of a developing story. *Time* magazine featured the little girl on the cover of a special "Nuclear Issue" on 25 September 1964.

*Daisy Petals and Mushroom Clouds* is particularly good in reflecting on both the ethics of the advertisement and the long-term implications. "Was it ethical to use a presidential campaign to strike fear into the hearts of American voters?" (p. 80), Mann asks. In answering that question, he cites some of the protagonists' acknowledgments that the spot may well have gone too far. At the same time, he contends that Goldwater's casual rhetoric did pose a threat. Mann quotes Theodore White in *The Making of the President*, highlighting the candidate's self-inflicted wounds and reflecting, "And then it must be added that he made the worst of them" (p. 87).

Mann notes that ultimately the daisy petal advertisement did not affect poll numbers. But, he argues, this "does not mean that the Daisy Girl spot was not a pivotal and historic moment in American political history" (p. 102). He maintains that the advertisement was the first to use fear so creatively in a presidential campaign. It asked viewers to interpret the scene through the framework of their own experience, but it contained no real information, no rational argument. Most important of all, "DDB brought to politics the same approach it applied to advertising automobiles, soap, and other products. In that way, Daisy Girl helped usher political advertising into the modern era" (p. 111).

*Daisy Petals and Mushroom Clouds* is a pleasure to read. Brief but to the point, it has a lively narrative that captures and holds one's attention. The appendix, with reproductions of documents that contributed to the campaign, seems unnecessary, but the story itself remains fascinating from beginning to end.

Daniel Bach and Mamoudou Gazibo, eds., *Neopatrimonialism in Africa and Beyond.* New York: Routledge, 2011. 260 pp.

*Reviewed by Ryan C. Briggs, Virginia Tech University*

Neopatrimonialism has become a catch-all explanation for state dysfunction and failed development in Africa. While serving this role, the concept has become "stretched," to use Giovanni Satrori's term from his essay on comparative methodology in *The American Political Science Review* some 45 years ago. This has resulted in a concept that is mostly confined to Africa but that within Africa is applied to a very broad range of phenomena. The concept's limited geographical scope and weak intension hinder its usefulness and further development. *Neopatrimonialism in Africa and Beyond* attempts to rectify these problems by collecting essays that return to Max Weber to analyze the concept of neopatrimonialism, reexamine its applications in Africa, and apply it to political life outside Africa. Although the book replicates some of the conceptual confusion in the field as a whole, it also provides a useful starting point for authors who want either to make more-informed use of neopatrimonialism in their work on Africa or to apply neopatrimonialism to new contexts.

Section one begins with an examination of the history and nuances of patrimonialism and neopatrimonialism. Here, Daniel Bach makes the important point that as the concept of neopatrimonialism spread through African studies, it became increasingly associated with anti-developmental outcomes. He points out that in the instances where patrimonialism or neopatrimonialism were used in other regions, such as Latin America or East Asia, it referred to aspects of personal or informal rule that were potentially compatible with a developmental state. Neopatrimonialism requires an entanglement of public and private interests, but this does not mean that the state is captured, hollowed out, or failing. This is a central theme of the book and comes up again in the conclusion. Diana Cammack and Tim Kelsall recently made a similar point in their article "Neo-patrimonialism, Institutions and Economic Growth: The Case of Malawi, 1964–2009," *IDS Bulletin*, Vol. 42, No. 2 (2011), pp. 88–96, but this related work is unfortunately ignored in the Bach and Gazibo volume. The remaining conceptual chapters usefully analyze how Weber understood the concept of patrimonialism and the value of the prefix "neo-." After the conceptual introduction, section two focuses on applying neopatrimonialism to new aspects of African cases, and section three examines cases outside Africa.

Although section one includes the book's first case study (a revised version of Jean-François Médard's 1987 chapter on Charles Njonjo), it is the second section that focuses squarely on African cases. This section contains new work on democratization, conflict, "godfatherism" in Nigeria, and the customs bureaucracy in Niger. All of these chapters have new empirical details and generally smaller but interesting conceptual innovations, and in the interest of brevity I will note only a few. In the chapter on neopatrimonialism and democratization, Nicolas van de Walle makes a distinction between *elite* and *mass* forms of clientelism and argues that African states have traditionally relied on elite clientelism. If Africa experiences a sustained rise in participatory and competitive democratic politics, he expects to see elite clientelism decline and mass clientelism rise. The chapter on "godfatherism" in Nigeria shows how the mixture of public and private interests that is the hallmark of neopatrimonialism can exist at the margins of the official state as well as within it. At their best, these cases demonstrate novel applications of neopatrimonialism and show how the concept can still illuminate new aspects of African politics.

The final section applies neopatrimonialism to cases outside Africa and includes chapters on the Philippines, Brazil, Uzbekistan, Italy, and French-African international relations. In many ways, these chapters are the most novel, and it is unfortunate that this section and the chapters within were not given more space. The third section provides strong evidence for the usefulness of the concept of neopatrimonialism outside Africa, helping to show that neopatrimonialism can exist in a wide variety of circumstances, from the Philippines to post-Soviet Uzbekistan, and can be coupled with diverse political and economic outcomes.

The largest failing of the book is a failure that it shares with much of the field; namely, a disconnect between careful conceptual work (section 1) and empirical research (sections 2 and 3). After a long discussion about the theoretical differences

between patrimonialism and neopatrimonialism, for example, some of the case studies then alternate between the two terms unselfconsciously. Although some of this may be expected from edited books, the disconnect is jarring. The book's greatest success is that it provides Africanists with both a deeper and wider view of one of their central concepts. The flaws of the book in no way outweigh its usefulness, and if anything they should propel more cross-regional work on neopatrimonialism.

Amy Bass, *Those About Him Who Remained Silent: The Battle over W. E. B. Du Bois.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012. 163 pp.

*Reviewed by Paul Buhle, Brown University (emeritus)*

Cold War studies are in high gear, including recent attacks on the lively volume by Jon Wiener, *How We Forgot the Cold War: A Historical Journey across America*. Wiener investigates, sometimes comically, dozens of sites, a high proportion of them downright silly as well as tragic (a California suburb has a Korean War jet on display, with a plaque honoring City Council members—even though no Korean War veterans are among them). Amy Bass homes in on a single location, the homesite of the greatest of African-American political thinkers in the twentieth century, W. E. B. Du Bois.

Great Barrington, Massachusetts, now home to prosperous, educated Manhattanites on vacation or in retirement, might easily and logically have tried to benefit from the celebrity of the location. After all, Du Bois led the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People in the crucial early years, wrote volume after volume of black history as it had never been written before, delivered his own kind of fiction and popular interpretation of religious practices and ideas, and lived long enough to influence Martin Luther King, Jr, and the whole civil rights movement.

This last point was, admittedly, part of the problem. If Du Bois had conveniently died as early as 1930, his memory would have been far easier to accept and hail. Thereafter, the great scholar delivered *Black Reconstruction* (1935), now seen as a masterpiece, but ignored or discredited by the historical profession for almost thirty years. Reconstruction in the eyes of liberal and conservative historians was not such a tragedy after all: it had a happy ending of sorts, with social stability restored and the country spiritually reunited. Compared to the dangers of "black rule" and the unrest it caused, the unhappiness of African-Americans was not such a big thing. Young radical historians, including African-American scholars, took issue with this view, but they could be kept aside for scholarly influence until the dawning of the 1970s. Popular elections in the historical associations, an unwanted innovation of the time, finally led to the demise of the old establishment, confirming significantly changed views of the American past.

Du Bois, depicted as a crypto-communist and supporter of the Soviet Union, was not exactly a new figure by the 1930s. He had supported Woodrow Wilson and