

at their worst when they are under alcohol's ravages. Slave catchers in the novel are "hot with brandy, swearing and foaming like so many wolves."

*Uncle Tom's Cabin* also reflected the importance to Stowe of marriage and the contented home. She wrote a book on the domestic household and helped popularize the home as the center of virtue. *Uncle Tom's Cabin* looks favorably on characters that value the healthy home, and the association of motherhood with religion permeates the novel. Stowe shows that slavery ripped apart family life and sometimes caused black women to become their masters' sex slaves. Stowe was also appalled by what she called "trash literature," which based its sales on stories of bawdy men and scandalous women. She intended *Uncle Tom's Cabin* to undercut such literature.

Much to Stowe's surprise, *Uncle Tom's Cabin* was overwhelmingly well received by American readers. Immediately after the book was published, merchants began to issue "Tomitudes," which were merchandise items that represented characters or scenes from the novel. Plays by George H. Aiken and H.J. Conway based on *Uncle Tom's Cabin* became standard fare for traveling troupes of actors in the period before the Civil War. Reynolds shows the excitement that the plays created both in large cities and in small towns and hamlets throughout the country. The Aiken version remained close to Stowe's plot and had huge sets and sensational scenes. The Conway version added characters from the minstrel show tradition and even used dogs on stage. Both plays delighted audiences with the character Topsy and her memorable line, "Never was born, ... Spect I grow'd." More people saw the plays than read the novel, and thus the plays had an even bigger effect than the novel had on Northern attitudes toward slavery in the pre-Civil War period.

At the advent of the 20th century, the novel began to have a major influence in Western Europe, especially in Russia, where it appealed to Tolstoy's Christian socialist views, and Lenin remarked that it was his favorite book

as a child. In the United States, by contrast, appreciation for *Uncle Tom's Cabin* decreased after 1900. The public was caught up in the thrill of the novel, *The Clansman* (1903), and D.W. Griffith's movie spinoff, *The Birth of a Nation* (1915), which made heroes of Ku Klux Klan members. Stowe, however, had the last word, so to speak, with the success in the 1970s of the book and television miniseries *Roots*, which Reynolds calls "a massive mea culpa for the American entertainment industry."

Reynolds' achievement in *Mightier Than the Sword* is his success in conveying in full measure the mythic status of *Uncle Tom's Cabin* throughout its history—from its background, to its immense impact on 19th-century America, and to its continuing influence even today. **TFL**

---

*Henry S. Cohn is a judge of the Connecticut Superior Court.*

### **Citizenship, Borders, and Human Needs**

Edited by Rogers M. Smith

University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, PA, 2011. 492 pages, \$65.00.

---

#### REVIEWED BY R. MARK FREY

The migration of peoples to the United States and other countries is a topic of great interest and concern to many around the world. Numerous questions abound. Why are "they" here? Why can't "they" be like us? Why are "they" all breaking the law? Why are "they" all on welfare? What are "they" actually contributing to the common good?

Immersed in the minutiae of daily casework, those of us who practice immigration law—whether for the government or otherwise—may lose sight of the broader context in which the migration of peoples takes place. Why are people immigrating to the United States and other wealthy countries? Why are people leaving their countries of origin, giving up virtually everything

to embark on a new life journey in a strange land? What does that strange land have to offer that's an improvement over their country of origin? Our answers to these questions will inform our overall approach to immigration. Should we focus more on enforcement and border security to protect the homeland or, given the growing irrelevance of national borders and the fact that so many "illegals" get in anyway, should we just open the borders?

Immigrants come from different cultures, ethnic backgrounds, economic classes, languages, and religions. That means diversity, and with diversity comes conflict—conflict that results from each group's ignorance of the other. (See, for example, the Islamic headscarf (hijab) controversy in France.) Is diversity good for a society? (Think of such heterogeneous nations as the United States, China, or Russia.) Or is a society better off with a homogeneous population? (Think of such nations as Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Japan, or South Korea.) Diversity and conflict often give rise to the cry that the immigration system is broken and needs to be fixed.

But how do we fix it? Should we pressure immigrants to assimilate, or should we support their maintenance of a unique and separate identity? Will the latter option lead to segregation of immigrant groups and their lack of identification with their new home country? If immigrants do not identify with their new country, then won't they feel little investment in the system and be less likely to contribute to it? What are the social costs of such marginalization? Can assimilation and maintaining a separate identity be balanced? What degree of identification and investment in the new nation is appropriate?

Given the interconnectedness and interdependence of our global community, shouldn't we permit some level of immigrant flow? If so, should we be more selective concerning whom we let in? What about family immigration? What degree of familial relationship should allow one to immigrate? Only the spouse and children? What about parents or siblings? And, what about

the immigration of workers? Should we allow skilled workers only? Won't unskilled workers take away jobs? But aren't those jobs left unfilled because people already here will not take them? What about a guest worker program? If we allow a guest worker program, what should the rules of the game be? What rights should guest workers have while here? Should we provide pathways to eventual citizenship or only entry for a fixed period of time to work, after which the immigrants must return home with their wages? If the latter, then will we create an underclass of workers on which the country grows increasingly dependent? (See, for example, the Gulf states of Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Kuwait, Bahrain, Qatar, and Oman.) But, if we don't limit the stay of guest workers, then won't our country and others be swarmed by throngs of immigrants contributing to a burgeoning population exceeding carrying capacity, which, in turn, will lead to environmental degradation and destruction of valuable natural resources?

And what about various forms of immigration based on humanitarian relief? Are we letting in too many people who ask for political asylum and refugee status? Aren't these people just economic migrants? (Look at Poland's experience with those immigrants from Ukraine and Belarus.) What about empathy overload? Must the United States be the solution to all the world's problems? How do we control for those who lie about their situation in their home countries? Isn't fraud rampant? (See, for example, the revelations about asylum fraud in the United States as published in the *New York Times* in July 2011.) Finally, how do we recognize asylum applicants who have legitimate grounds to claim that they will be killed upon returning to their home countries if we deny them relief?

What is to be done? This is the starting point for Rogers Smith's *Citizenship, Borders, and Human Needs*. Sixteen scholars specializing in a variety of disciplines—including law, political science, sociology, anthropology, international relations, and economics—were asked to consider one of four questions:

1. “[W]hose and what economic needs are helped and harmed by current patterns of immigration flows and immigration regulations?”
2. “[W]hat should we make of the much-discussed cultural dimensions of current immigration issues, in regard to the cultures of members of sending countries, receiving countries, and the immigrants themselves, in all their diversity?”
3. “[W]hat are the political choices in terms of institutions and policies faced by both immigration-receiving and immigration-sending nations?”
4. “[W]hat, in the end, are the normative precepts that should guide policy making on immigration in the twenty-first century around the globe?”

The resulting essays seek to provide the reader with a sense of what is taking place as people move about the world in greater numbers and frequency as well as what to expect in the future. Although numbers and frequency may be higher than before, Smith observes that, “as a percentage of the world's population, there are not actually more immigrants today than there were at the start of any decade since 1960.” Furthermore, he writes, “even though the countries of North America and Europe are host to some 110 million immigrants and receive several more each year, it is Asia—for economic, demographic, social, and other reasons—that is likely to be the largest receiver of immigrants in the decades to come.”

The value of *Citizenship, Borders, and Human Needs* lies not so much in the answers that the essays provide as in the questions that a close reading raises. The book fosters a more mature and nuanced examination of immigration policy in this country and elsewhere. Instead of providing answers, the book prompts one to engage in a dialogue with oneself, raising questions that lead to more questions until the process yields a sense of the interconnectedness of the various issues that surround immigration.

It is a given that the United States is a nation of immigrants. But should we continue to welcome the flow of new people? If not, how do we decrease or

stop the flow? If we continue to allow the flow, what types of immigrants do we want to receive in this country? This dialogue needs to take place, and I fear that, for far too long, it has been the proverbial can kicked down the road for future leaders of the country to tackle. All sides of the debate agree that comprehensive immigration reform, not a patchwork of legislative bits and pieces cobbled together, is called for and, indeed, necessary. But, how to carry out comprehensive immigration reform is the fly in the ointment. The solution will require us to arrive at a vision for the country and its immigrants as we travel down the path of the 21st century. This vision will have to address such issues as race and diversity as well as economic justice explicitly. Let us hope that we act on this responsibility. **TFL**

---

*R. Mark Frey is an attorney based in St. Paul, Minn. He has practiced immigration law for almost 25 years with an emphasis on political asylum, family immigration, removal defense, and naturalization.*

### **Known and Unknown: A Memoir**

By Donald Rumsfeld

*Sentinel* (Penguin Group), New York, NY, 2011. 815 pages, \$36.00.

---

#### REVIEWED BY JOHN C. HOLMES

Now well into his 70s, Donald Rumsfeld took nearly four years to write this autobiography, his first book. Rumsfeld is unique in having been both the youngest and the oldest U.S. secretary of defense in history under Presidents Gerald Ford and George W. Bush, respectively. In the latter service, he was at first applauded for his candor and wry sense of humor, which contrasted with George W. Bush's stiffness. However, as the contentious aftermath of the invasion of Iraq dragged on and fighting continued in Afghanistan, Rumsfeld increasingly became the target of those opposed

**REVIEWS** *continued on page 68*