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Sectionalism and the conflicts between North and South, East and West, have been among the major themes in American history. The United States has not always been united; regional differences run deep in the nation's culture and politics. In *Regions and Regionalism in the United States*, British geographer Michael Bradshaw examines the nation's regional variations and their implications for public policy in the middle and late twentieth century. In the process he emphasizes the continuing significance of the concept of region in American history and government.

In part one of the book Bradshaw describes regional differences within the United States, primarily considering variations in natural resources and the diversity of migration and settlement patterns. He also reviews the historic bases for existing regional differences, summarizing the evolution of the United States in twenty-five pages. For American readers familiar with their native terrain and the outline of their past, these chapters may seem elementary, but they are necessary for the international audience Bradshaw is addressing. Some Americans also may take exception to a few of Bradshaw's generalizations. For example, some loyal midwesterners would bristle at the statement that their region's climate "is ideal for ... corn and soybeans (even though it is dreadful for human beings)" (13).

Having laid his foundation, Bradshaw proceeds in part two to examine some of the regional concerns of the twentieth century. He discusses the Frostbelt-Sunbelt conflict, the western preoccupation with water resources and public lands, and the regional rifts exacerbated by the energy crisis of the 1970s. He also focuses on the application of the regional concept to public policy, recounting the history of the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Appalachian Regional Commission, and other less noteworthy attempts by the federal government at regional planning and development. Bradshaw notes that American attempts at social planning have been sporadic and short-lived; consequently, public works projects have dominated regional programs—electric power development in the case of the TVA, and highway construction in the case of the Appalachian Commission. Although these agencies consumed much concrete and asphalt, Bradshaw recognizes their limited results and their failure to stir enthusiasm for similar efforts elsewhere in the country.
In the course of 180 pages, Bradshaw thus offers a concise introduction to the issue of regionalism in the late twentieth-century United States. Americans with good memories or an accurate knowledge of history will note certain minor errors. For example, Spiro Agnew was from Maryland, not Virginia (92), and the chairman of the TVA was David Lilienthal, not John Lilienthal (130–31). Bradshaw also fails to consider interstate compacts as tools of multistate planning and development. Yet Bradshaw does remind readers of the continuing significance of the concept of region, and he offers insights useful to students of recent public policy.
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The concept of regionalism (or sectionalism) is of long standing in the study of American history, life, and politics. Whether we think in terms of East and West, North and South, or, more recently, Frostbelt and Sunbelt, many attempts to understand and interpret the American experience include a consciousness of two or more distinct regions or parts of the United States. Many individuals have a feeling of identity with and loyalty to a particular geographical area of the country. The concept of regionalism frequently, perhaps usually, includes a belief in the homogeneity and distinctiveness of the residents of a particular area. According to Frederick Jackson Turner, “sectionalism was the dominant influence in shaping our political history upon all important measures.” Although most historians think of regionalism in the context of the nation, some behavioral scientists apply the concept to the study of smaller political units, exploring substate regionalism.

Diversity, Conflict, and State Politics, for example, applies the concept of substate regionalism to Illinois, one of the more heterogeneous of the American states. Editor Peter Nardulli and his collaborators conclude that Illinois has five regions: the city of Chicago, its “suburban collar,” northern Illinois, central Illinois, and southern Illinois. They note that “the choice of Chicago and its suburban collar was the easiest,” and that the most “meaningful divisions of the state may vary depending on the time frame with which one is concerned or the substance of one’s concerns (political, social, economic)” (22–23).