

reformist goals, Banaszak urges us to move past binary distinctions which create false divisions among activists and hinder our understandings of social movements.

Through her analysis of archival data and in-depth interviews with 40 feminist insiders, Banaszak develops a theoretical understanding of movement-state intersections. These intersections develop when social movement actors and/or organizations create networks located within the state. Arguing that the state is a complex institution representing multiple and conflicting interests, Banaszak focuses on the individuals that work within the state apparatus and their ability to represent their own interests. Although she recognizes that insiders are limited by their dual roles as activists and bureaucrats, as well as by the level of exclusion faced within the state, she contends that their insider status allows them to create opportunities for movements in ways that those working outside the state are unable to. Importantly, Banaszak reminds us that movement-state intersections are fluid, with opportunities and constraints varying according to the movements in question and across time.

Banaszak explores many important questions throughout her book. For instance, she asks whether feminist bureaucrats were representative of the larger women's movement in terms of their class, education, race, and ideology. What was their relationship with women's organizations and feminist activists outside the state? How did their location within the state influence the goals and tactics chosen? What influence did feminist insiders have over policy development and its implementation? Finally, she questions whether feminist insiders were able to continue their work under hostile administrations, particularly under the Reagan and Bush administrations.

Banaszak's study challenges several commonly held assumptions in the social movement literature. For

instance, although feminist bureaucrats tended to be white, middle-class, and well-educated, they were diverse ideologically, ranging from Republicans to radical feminists. Furthermore, feminist insiders employed a combination of conventional and confrontational tactics depending on existing opportunities and constraints. Indeed, many of the activists interviewed insisted that their insider knowledge of the state made them understand more clearly the need for outside mobilization, and allowed them to see when confrontational tactics would be necessary. Banaszak emphasizes the importance of the alliances between feminists working inside and outside the state, rejecting claims which question feminist bureaucrats' commitment to the women's movement. Moreover, she reminds us that these groups of activists cannot be so easily separated as many feminist insiders were often simultaneously engaged in movement activity outside the state.

A central goal of Banaszak's work is to highlight the experiences of feminists working within the state. She believes that their stories are often neglected or excluded in histories of the American women's movement, and she contends that this neglect is often the result of preconceived ideas about the separation between movements and states. Her case study renders a clear division between these two concepts false and the data she provides allows us to see the complex ways that states and movements intersect.

Although Banaszak arguably places too much emphasis on the role of individual agency, her research makes an important contribution to our understandings of states, women's movements, and social movements more broadly. Supporting her theoretical arguments with rich data, Banaszak forces us to re-evaluate our assumptions about state-movement relations. Given this, her book is an asset to those with an interest in so-

cial movements, state feminism or the history of women's movements.

Lisa Boucher is a Ph.D. student in the Women's Studies department at York University. Her research interests include women's movements, feminist organizations, state funding, the voluntary sector, and women's unpaid labour.

LAW AND THE BORDERS OF BELONGING IN THE LONG NINETEENTH CENTURY UNITED STATES

Barbara Young Welke
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010

REVIEWED BY KATHARINE WROBEL

Law and the Borders of Belonging discusses the parameters of legal inclusion and exclusion during a formative phase of American history. This book explores how exclusionary practices are not unrelated precursors to the formation of American society; rather, they are "embedded" in the notions of personhood and citizenship that comprise America's legal and social history and legacy.

Like many social and political historians, Barbara Young Welke starts with the premise that the founding of the modern American liberal state rests on the concept of individual rights and freedoms. By exploring this ground through the theoretical frame of "belonging," Welke considers how law constructs individual identity and liberty, within intersections such as race, ethnicity, sex, and ability, in order to demarcate and to divide. Thus, conceptions of belonging require borders—exclusions as much as inclusions—in order to operate through the law. Welke extends her

scope beyond the strictly historical borders of the nineteenth century to include the adoption of the Constitution in the eighteenth century and the subsequent amendments that followed. In this way, she considers the various challenges to the notions of personhood and citizenship that came with the abolition of slavery, with calls for suffrage, with property reform, and with the Immigration Acts of the 1920s.

This book asks a series of questions that demonstrate the complexity of the concept of “belonging.” Welke provides examples of the ways in which personhood and citizenship, while interrelated, are somewhat distinct considerations: personhood being the recognition of the individual specifically under law, the practices that constitute the rights of individual security and well-being, as well as self-ownership and mobility; and citizenship being the recognized set of formal practices and obligations to the law.

By acknowledging how white, able manhood was invested with full personhood, thus providing the framework for claims to land, liberty and law, Welke explores the ways that an individual may have the rights of citizenship, but be bereft of the rights of personhood. This understanding of personhood and citizenship illuminates how legal practices shape personal identity—with all its possibilities under law—but simultaneously thwart the exercise of an individual under that law.

The major assertion is that “the borders of belonging,” built on legal practices of subordination and exclusion, are ultimately fragile; they must be constantly reaffirmed and redrawn in order to maintain their authority, and in this sense, the organization of the book follows this contention. The first chapter discusses the legal means and claims that construct the universal legal subject as able, white, and male. The second chapter considers the consequences of conceptualizing this universal subject for those not included in its definition. Particularly, it highlights how administrative

regimes and categories of illegality dispose disabled persons, racialized Others, and women as people outside the borders of belonging. The third and final chapter discusses the means by which individuals challenge and resist these borders, and how those sanctioned under law attempt to defend them. What is striking here are the similarities between contestations and defenses. Welke points out, for instance, that like those challenging oppressive legal structures, those who defend them rely on a similar language of inclusion in order to mask privilege and make it less accessible to those subordinated under law.

Encompassing legal precedents and court cases, social histories, and published letters and memoirs, Welke’s research is expansive and varied. At times, however, Welke relies on a somewhat evidentiary listing of cases for her argument. This is understandable given the technique of legal writing and defense, yet a sustained discussion of select legal cases or examples—many only alluded to in the chapters or their epigraphs—could add a more rigorous and nuanced means of exploring the discrepancies between legal language and practice.

One possibility for expansion on Welke’s arguments is a more intricate elaboration on collective social or legal action and its role in contesting the limits of “belonging.” Certainly, Welke’s principle focus is individual rights, yet she contends that practices of exclusion also work to create community. Thus, collectivity lies at the heart of “belonging,” and we can consider this, along with the questions that Welke raises, when thinking about emergent claims to legal rights in the twenty-first century.

Katharine Wrobel is a Ph.D. Candidate in English at York University. Her current research explores nineteenth-century political radicalism and representations of anger in the British novel during the Reform Acts.

BLUESTOCKINGS: WOMEN OF REASON FROM ENLIGHTENMENT TO ROMANTICISM

Elizabeth Eger
Houndsmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave
Macmillan, 2010

REVIEWED BY GISELA ARGYLE

Elizabeth Eger’s group biography builds on and expands the focus of Sylvia Myers’s study *The Bluestocking Circle: Women, Friendship, and the Life of the Mind in Eighteenth-Century England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990). Myers used Carol Gilligan’s analysis of female experience as typically structured like a web, rather than the male hierarchical structure, in order to demonstrate, with a series of case studies, that the guidance and support of female and male mentors and friends helped the original “bluestocking” women gain confidence and achieve autonomy as intellectuals. Myers counted three strands in the circle’s preoccupations: female advocacy, wider social opportunities, and aspirations to the life of the mind. In chapters on the bluestockings’ mentors, families, and friends, their choices and changing views of marriage, and their role as women writers, she provided a thorough and detailed social context for the bluestockings’ pursuit of learning and virtue.

Eger relies on the reader’s familiarity with Myers’s portrait and concentrates on her own thesis that better recognition of the bluestockings’ intellectual work across genres complicates the common dichotomies for eighteenth-century culture: “the public and the private; reason and feeling; masculine and feminine; local and national; the domestic and the civic; Enlightenment and Romanticism.” Eger initiated an exhibition, “Brilliant Women: 18th-Century Bluestockings,” in the