

edly privileging the concerns and interests of Arab leaders over those of New Deal coalition members in the knowledge that neither American trade unionists nor Jewish Americans would abandon the New Deal coalition in favor of the Republican Party. *Sewing the Fabric of Statehood* is less a story of American NGOs using political access to lobby for what they want and more an example of the dangers of surrendering electoral independence in American politics.

Zionist-supporting labor leaders were also wholly ineffective in their lobbying of the British government. Even when the British Labour Party came to power in Great Britain in 1945, the Labour prime minister Clement Attlee ignored pressure from American trade unionists and maintained the Conservative Party's policy of restricting European Jewish immigration to Palestine, and then used the British Army to maintain its colonial control over the protectorate. It was only in the unusual election of 1948—when the Democratic Party split into Progressive, mainstream, and Dixiecrat factions, causing Truman to fear he would lose the election—that labor leaders and members of the New York Liberal Party were able to persuade Truman that they were the swing votes that could deliver New York's essential electoral votes to him in the presidential election. Only in this rare political moment could Zionist labor leaders finally persuade Truman to recognize Israel, which he did on May 14, 1948.

Although Howard focuses on the efforts of American NGOs, it is the Palestinian Zionist NGO, Histadrut, that appears to have been the most effective in achieving its political goals, which raises the question of whether Howard's focus of analysis on American NGOs is misplaced.

Despite this criticism, *Sewing the Fabric of Statehood* would be of use to anyone interested in issues of leadership, interest groups, and foreign policy, as well as labor and Jewish history. A strength of the book is its repeated observations of the divisions within the labor movement, and within the American Jewish community, about whether to support a Jewish homeland (Zionism) or an international workers' movement (Bundism). The ability of Histadrut leaders to convince the many Jewish anti-Zionists within the American labor movement that its Zionist nation-building project was actually a democratic socialist labor movement is a testament to Histadrut's political savvy.

CHRISTINA A. ZIEGLER-MCPHERSON
German Maritime Museum

SARAH B. SNYDER. *From Selma to Moscow: How Human Rights Activists Transformed U.S. Foreign Policy*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2018. Pp. xi, 301. Cloth \$90.00, paper \$30.00, e-book \$29.99.

Sarah B. Snyder's *From Selma to Moscow: How Human Rights Activists Transformed U.S. Foreign Policy*

is a concise and insightful exploration of the origins of the U.S. human rights movement and the incorporation of human rights concerns into U.S. foreign-policy making. Rather than beginning in the 1970s, as many studies do, Snyder focuses on the "long 1960s"—the period between the 1961 inauguration of John F. Kennedy and the 1977 inauguration of Jimmy Carter. She asserts that Americans engaged in a broad variety of human rights activism during this period. Influenced by their transnational connections and experiences with domestic activism, American human rights activists shifted their focus from the United Nations to Washington, D.C., and in so doing, they transformed U.S. foreign policy. Thus, despite resistance from the White House, Snyder demonstrates how Americans' human rights activism expanded and began to shape government policy well before Carter's election.

Snyder uses several human rights campaigns to illuminate how American grassroots activists, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), members of Congress, and lower-level state actors increasingly pushed a human rights agenda over the course of the "long 1960s." In most cases, these actors were driven by personal and transnational ties to countries where human rights violations occurred, by domestic activist experience, and by ideals of civil and political freedom. The first instance during the "long 1960s" when Americans deployed human rights language to critique a foreign government and U.S. policy was over the issue of human rights in the Soviet Union, particularly the rights of Soviet Jewry. In this instance, American Jews, supporters of Soviet dissidents, and members of Congress, especially Senator Henry "Scoop" Jackson, were motivated in part by personal and religious ties to pressure the White House to take a hard line on Soviet human rights violations. When Southern Rhodesia unilaterally declared independence from Great Britain in 1965 and attempted to institute racial apartheid, Americans who had participated in the U.S. civil rights movement led the charge against white supremacy abroad.

While religious and racial ties influenced anti-Soviet and anti-Rhodesian activism, Americans' personal transnational connections led to non-state and congressional condemnation of the Greek junta that engaged in widespread political repression and torture of political prisoners after 1967. Andreas Papandreou, leader of the Greek opposition, had extensive connections with American academics, and his imprisonment heightened the activism of academics, members of NGOs like Amnesty International, diplomats stationed in Greece, and members of Congress, like Donald Fraser. A similar situation developed in response to the repressive regime of Park Chung Hee, who rose to power in a military coup in South Korea in 1961. U.S. diplomats who served in Korea, as well as missionaries and journalists, drew attention to Park's human rights abuses. Finally, American missionaries, supporters of

Salvador Allende, and liberal members of Congress condemned Augusto Pinochet's junta in Chile after Pinochet overthrew the leftist Allende in 1973.

In each case, American non-state activists, concerned members of Congress, diplomats, and lower-ranking members of the State Department faced stiff resistance by the White House. Détente with the Soviet Union and U.S. anti-communist alliances outweighed human rights for the Kennedy, Lyndon Johnson, and Richard Nixon administrations. In fact, Henry Kissinger was openly disdainful of human rights. Nevertheless, as concerned Americans increasingly began to deploy the language of human rights and to organize around human rights abuses in places like Chile, they began to change U.S. policy. Because of the public salience of human rights, even Kissinger was forced to use human rights rhetoric during the 1976 presidential election. On a more substantive level, Snyder argues that by the 1970s human rights activism "achieved congressional legislation that curbed military and economic assistance to repressive governments, established institutions to monitor human rights around the world, and shifted patterns of U.S. foreign-policy making for years to come" (171).

Snyder's tightly focused and impressively researched book offers significant insight into how Americans from many backgrounds came to embrace human rights over the course of the "long 1960s." Her analysis demonstrates how a series of human rights-violating regimes spurred Americans inside and outside the government to assert that human rights are a legitimate and important policy concern. However, while the book's brevity and focus is a strength, it also leaves little room for discussion of broader questions. Why, for instance, did certain issues resonate with American activists and the public more than others? Snyder clearly explains why more Americans decried human rights violations in the Soviet Union and Greece than in South Korea, but why did the issue of Soviet Jewry or torture in Greece resonate more than other potential human rights issues at the time, like political repression in the Dominican Republic or Iran? Another question that the book raises but does not answer explicitly is the question of when and how American activists can influence U.S. foreign policy successfully, and when such efforts are likely to be less successful.

Snyder also hints at opponents of human rights within Congress in her discussion of the Byrd Amendment in chapter 2, but more explanation of the battles within Congress during the "long 1960s" would have made her arguments about the increasing salience of human rights in Congress even more compelling. One also wonders how or whether other rights movements in the U.S. at the time beyond civil rights—the feminist, Chicana, gay rights, and Native American movements—influenced human rights activism. In short, this well-written and persuasively argued book leaves

me wanting even more, and it raises important questions for anyone interested in the history of human rights and U.S. foreign relations. By locating the origins of American human rights activism in the "long 1960s," *From Selma to Moscow* will remain an important book for years to come.

KELLY J. SHANNON
Florida Atlantic University

KATIE BATZA. *Before AIDS: Gay Health Politics in the 1970s*. (Politics and Culture in Modern America.) Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2018. Pp. xii, 178. Cloth \$45.00.

In *Before AIDS: Gay Health Politics in the 1970s*, Katie Batza examines the state of gay community clinics and sexual health outreach programs during the gay liberation era of the 1970s. Through a series of three case studies, she demonstrates how a national gay medical network was already well in place when the AIDS crisis hit in 1981. Challenging a narrative that focuses on the unique role of ACT UP, Gay Men's Health Crisis, and other AIDS-era organizations in creating a community response to public health threats, Batza finds that "gay health activism" was already flourishing in the 1970s (2).

Batza's research focuses on three local examples of gay communities trying to provide for their own unique health needs. Each developed during the time after the Stonewall Riots of 1969, when the mainstream American medical system still considered homosexuality itself an illness and generally made gay men feel unwelcome and shameful. Batza's focus rests on gay men, since, as she explains, lesbian health activism occurred mostly within the context of women's health clinics, not LGBT ones.

In Boston, she shows how a modest one-night-a-week gay health clinic developed within a broader community-based center in the Back Bay neighborhood. Inspired by the Black Panthers, the Fenway Community Health Clinic was originally designed not only to serve the health needs of a diverse local community but also as part of an effort to thwart a potentially destructive neighborhood urban renewal project. Its ties to gay liberation were minimal.

In Los Angeles, by contrast, Batza found an effort spearheaded by members of the Gay Liberation Front (GLF), who through their involvement with a gay helpline developed the notion of "oppression sickness"—how anti-gay discrimination within the legal, medical, and cultural realms created a collective and largely unidentified health risk for LGBT people (25). They responded by opening a clinic within the GLF-sponsored community center. By 1978 it was handling fifteen thousand venereal disease tests a year.

In Chicago, it was medical students, responding to the homophobia they witnessed in their own profes-