

In caring for and rescuing each other, Remes argues, Salemites and Haligonians constructed and practiced “disaster citizenship,” “a new form of citizenship for a new era of governance” (20).

As Remes shows, however, such alternative visions of citizenship did not go uncontested. Tensions arose between working-class disaster survivors and the middle- and upper-class individuals who endeavored to assist them, due in large part to their competing perceptions of order and disorder. Economic elites and government authorities, guided by a “progressive ideology of disaster relief” (13), saw technocratic approaches to disaster assistance, designed and administered by professional relief experts, as critical to restoring and preserving social order. Yet in privileging such a relief system, Remes argues, authorities failed to recognize the material and emotional importance of everyday forms of solidarity to working-class disaster survivors. Unable to comprehend the spontaneous post-disaster order that survivors constructed—one based on informal, local ties—elites perceived working-class responses to the crises as amateurish; irrational; and above all, disorderly.

Such competing visions of disaster relief led to confrontations between the providers and recipients of disaster relief. Such conflicts over aid were inherently political, for they put the growing power of the welfare state in direct conflict with survivors’ desires to maintain their own agency. While Remes bases his interpretations on events in Progressive Era Massachusetts and Nova Scotia, he also contends that similar themes and conflicts resonate in the wake of many other catastrophes, including those in our own time. By extending his analysis beyond early twentieth-century Salem and Halifax, his book makes a useful theoretical contribution to disaster studies more broadly.

While Remes adds much to the scholarship on disasters and labor history, he also provides valuable insights on the transnational history of the United States and Canada. Focusing on an overlooked borderlands region of North America, Remes calls attention to the many intimate connections that linked Massachusetts and Nova Scotia. Working-class migrants traveled extensively between the two areas, creating “ties of literal and figurative kinship” (194). When disaster struck, monetary and material aid flowed along these preexisting networks, as solidarity crossed national boundaries. At the same time, middle- and upper-class U.S. and Canadian authorities exchanged ideas about disaster relief, while professional disaster experts and institutions offered their knowledge and resources on both sides of the border. In analyzing these various connections, Remes makes a persuasive case for studying U.S. and Canadian history in concert.

In sum, *Disaster Citizenship* is an impressive first book. Perhaps its most poignant message, though, is that disasters are not simply unmitigated tragedies; for survivors, they can also represent opportunities for social progress, “moments of empathy and solidarity that can take on political meaning” (199). Although Salemites and Haligonians may not have sung “Solidarity Forever” in response to the unbelievable devastation they experienced, its lyrics—and one line, in particular—surely would have resonated with them: “Now we stand outcast and starving midst the wonders we have made / But the union makes us strong.”

## THE STRENUOUS LIFE REVISITED

CANFIELD, MARK R. *Theodore Roosevelt in the Field*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2015. 476 pp. \$35.00 (cloth), ISBN 978-0226298375.

REVIEWED BY MONICA RICO, Lawrence University  
doi:10.1017/S1537781416000347

If put together end to end, the volume of words produced about Theodore Roosevelt might stretch around the globe several times, and yet Michael R. Canfield, in *Theodore Roosevelt in the Field*, succeeds in providing new insights into the twenty-sixth president’s personality and accomplishments.

He does so by focusing on Roosevelt's lifelong love affair with direct experience of the natural world (i.e., "the field"). A field biologist himself, Canfield draws upon his own knowledge of scientists' holistic observational practices to elucidate how Roosevelt encountered nature as an organic landscape yielding inexhaustible sensations. He makes a persuasive argument for the claim that disparate elements of Roosevelt's life—naturalist, rancher, soldier, conservationist, writer, father—can best be understood as repeating patterns of "a cycle that began with reading and observation, grew into direct contact through action in the outdoors, and then looped back to his own renderings of those experiences in his stories and writings" (14).

Canfield begins his book with a vignette describing Roosevelt at the height of his career, in the White House, posing for a portrait by John Singer Sargent, but he then moves his narrative back to the 1860s in order to incorporate the young Roosevelt's near-obsession with what was, at the time, still known as "natural history." Canfield perhaps reads too much into the future president's admittedly charming juvenilia—surely many children find animals fascinating and enjoy drawing pictures of them—but he is on more certain ground once he moves to a discussion of Roosevelt as a young man, struggling with a passion for field observation that placed him in conflict with his Harvard biology teachers, devoted as they were to the laboratory as the emerging standard for knowledge production in the life sciences. Canfield touches upon the relatively well-known story of Roosevelt's courtship of and engagement to Alice Lee, his rejection of science for financial as well as economic reasons, and the tragedy of Alice's death on the same day as his adored mother; he also quickly sketches Roosevelt's eventual remarriage and embarkation on family life. He notes essential episodes in Roosevelt's political life, but events that would loom large in a conventional biography, such as the 1912 bid for president, are handled quickly.

Canfield argues that "Ultimately, Roosevelt was never content to experience life as a witness from an armchair: in his studies of biology he had eschewed the relative comforts of the laboratory for study of animals in their natural habitat ... on hunts he had followed even the most ferocious animals to their burrows and dens. Roosevelt had always worked to be in the middle of the action" (185). Canfield's study charts how this passion to be "in the middle of the action" influenced Roosevelt's formation of the Rough Riders, commitment to resource conservation and the creation of nature reserves, and enthusiastic pursuit of big game in Africa. Even as his health declined, the fifty-five-year-old Roosevelt undertook an expedition in the Amazon jungle, determined to once again get out of "the armchair" and into the spaces where, it is evident, he felt most alive. When not in the field, Roosevelt sought out people, such as naturalist John Burroughs and safari hunter Frederick Selous, who could share their stories of outdoors action via correspondence and visits. To stay still was in some sense to surrender life. Canfield also notes, however, that Roosevelt never was content merely to experience something and then move on. Instead, he wrote prolifically and skillfully about his life in the field, sharing his narratives of outdoors adventure with a wide audience in the popular periodicals of the day as well as in book-length writings. For Roosevelt, experience and narrative together created the field.

Canfield situates Roosevelt's love of the field in multiple contexts. He is most persuasive when interpreting Roosevelt's scientific interests in the American tradition of natural historians such as John James Audubon, adventurers who combined literature, art, and hunting prowess with serious scientific study. Canfield's own scientific knowledge also enriches the book's discussions of the behavior of the various species that caught Roosevelt's attention in the field. Efforts to relate Roosevelt's Amazon journey to other exploration ventures, such as the Shackleton Antarctic expedition, sit on somewhat less-solid ground, mostly consisting of the pointing out of parallels and similarities.

*Roosevelt in the Field* should appeal to general readers as well as professional scholars. Canfield writes well and with obvious affection for his subject, and his book contains many beautiful reproductions of pages from the Roosevelt family archive as well as from multiple pictorial

sources from the period. If he does not plumb the cultural depths that lay beneath Roosevelt's fascination with the field as a testing ground for white manliness, he succeeds in marshalling abundant evidence for the field as a meaningful lens through which to view Roosevelt's life, writings, and influence.

OGLE, VANESSA. *The Global Transformation of Time, 1870–1950*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2015. 288 pp. \$39.95 (cloth), ISBN 978-0674286146.

REVIEWED BY KOLBY KNIGHT, University of California, San Diego  
doi:10.1017/S1537781416000335

Vanessa Ogle's *The Global Transformation of Time* complicates stories of "globalization" as a unidirectional process of economic standardization and transnational interconnectedness. In a study of "time reforms" from 1870–1950, Ogle deftly demonstrates that "globalization"—rather than "connecting" the world through a homogenizing and inevitable movement of capitalist markets—engendered and accentuated regional and national distinctions. She cites sources in English, German, French, and Arabic to trace the politics of time as they played out on the ground in a number of locations.

Ogle describes "globalization" and "connectivity-talk" as a highly normative ideology. According to narratives of globalization, capitalism—for better or worse—has penetrated every region and locale, standardizing the ways in which individuals think about and engage the world as economic subjects. Important to these accounts, according to Ogle, is a purported transformation in how individuals began to conceive of time as "abstract" and "homogenous." Ogle delineates Benedict Anderson's "imagined communities" as representative of this mode of interpretation. Yet, Ogle demonstrates how "time" itself became an object of debate and comparison within the colonial and imperial projects of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The "interconnectedness" that emerged within these political interactions, according to Ogle, did not entail homogenization. Instead, it occasioned moments of comparison through assertions of cultural, religious, racial, and national particularities.

The decision to begin in 1870 is important for this interpretation of "time reform." Through the figure of Helmuth von Moltke (with whom she begins the book), Ogle claims that the standardization of railroad schedules in Germany during the 1870–1 conflict with France was primarily a matter of national security (2). This bolsters her analysis that the standardization of time involved national definition more than an inevitable "modernization" of economies. For instance, after the adoption of "Greenwich Time" in 1880 by Britain and in 1883 by the United States, Germany and France resisted it. France adhered to "Paris Time" until the early twentieth century, while Germany accepted "Central European Time" (set one hour in advance to Greenwich time) at the end of the nineteenth century. Even with the institutionalization of national "mean times" for railways and civil life, the coexistence of "local times" further obstructed standardization efforts.

Ogle points to attempts to implement daylight savings time (DSL) as an example of the difficulty of establishing "abstract" time (48). In Western nation-states and in colonial states in Africa, Asia, and the Levant, reformers believed that DSL was imperative in the maximization of labor productivity, as well as the regulation of the body politic broadly. Through her discussion of DSL, Ogle shows that the regulation of time through law proved elusive. Narratives that privilege "centralization," according to Ogle, fail to account for the ways in which the "peripheries" interacted with and defined "time." Whether it was colonial governments highlighting the intensity of the Sub-Saharan climate, or people simply ignoring public clocks in Europe, Asia, Africa, and elsewhere, states did not always have the capacity (and, at time, did not want to) standardize temporality.