Davis or Robert F. Williams act mainly as ballast for her larger argument, rather than making original claims. In large part, this is due to her reliance on a few published works by

or about these individuals, rather than archival research, such as the loosely-organized Amiri Baraka collection at the Moorland-Spingarn Research Center, or the voluminous Cruse papers at the Schomburg Library, both of which offer enormous insights into how these seminal men came to constitute themselves.

At some points, it is unclear whether the author is trying to fashion an original historical narrative, or offering a cultural analysis based on existing scholarship; only a few people have been able to carry off both (Harold Cruse is one example). If this book is meant to fashion a new history, then it has problems of depth: it is not correct to write that “it was not until 1966 that Stokely Carmichael would coin the phrase *black power*,” as Young does on page 44. Those two loaded words had become famous as the title of a 1954 book by Richard Wright, itself a prime instance of the kind of Third Worldist discourse which *Soul Power* seeks to surface. Then in the early 1960s the idea of ‘black power’ was repeatedly invoked by key intellectual actors like Lerone Bennett and James Boggs.

However, one suspects that rather than simply (or mainly) a historical narrative, Young intends to move across several disciplinary modes, intervening in both scholarly and political debates, so a critique on purely historical terms may not be useful. Her theoretical argument raises more fundamental questions. To this reviewer, it never becomes clear how the ‘U.S. Third World Left’ is distinct from the more internationalist sections of the New Left itself, or the implications of claiming it as a distinct trend. Who or what was included: was the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee part of the Third World Left in the U.S.? What about Dr. Martin Luther King, given how from 1956 on he insisted on the connections between ‘civil rights’ in the U.S. and anti-colonial liberation in Africa and elsewhere? If it was indeed multiracial, which white-led organizations played a role, besides the few cited here? Minus that articulation, a ‘Third World Left’ seems more of a discursive construct than a useful insight into the actual structure of the American Left between the 1950s and the 1970s.

The most intriguing argument Young makes, which could have been made much more strongly, is her suggestion that the Third World Left stretched across the so-called Old and New Lefts, most notably via her inclusion of the quintessential example of surviving Communist Party influence, Local 1199. Of course, the enigmatic Davis—an icon of Black Power and yet, at least formally, an orthodox Communist—by her very presence raised the question of why we insist on segmenting the U.S. Left into so many particularistic strands. *Soul Power* forces us to consider that question, which may be its largest contribution to the ongoing debate about how to understand radicalism in the Cold War era.

Van Gosse
Franklin and Marshall College