of the most recent half century as well and continue to plague Charleston in the present day. Though less prominently, *Charleston in Black and White* shows that the same holds true for women's rights, and gay rights as well.

Estes's account challenges some scholarship regarding the rise of conservative politics in the postmovement South, mainly in his examination of Charleston's city politics. There, an urban coalition of African Americans and liberal whites allowed Democrat Joe Riley to serve as mayor from the 1970s until the 2010s, despite growing conservatism in the city's suburbs. The fact that he was "perhaps more of a racial liberal than any white Charleston politician had been since Reconstruction" helped Riley weld together a diverse constituency that undergirded his political success. In *Charleston in Black and White*, Estes maintains that the previous focus on southern conservatism in the post–civil rights era has "hidden a fascinating history of urban and liberal southern politics" (36).

That is not to suggest that Estes disregards the rise of the Republican Party in South Carolina in the post–civil rights era. Rather, *Charleston in Black and White* demonstrates that, outside of urban areas (and even in some cities), Republican politicians came to dominate state politics starting in the 1980s. Estes attributes the rise of the Republican Party in South Carolina to a variety of factors, but he pays particular attention to the redistricting of political boundaries and to neo-Confederate symbolism, particularly the Confederate flag. In the aftermath of the June 2015 tragedy at Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church in Charleston, of course, the latter issue has taken on new meaning.

Charleston in Black and White is a valuable and well-executed study of civil and human rights in one southern city in the years following the Civil Rights Movement. A solid local history, it also sheds light on a variety of issues facing the present-day South more broadly.

Brian Daugherity, Virginia Commonwealth University

MARY FRANCES BERRY *History Teaches Us to Resist: How Progressive Movements Have Succeeded in Challenging Times*
Boston: Beacon Press, 2018. Pp. 222. $26.95 (cloth)

In her account of progressive movements since World War II, Mary Frances Berry aims to provide historically grounded inspiration to those experiencing despair at the arrival of the Donald Trump presidency. The essence of Berry's lesson is that resistance to power always matters and that even when democratic struggles appear headed for failure, activists are able to positively influence the course of history. In short, it matters now more than ever to organize, agitate, and educate against the current administration's policies. Be this as it

may, Berry's history sheds little insight on what kinds of resistance the current state of affairs warrants. In fact, there is precious little black historical struggle in Berry's account, and, to my reading, *History Teaches Us to Resist* ironically lends ample grist for moving away from precisely the kind of resistance that it holds up as "successful" and essential.

The archive she most heavily mines is that of corporate journalism from the different periods in question, supplemented by the occasional secondary source material. This inevitably produces a mainstream liberal account of historical struggle, in particular, an account of the heroic individual: that of presidents and their worthy adversaries. *History Teaches Us to Resist* is not an account of how the black masses lay their imprint on the world, in the tradition of a W.E.B. DuBois, C.L.R. James, or James and Grace Lee Boggs. Berry's history obscures black positionality and the struggle based on this unique position, in favor of a general account of "progressive" politics.

Telling history via heroic leaders not only leaves an incomplete accounting but also sublimates social movement into the persona of the leader. This is also a problem for scholarship, wherein individual authors are conflated with their writings to such a degree that we miss how thought is social, not individual. Although a critical review of Berry's extensive oeuvre is beyond the scope of this essay, I suggest that there are connections between Berry's approach in *History Teaches Us to Resist* and her many influential works. Suffice it to say, Berry's approach here brushes against the grain of a critical seam in an archive that confronts the mythical narrative of black leadership—such as Cedric Robinson's *The Terms of Order: Political Science and the Myth of Leadership* (1980), Charles Payne's *I've Got the Light of Freedom: The Organizing Tradition and the Mississippi Freedom Struggle* (1995), and Erica Edwards's *Charisma and the Fictions of Black Leadership* (2012).

In Berry's account of the March on Washington Movement (MOWM), for instance, she seems more concerned to emphasize the endurance of A. Philip Randolph than to reflect on the pitfalls of black patriotism and desegregation. She lauds Randolph's decision to call off the march once President Truman signed Executive Order 9981 integrating the armed services in 1948 as the correct one, concluding that the MOWM gained all there was to be gained at the time. Given all else that was going on in black America at the time, it begs the question: from whom did Randolph take his direction? To whom was he accountable? Berry suggests that Randolph's legacy was most evident in the Negro American Labor Council that he organized in 1960 and that was successfully confronting racial discrimination in the AFL-CIO—until "it was overtaken by black nationalist movements and organizations like the League of Revolutionary Black Workers and the Dodge Revolutionary Union Movement" (24). This point rehearses a tired refrain from liberal civil rights histo-

riography in which Black Power derailed the steady progress of the civil rights movement. The only connections Berry offers between the 1941 MOWM and the subsequent 1963 march was that the organizers in 1963 learned from Randolph the effectiveness of a one-day march and how to keep the logistics simple. If we consider Malcolm X's subsequent argument in his "Message to the Grassroots" speech that the 1963 march was designed to thwart the black masses who were in open revolt in various parts of the country and preparing to descend on Washington to shut down government and impose a general strike, Berry's conclusion takes on other, unintended, meanings.

There is a class dimension to the matter on which historical narrative of black struggle Berry choses to shine her light. Derrick Bell once observed that elite civil rights organizations pursued integration through legal reform despite the fact that black parents wanted something altogether different: better funding for black schools. In her discussion of the Reagan era, however, Berry offers no such reflection on the limits of integration. She notes that Reagan's "victory in the 1980 presidential election was decades in the making" (67) but does not consider the integrationist agenda's evisceration of black institutions as part of the foundation for the white revanchist victories that have steadily moved the political center so far to the right that Clinton's draconian policies in criminal justice and welfare, in particular, "generated little opposition in real time" (135). The important counterpoint here is Elaine Brown's *The Condemnation of Little B* (2002) which is scathing in its analysis of black elites' complicity in the terror inflicted anew on the black masses since the 1980s. Berry offers the reader no insight on how the reforms in criminal justice, welfare, and education were not "failures" but were in fact successes for the social order that regards the black liberation agenda with suspicion (at best). To wit: the "failure" of Bush's No Child Left Behind has paved the way for the further shuttering of black schools and the privatization of education in general.

The only conclusions that Berry offers from this review of fifty-plus years of historical struggle: keep resisting; and, social media makes things easier today because of communication, but also more difficult because it facilitates state surveillance. For this reader, the only moment in Berry's book where she offers true insight into what kind of organizing really works is when she notes that Students for a Democratic Society, the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, and the Congress on Racial Equality had their biggest successes when they allowed their agendas to be informed by the discrete needs of local communities—a model that the Movement for Black Lives is pursuing today (32).

Tryon P. Woods, University of Massachusetts, Dartmouth