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towns, particularly Dedham, Andover, Rowley, Hingham, Northampton and Ipswich. But a convincing argument never coalesces around these comparisons. The starting point — a shared institutional experience across what appear to be widely different contexts — is promising, though flawed; it is not clear that Newtowners' ideas of town life differed significantly from those of New Englanders. Most of the town's settlers seem to have migrated from Connecticut, and it might be argued that residents developed a sense of community in the town's early years because the Dutch treated Newtown as a specially privileged foreign enclave.

More important, the explanatory device cannot bear the burden placed upon it. Kross presumes because of these different contexts, that there was a great difference in the purposes of and approaches toward town life in Newtown and New England. She attempts to explain the similar course of institutional development in both places by residents' adherence to a common English value system built around "liberty, the sanctity of private property, the legitimacy of profit, family, and harmony" (p. xv). This belief system seems to have remained a constant throughout the period the author discusses. Kross's references to it, however, appear sporadically and are insufficiently supported and elaborated upon to achieve sustained force.

Overall, the book suffers from a lack of rigor in maintaining the necessary distinctions among the institutional course of town life in Newtown and New England, ideas about town life in each place, and presumably-shared general ideas about life in society and polity. Constant reference to the New England literature at all three levels confuses the reader, and the invocation of early modern English ideology is poorly integrated and supported. Therefore, while Kross's conclusions regarding Newtown's institutional patterns are unexceptionable, her comparison of Newtown with New England towns is unfortunately not as rewarding as it might be.
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No previous histories have dealt with the precise management of living space in the lives of immigrants. This former doctoral dissertation focuses upon how environment, block by block, and house by house, affected a small group of Sicilians who settled in a particular New York City neighbourhood. Gabaccia deals as well with the changes in social attitudes that occurred after they left their homeland. She has also scrupulously examined living arrangements in the small rural villages which they abandoned in favour of life in crowded tenements. In presenting a mass of statistical demographic data, she has attempted to humanize the material within a systematic sociological framework, making good use of manuscript census and municipal records.

Gabaccia compares the agrotown of Sambuca in western Sicily to the Sicilian neighbourhood along Elizabeth Street on New York's Lower East Side. She regrets the adjustments which every immigrant group, not merely Sicilians, had to make in a harsh new tenement environment. She sees the resultant experience as mezzo amare e mezzo dolce, half bitter, half sweet. On this score she seems to have ignored the findings of a book whose theme this is: The Italian Americans: Troubled Roots (1981).

Finding the right niche in America included confronting poverty, hunger for success, feelings of exclusion, and all those internal hatreds directed against one's foreignness. These disabilities were reflected in clashes within the immigrant family that appear and reappear in the writings of Italo-American novelists.

Former peasants who suffered lost feelings of anomie scarcely realized that part of their unease also lay in the provincial life from which they had only recently emerged. Deprivations suffered it Italy's Mezzogiorno had masked insecurities that came alive in new forms within America's so-called melting pot.

We need more volumes which speak with new authority and independence as compared with the hackneyed clichés of the old immigration history perpetuated by Oscar Handlin's outmoded volume The Uprooted. This is one of them.
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Most of the significant histories of Black urban communities begin in the 1890s and conclude at the onset of the Great Depression. In the study of the "Black ghetto," as in many other areas of Afro-American history, the immediate post-World War II period has remained, in Richard Dal-
fiume’s phrase, the “forgotten decade” of Black history. Arnold Hirsch has sought to redress that imbalance by exploring the emergence of what he calls the “second ghetto,” new areas of Black residence on the Southside of Chicago that emerged after the war.

Unlike the pre-war city, papered-over with restrictive covenants and the unwritten racial policies of realtors, the second ghetto emerged from the deliberate policies of the federal government and a city administration which capitulated to White violence. Perhaps Hirsch’s most original insight is to point out the irony of the egalitarianism occasioned by the Second World War. The 1948 Shelley v. Kraemer decision that outlawed restrictive covenants, and even the 1954 Supreme Court decision on segregated schools, which all moved the nation in one direction while local political and economic decisions in Chicago, intensified the racial isolation and social stratification of its Black citizen.

The efficacy of White violence in holding the line against Black residential movement is the central theme of Hirsch’s story. In the late 1940s there was one racially motivated bombing or arson every twenty days; and White riots in Fernwood Park, Trumbell Park and Cicero put pressure on the city council to grant aldermen veto power over the construction of public housing sites in their wards. Public housing, a major Black issue in the late 1930s, now served to reinforce the isolation of Blacks in mile-long concrete reservations that formed the dividing line between Black and White on the near Southside.

Yet only a few miles away, downtown businessmen and Hyde Park university administrators were devising more sophisticated techniques to “reclaim” the near Southside. Urban renewal “dehoused” Black residents: 70 per cent of the housing units condemned for urban renewal projects had been occupied by Blacks. University of Chicago intellectuals and Hyde Park liberals appalled at the “savagery” of White ethnic violence against Blacks, dared not look too deeply at the implications of the University of Chicago housing policies which accomplished the same ends and shared similar motives as the rioters they condemned. University president Lawrence A. Kimpton and Julian Levi, director of the university controlled South East Chicago Commission and used class as a “back-up” for race. Their Hyde Park “conservation” plan involved the dislocation of a few lower middle class Whites but their goal was the same as that of the “pathetic creatures” in the South Deering Improvement Association: to keep Blacks out. Julian Levi even intervened to prevent the distinguished Black sociologist St. Clair Drake from purchasing a home in an all-white section in south east Hyde Park.

Making the Second Ghetto makes a compelling case for the political powerlessness of Black Chica-goans. Congressman William L. Dawson was interested primarily in patronage and maintaining his political powerbase. Sidney Williams, Executive Secretary of the Chicago Urban League lost his job when his Committee to End Mob Violence began to cost the League valuable White donations. By the summer of 1954, when Elizabeth Wood was fired as executive secretary of the Chicago Housing Authority and the Kennelly administration had completely capitulated to White racial interests, the contours of the “second ghetto” were complete.

Hirsch is not unsympathetic to the homeownership aspirations of White ethnics, but he believes the two decades between the Second World War and the civil rights movement were pivotal for the history of race relations in Chicago. Ultimately, the second ghetto would come to resemble the first, Blacks of divergent incomes and interests huddled together while a declining White population scrambled for different but thinly veiled strategies to maintain the colour line. The ghetto, and the legacy of racial isolation and antipathy it spawned, endures.
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This engrossing volume is a detailed study of the organization and activities of the Communist Party in Harlem, the largest Black community in the United States, from the early 1920s to the end of 1941. The establishment of the party in the twenties was the work of a small cadre, dominated by West Indian immigrants, but in the depression years the Comintern and the White leaders of the CPUSA targeted Harlem for a major effort, seeking to make the ghetto the showplace of its “Negro work.” But Harlem was more than a ghetto; it contained Latin, Irish, Italian, Finnish, Estonian and Jewish neighbourhoods, and representatives of each of these ethnic groups, predominantly the Jews, contributed activists to the party’s cause.

The primary focus of Naison’s volume, however, is Black Harlem. Essentially the book contains three sections. The first details the formative years of party work and the recruitment of its first cadre. The second, and most substantial section, describes the complex of party efforts during the Popular Front years (1935-1939), the period in which Communist influence in Harlem (and elsewhere) was greatest. And the third section assesses the decline of the party in the aftermath of the Nazi-Soviet Pact of August, 1939.