Southern Political Science Association

Violence as Protest: A Study of Riots and Ghettos. by Robert M. Fogelson

Review by: David C. Perry

The Journal of Politics, Vol. 34, No. 3 (Aug., 1972), pp. 987-989

Published by: [Cambridge University Press](#) on behalf of the [Southern Political Science Association](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2129305>

Accessed: 04/02/2014 14:29

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Cambridge University Press and Southern Political Science Association are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of Politics*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

late 1950s Washington was happy to support Trujillo and had next to no interest in the character of his rule.

Atkins and Wilson of course are aware of this familiar criticism of United States policy. Their rebuttal seems to consist of two main arguments. At one level they tend to accept the validity of United States priorities, explicitly arguing that the United States needed Trujillo's support in World War II because of the "great strategic importance" of the Dominican Republic, and at least partially accepting the postwar rationale for United States diplomatic support and arms aid to Trujillo as necessary for "hemispheric defense." If one believes that it is meaningless nonsense, even in the context of World War II, to talk of the Dominican Republic as the "gateway to the Caribbean" and to point to its "proximity to the Panama Canal," and if one further believes that in the cold war period Trujillo made a nonexistent contribution to the defense against a nonexistent threat, one will not be impressed by this line of thought.

In any event, the authors argue, there was little the United States could do about the Trujillo regime short of military intervention and occupation, which was prohibited by international law and otherwise unwise. This is also dubious, for although United States economic, military, and diplomatic assistance to Trujillo was not primarily responsible for keeping him in power it nevertheless played an important role, especially psychologically. Was it purely coincidental that the removal of United States support in the late 1950s was rapidly followed by the growth of domestic opposition to Trujillo, culminating in tyrannicide in 1961?

In brief, this book cannot be recommended for either its historical analysis of United States-Dominican relations, which is pedestrian and adds nothing new to the oft-recited facts, or for its underlying theme, which is simplistic and unpersuasive. However, the book does have an excellent bibliography.

JEROME SLATER, *State University of New York at Buffalo*

Violence as Protest: A Study of Riots and Ghettos. By ROBERT M. FOGELSON. (Garden City: Doubleday, 1971. Pp. xvii, 320. \$1.95 paper.)

The author of this incisive and quite complete book has become quite well known through the snippets of this study which have been published in other forms. For this reviewer, at least, it is good to have it all in one place. The title describes the normative posture with which the author couches his empirical findings. This is not to say that the findings do not support Fogelson's stated predisposition that men who engage in violent behavior have by the very nature of their behavior the "... claim to be taken seriously..." On the contrary it makes the findings all the more startling and worthy of the reader's attention.

The author uses his data and experience to present us with one of the best documented and most highly readable books on the urban riots of the 1960s. He argues that the riots were demonstrations of general citizen discontent and not the deliberative results of actions led by professional agitators, hoodlums, pathological, and anomic fringe groups and other such "riff-raff"; they were "articulate protests by ordinary blacks." He demonstrates that the rioters were more representative of the over-all population of our nation's ghettos than many of the preliminary and even later explanations of the riots would have us believe. He also discusses the nature of the types of violence which occurred during the riots (rioting, looting, arson, and assault) and the targets of such actions. Fogelson examines, in particular, the nature of collective violence aimed at the police. All this occurred with a high sense of informal communication and a startling level of precision, given the fact that the riots were not the organized results of revolutionaries or criminals.

However, much of this has been said before, and while Fogelson gathers a large amount of data in his attack against the "riff-raff" theory and its related explanations of violence, by the time the reader reaches the last third of the book, it appears as if the author were almost lobbying against a dead horse. It is in the final two chapters, exclusive of the epilogue, that Fogelson provides substantial challenges to black moderates and white liberals either to rethink their positions vis-à-vis rioting as a legitimate demonstration of political expression or eat their own rhetoric for change. The nature of the riots, the new calls for community control, and the weak and ineffective nature of governmental response to the blueprint for change articulated in the Kerner Commission report, all

provide a "dilemma for moderates" (chapter 6) and place "liberals at an impasse" (chapter 7). The author sees these present crises in political consciousness as fuel for the racial fires of the future.

The question which seems pertinent at this point is: Is this book and its subject matter the victim of such a landslide of premature and rhetorical scholarship that, while it is a comprehensive and well-argued work, it may well fall into the wastebasket under the category of "too much, too late?" Or since we are no longer experiencing highly visible riots of the magnitude of Watts, Newark, Harlem, or Rochester, has this book passed into oblivion on the mythical academic "relevance scale"?

Fogelson seems concerned with this obvious diminution of the full-scale riot. In his epilogue he attributes this decrease in visible and intense rioting to a variety of reasons, among them the increased speed and sophistication of police response. At the same time Fogelson argues that increasing polarization of the black and white races has occurred. He predicts that such polarization and unanswered frustration of both blacks and whites could lead to a long-term rash of less intense and more selective disruptions and terrorism which could be much more devastating for the nation than the short-run experience of the intense race riots of the sixties. He argues, in conclusion, that history has shown the nation can survive intense riots but that it is much less likely that we would fare well in a prolonged battle of disruption and terrorism.

All in all, *Violence as Protest* is an exciting and fairly well argued book which deserves the attention of those social scientists interested in the general study of contemporary urban America, as well as ghetto-specific discussions of collective violence.

DAVID C. PERRY, *University of Texas at Austin*

Rites of Way: The Politics of Transportation in Boston and the U.S. City. By ALAN LUPO, FRANK COLCORD, and EDMUND P. FOWLER.
(Boston: Little, Brown, 1971. Pp. xi, 294. \$4.95.)