In the final section of *Liberalism for a New Century*, Danny Postel and Michael Tomasky extend the postmortem for liberalism to foreign policy in ways that support the general tenor of the earlier chapters: the liberalism of the New Deal and the Great Society was better, more authentic, more universally appealing than the anti-establishment, anti-capitalist, postmodern, anything-goes post-1960s liberalism of relativism, fluid identity, and lifestyle choice. Postel argues that Iranian intellectuals' fondness for Habermas, Popper, and Arendt reveals how appealing an older, Enlightenment-based liberalism of individual freedom, political democracy, and rights remains in much of the non-Western world. Tomasky contends that liberal hawks who supported the Iraq war and liberal doves who opposed it need to own up to their mistakes: for hawks, their defense of the invasion as a justifiable effort to establish democracy, when George Bush actually intended to establish a client state in the Middle East; and for doves, the view that any foreign intervention whatsoever is always illegitimate. Both groups should resubscribe to a pre-Bush liberal internationalism, argues Tomasky, in which fighting wars to right unacceptable wrongs may at times be both legitimate and necessary.

The strongest (and most controversial) message of the edited volume is a call for return to liberalism at its best and brightest, when liberals achieved significant steps toward a welfare state, established (*de jure*) full civil rights, set in place international structures and policies that ultimately defeated communism, and retained a diverse middle and working class base in the Democratic Party. Thus the volume can be read as an endorsement of the vision that placed Barack Obama in the White House, promising to withdraw US forces from Iraq, redress wrongs perpetrated at Guantanamo, achieve universal health care, restore essential economic regulation, and deal with global warming. Yet the serious defense of workers' job and organiing rights that these writers see as essential to liberalism has not had top billing in the Obama agenda; nor, it currently appears, will a significant redistribution of income and wealth be a major goal of the rebuilding of economic regulation. Perhaps more renewal will be needed.

Mary O. Furner
University of California, Santa Barbara

Louis Adamic, *Dynamite: The Story of Class Violence in America* (Edinburgh, Oakland, West Virginia: AK Press, 2008).

In 1931, as the Great Depression gathered steam, Louis Adamic published *Dynamite: The Story of Class Violence in America*. Adamic, a self-taught Slovenian immigrant who came to the United States in 1913, drew on extensive experience as a wage labourer and his wide reading of literature on the labour movement to create a compelling "popular" account of violence in American labour history.

It remains compelling to this day, testament to Adamic's searching critique of American capitalism, and compassion for its victims.

On one level *Dynamite* recounts the familiar story of the Molly Maguires, the great riots of 1877, Haymarket, the Homestead Strike, the 1910 dynamiting of the Los Angeles *Times* building, the Mooney-Billings frame-up, the Great Steel Strike of 1919, and Sacco and Vanzetti. Some readers will find Adamic's choice of emphasis erratic; five pages are dedicated to General Jacob Coxey's 1893-94 march of the unemployed on Washington, while the execution of Joe Hill, legendary Industrial Workers of the World (IWW) labour organizer, merits a single paragraph. Adamic's use of terminology can be confusing; in discussing the IWW he quite rightly distinguishes violence from sabotage, correctly interpreted as striking on the job. Yet in describing some Wobblies in the 1920s as "veritable evangelists of sabotage" (269) Adamic calls into question his own distinction, leaving the impression that Wobbly-influenced American workers understood destroying company property and wrecking machinery as very much a form of violence.

In contrast, Adamic demonstrates insight and nuance in challenging the stark dichotomies academic labour historians have tended to draw between the reformist American Federation of Labor (AFL) and the radical American Railway Union, Western Federation of Miners and IWW. Adamic argues that in the 1910-11 period the American left and labour movement was at the height of its challenge to American capitalism and the American state; there was little to distinguish the rhetoric of Samuel Gompers from the rhetoric of Eugene Debs, little to differentiate the left from the right of the labour movement. At times readers will find Adamic's arguments contentious, contradictory, and lacking evidentiary credibility, but rarely will they find them without insight and challenge.

At first curious, but ultimately understandable, is that the heart of *Dynamite* is a 50-page treatment of the 1910 bombing of the Los Angeles *Times* building, a "crime" later confessed to by the McNamara brothers, John J. and James B. Adamic uses the case to effectively communicate that in 1910 the AFL was a hybrid beast, Samuel Gompers' denunciations of anarchists and violence its public face, the use of dynamite "a definite part" of its policy and tactics (66). AFL unionists employed dynamite, Adamic insists, and Gompers and the AFL "knew what they were doing" (67). Adamic is a fierce critic of Gompers and the AFL, but he has no use for left-wing radicals and liberal intellectuals who fail to understand that the Federation survived because of rank-and-file militance and the necessary resort of its leaders to violence.

At the core of Adamic's analysis is the intertwining of organized labour and organized crime. The Chicago anarchists advocated the use of dynamite, which was then taken up by AFL unionists such as the Iron Workers, only then to be taken up by professional criminals. Labour unions instructed gangsters in the use of dynamite, not the other way around (252). Making the link

to the rank-and-file, Adamic brilliantly reveals, with great verve and insight, why an American worker would much prefer to be a racketeer and criminal than an honest industrial labourer. Poverty in America, Adamic argues, drives the worker into the underworld, not into the radical movement. There is hope that the American working class will some day embrace Marx and the class struggle, but Adamic lays down the gauntlet; before that happens, Marxist intellectuals need to truly open their eyes to the brutal underbelly of American life.

Worker run book publisher and distributor AK Press is to be commended for re-publishing *Dynamite*, complete with a revealing "Forward" by Jon Bekken that locates *Dynamite* in the context of Louis Adamic's other works. AK Press has looked beyond its anarchist mandate to publish a work that at times seems to suggest that the function of labour violence has been to save capitalists from themselves. That said, *Dynamite* is a hard hitting, honest, and revealing exposé of the brutal and unrelenting violence of American capitalism. Desperation, Adamic quite rightly argues, breeds violence, and in terroristic acts we see "the horror of desperate men thrown out of work with their families on the verge of starvation" (249). Put *Dynamite* on your to-read list; it is a heartfelt appeal for understanding of American workers who have been driven, and will continue to be driven, to not-so-quiet acts of desperation.

Peter Campbell
Queen's University

Rebecca N. Hill, *Men, Mobs, and Law: Anti-Lynching and Labor Defense in U.S. Radical History* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2008).

Some historians work within tightly bounded areas: one particular event, or institution, or place, at one particular time. Others, and Rebecca N. Hill falls in this category, look across a broader expanse of the past and see connections between different segments that are generally treated separately. *Men, Mobs, and Law: Anti-Lynching and Labor Defense in U.S. Radical History* traces the "history of both anti-lynching campaigns and radical defense from the era of abolitionism until the New Left" (3). From that brief description, it should be clear that Hill has set herself an ambitious task, and the book that results is challenging but very worthwhile.

What the campaigns discussed here (John Brown, Haymarket, anti-lynching, various IWW campaigns, Sacco and Vanzetti, Scottsboro, the Rosenbergs, and George Jackson) have in common is that the state and its judicial apparatus is figured as the enemy of justice, particularly for those working for social and political change. Even the anti-lynching campaigns of Ida B. Wells and others sought social and political change, though they wanted more vigorous action by the legal system, not less. During the period under discus-