her most unhappy” (177) and “homoerotic attractions never mentioned in the memoirs are given voice in verse” (244). She suggests that later in life Kemble wore her clothes in a rigid rotation “partly as a means of keeping her life in order” (212). David notes that, upon returning to England from America, “Kemble then mingled masculine bravura and feminine tenderness into an androgynous persona” (245).

The Fanny Kemble persona continues to fascinate. As a Kemble biographer myself, I have to confess that I sat down with this book with trepidation but found it was like listening to a new acquaintance describe how an old friend was doing. David’s book is a distinctive and welcome addition to the literature and an evocative and perceptive biographical study.

Queen’s University Belfast

CATHERINE CLINTON


Readers of this book will soon realize that its principal figure was not only a world-famous industrialist but also an accomplished writer and political activist. Andrew Carnegie, a self-educated man with only one year of formal schooling, produced an important book, Triumphant Democracy. It took four years to write and was described by one critic as a “valuable essay in comparative political sociology” (xv).

In his study, Carnegie’s Model Republic, A. S. Eisenstadt effectively demonstrates that the canny Scot from Dunfermline believed that knowledge and scholarship were the tools required to advance social welfare. He further notes that Carnegie considered socialism to be a spurious doctrine that appealed to the dregs of society and taught dependence rather than independence.

A citizen of America and Britain, Carnegie became known as the “star-spangled Scotsman” because he carried his perpetual message to the United Kingdom. Carnegie believed—and he proclaimed—that American society was democratic and humane and provided a useful model for Britain. Carnegie’s book encouraged each nation to identify its problems and to look to other societies for ways to solve them.

Eisenstadt’s work will find a place in international discourse because it emphasizes a better understanding between American and British people. Americans were citizens of their republic, while, to Carnegie, the British were subjects of their monarch and inferiors in the royal aristocratic order. The opening paragraph of Triumphant Democracy sums up the theme of his volume of principled instruction: “America already leads the civilized world” (15).
It is difficult to imagine a more important topic in late nineteenth-century British-American relations than the changed relative positions of the two nations. In effect, the student had overtaken and now led the teacher. Carnegie observed, “America also offers a helpful model for Britain’s struggle with its own domestic conflict” (159). He also declared that American democracy represented a far better type of polity than the British aristocracy. He argued that the political equality of all Americans in contrast to the British class system was a prime factor in the former colony’s vast economic achievement.

Eisenstadt reveals that Carnegie relied on and cited numerous statistics to support his position. He pointed to a population increase of more than 30 percent among native-born Americans. Annual expenditures on public education had risen dramatically, and, at the time Carnegie wrote, America’s farms comprised 84,000 square miles, an area equal to one-fourth of Europe.

The reader will also learn of Britain’s response to Carnegie. The British establishment defensively challenged his premises and what it considered downright effrontery. Britain, “the land of effetes and snobs” (115), struck back. The aristocracy did not merely claim privilege, but knew it had some obligation to the nation, whereas the American aristocracy of money felt none. In effect, America was far from being the perfect land that Carnegie described. There was trouble in this paradise: inequality of wealth distribution and a wasteful, luxurious lifestyle that surpassed that of the British ruling classes.

In a book full of positives, one minor negative stands out: there is a lot of repetition. However, Eisenstadt’s critique of Carnegie stands on solid ground, is highly readable, and earns high marks from this reviewer.

Eastern University

JOHN A. BAIRD JR.


Amy Werbel’s new book on Thomas Eakins (1844–1916) seeks to understand Philadelphia’s foremost realist painter and the controversies surrounding him “with a medical gaze” (30)—a perspective ostensibly truer and more faithful to the artist than that found in much recent scholarly writing. The book makes some valuable contributions, notably in clarifying the nature of Eakins’s photographs and his relation to medical anatomy, but it ultimately seems marred by a combative approach reflecting the current divisive state of scholarship on the artist. Werbel espouses a hard-line empiricist view that “historical facts” (x) understood “objectively” (41) trump what she calls “the cottage industry of speculative historians” today (4). “In recent years,” says Werbel (without naming