violent images of antiviolence texts might have spurred violence. But there is another, equally important irony. The American Revolution ushered in modernity as ordinary people challenged the vertical ties that had knit people together in aristocratic societies. Unlike in the Old World, social order could not be taken for granted in a new, democratic society that relied on popular consent. Order would have to come from the people themselves. New England’s ministers thus turned to voluntary associations to empower ordinary people to enforce communal norms. But once citizens learned that the existing social order was subject to their own control, they also learned to challenge it. Thus, the very thing that sustained order—the people voluntarily associated—could undermine it. Little wonder that older, conservative ministers condemned abolitionist societies’ radicalism.

Cleves not only reinterprets New England conservatism and the rise of abolitionism but raises profound questions about the human condition. Liberals, in a tradition dating back to Jefferson, are inclined to think the best of people. But if Cleves is correct that violence is “a predictable behavior, which we must work to suppress,” she asks readers of her book, and of this journal, to rethink whether peace is possible without a meaningful understanding of authority.

Johann N. Neem
Western Washington University


United States-based Latin American solidarity movements are gaining an increasing amount of academic attention. In recent years, key members of the Peace History Society such as Virginia Williams and Roger Peace have presented on this topic at PHS conferences and published the results of their research in *Peace & Change*. In 2009, Margaret Power and Julie Charlip edited a special issue of *Latin American Perspectives* on the topic. Aviva Chomsky and Steve Striffler continue to organize conferences as part of a broader and ongoing project studying the history of solidarity movements.

Many of the studies on solidarity movements have only traced this history back to opposition to August Pinochet’s 1973 coup against
Salvador Allende’s leftist government in Chile, or support for the 1979 triumph of the Sandinista guerrillas in Nicaragua. For solidarity activists, this has become a commonly accepted story line. For example, I previously worked with Community Action on Latin America (CALA) in Madison, Wisconsin. None of the founders are still actively involved in the organization, but in our minds we have this vague understanding that the group started in the early 1970s in solidarity with Allende’s socialist experiment in Chile and that after the 1973 coup CALA became one of the early models for organizing opposition to United States imperial interests in Latin America.

James Green’s new lengthy book is a masterful study that provides more historical depth to common notions of the origins of contemporary solidarity movements. In the process, he provides us with a corrective of what we think we knew about these efforts, as well as a model for what subsequent scholarship on international solidarity organizing efforts might look like. Although many subsequent activists were only vaguely aware of this early history, Green argues that the tactics, strategies, networks, and activities that organizers employed in the 1960s against abuses of the Brazilian military dictatorship helped shape directly subsequent movements in the 1970s and 1980s in solidarity with Chile and Central America. Organizing strategies that had been innovative in the 1960s had become standard practice by the late 1970s.

As one example of the groundwork that earlier Brazilian activists laid for subsequent organizing efforts, Green points to a conference that CALA organized on Brazil in Madison in the early 1970s. The 1973 coup in Chile, however, intervened to distract attention away from Brazil, while at the same time, the outrages of Pinochet’s dictatorship pulled many more people into these political activities. Green seems to regret that these intervening developments distracted political attention away from Brazil. Considering Green’s personal history, this is not a surprise. Green is a model scholar/activist and overtly positions this book as growing out of his own political involvement with Brazilian issues.

Green emphasizes two main wings of the Brazilian solidarity movement, one rooted in academia and another in the religious world. He traces the roots of the book to conversations at a 1998 Latin American Studies Association (LASA) congress about a lack of awareness of opposition in the United States to the Brazilian military government. For Latin American scholars and activists, many of the
names (including Richard Morse, Charles Wagley, Stanley Stein, and Thomas Skidmore) and organizations (LASA, the North American Congress on Latin America – NACLA, Washington Office on Latin America – WOLA, among others) are familiar, although their specific actions on Brazil will be less so.

For those schooled in 1980s Central American solidarity work, religious opposition to torture will not be unfamiliar, even though again the specifics of religious work on Brazil may not be. In part, Green attributes this lack of awareness to their engagement in solidarity activism without the goals of self-promotion or aggrandizement. Furthermore, a relatively small number of people were actively involved in these early organizing efforts, although Green emphasizes that a few dedicated souls were able to mobilize many more people around issues of human rights, torture, and democracy. In the process, they also helped shift political dynamics in the United States that led to Senator Frank Church’s 1975 hearings and President Jimmy Carter’s emphasis on human rights.

Green’s study is broadly framed and contextualized in terms of Brazil’s political history, United States support for the military government, perspectives of political activists in Brazil, and the role of film and theater in drawing awareness to torture. The result is a powerful and well-rounded book on an important but little-known part of international solidarity organizing efforts.

Marc Becker
Truman State University


How does a state formulate its refugee policies? What political processes trigger re-evaluation of those policies and guidelines to grant asylum? How does a state mitigate the relationship between public interests of the state and private concerns of individuals in defining its refugee policy? What are the broader implications for national advancements of noncitizens’ rights in international law? Lisa Alfredson’s Creating Human Rights addresses these questions in a careful analysis of the women’s refugee movement in Canada that