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In the halcyon days of 80s African American literary study, exciting, even liberating, theoretical frameworks were established for reading, categorizing, and evaluating black literary and cultural productivity. In hindsight, it seems fraught with unimagined risks as moves of significant gravitas were made with slight historical frameworks. The emergence of teaching structures—syllabi and anthologies—meant a basic periodization had taken form and with it the rough outlines of a canon, but, again, in hindsight, it is remarkable how little sensitivity there was to patterns of cultural consumption and production, to genealogies rooted in locale and learning, and, most importantly, to intercultural exchanges and overlap. It was probably a reasonable collective gamble; the institutionalization and sometimes prioritizing of African American literary study drew upon the prestige of theory, and without question lead to close and compelling non-sociological readings of core texts and the emergence of a nimble critical vocabulary.

Regardless of one’s sense of logical order (history to theory or theory to history), it seems like some shift has begun to take place. This shift has taken fullest shape in a couple of pivotal areas, most importantly in our accounting of the Harlem Renaissance and in the reconstruction of the African American literary left. In the case of the former, the motivation has been to contextualize and evaluate the mythmaking of a previous cultural entrepreneurial moment, while in the case of the latter it has been to combat Cold War constructions of the value and richness (if not the mere presence) of left political activity in and around the black cultural sphere.

James Smethurst’s *The Black Arts Movement: Literary Nationalism in the 1960s and 1970s* is rooted in the second historicist effort, but is by no means limited by that particular commitment. It is simply the most comprehensive and detailed genealogical and archaeological pursuit of a large scale African American cultural frame that we have to the current moment. It will stand with George Hutchinson’s *The Harlem Renaissance in Black and White* as a crucial intervention in both our historical under-
standing and our critical practice. The book is a monumental contribution because of its rich encounter with the archive, its extensive oral historical work, and its reasoned judgment and evaluation of a contested cultural moment and movement. As he rightly asserts in his introduction, the status upgrade that theory provided was sometimes achieved in cynical rhetorical exchange that sought to ritually demolish much of the cultural output of the 1960s as naïve, crassly and grotesquely political, and which either flirted with or embodied anti-Semitism, sexism, and essentialist constructions of racial and national identity. It is a reasonable critique of the book that Smethurst does not systematically refute these charges, but instead opts “simply” to make it impossible for any future critic or historian to be dismissive of the movement’s scope, import, or influence, by his relentless documentation of its deep roots and ambition.

Smethurst documents convincingly the import of the remnants of Popular Front and other Left coalition and straightforwardly Communist cultural enterprises—discussion groups, bookstores, civil rights organizations, and interpersonal networks—in foregrounding and seeding the diverse cultural nationalist organizations, representations, networks, and conversations that make up what we commonly understand as the “Black Arts Movement.” Perhaps most important of all, and as no small or side assertion, Smethurst believes that it was indeed a substantial and coherent social and cultural movement, even as it is appropriately described and documented through its ideological diversity, its rich local and regional manifestations, and personal idiosyncrasy. Similarly, Smethurst is convincing and helpful in describing the myriad ways that the movement seeded, supported, and modeled action for parallel developments in Puerto Rican, Chicano, and Asian American cultural movements. While his project is primarily reconstructive, he appropriately asserts that the Black Arts movement paved the way for what we understand as multiculturalism and for distinct changes in cultural taste and especially the emergence of popular community-based arts activity like performance poetry that we now take for granted.

Smethurst is unapologetic for his literary bias and commitment to documenting poetic activity in particular. No apology is necessary but some extended reflection on how the movement might look should future historians and critics privilege painting, jazz, or dance, say, would be helpful in our getting a better handle on how truly comprehensive this historical reconstruction might really be. Similarly, Smethurst’s tendency is to treat the movement (whatever its internal ideological diversity and evolution) to be largely a consensus enterprise. More consideration of figures who were actively contrarian, ambivalent, or simply hard to place would have been welcome, as would an effort to sustain attention to the richness of the dialogue between movement figures and outsiders. At minimum, it is important not simply to dismiss as “conservative” the hesitations of individuals as diverse as James Baldwin, Ralph Ellison, and Robert Hayden.

The book’s most important provocation may be amongst its most subtle but may also be the most lasting. Its rich regionalism, commitment to the idea of the local, and attention to the literary and artistic cultures of black New Orleans, Atlanta, Philadelphia, Cleveland, Los Angeles, and San Francisco, in particular, may have done us the significant service of breaking our unspoken sense that the only places we could do significant African American cultural history is New York. Smethurst has written a book of impeccable commitment and scholarship and it should push us urgently towards the fullest possible historical and cultural record imaginable.

University of Alabama
James C. Hall

“Citizenship” as an analytic tool has increasingly gained currency in American Studies and its kindred fields in recent years. Evelyn Nakano Glenn’s Unequal Freedom: How Race and Gender Shaped American Citizenship and Labor successfully demonstrates the valuable insights to be gained by considering American social, cultural, economic, and political history in this framework. Ambitious in reach and scope, Unequal Freedom effectively synthesizes important works of United States historiography and critical race and feminist studies in order to understand how and why “in a society that proclaims freedom, individualism, and unlimited mobility” that “rampant inequality along ascriptive lines of race and gender” persists (1).

The strength of Unequal Freedom is Glenn’s simultaneous attention to multiple axes of power relations—race, gender, and labor—and the ways in which these worked to shape the terms of belonging in the national community during the period spanning 1870-1930. The first half of the book presents an overview of the major concepts underpinning her study. In Chapter 1, Glenn sets forth her argument that race and gender must be considered together as “interacting, interlocking structures” that are “mutually constituted” (6, 12). Chapter 2 traces the trajectory of citizenship—that is, “full membership in the community in which one lives” that entails “certain rights in and reciprocal duties toward the community”(19)—in the United States, positing that it has consistently remained the domain of white males. Race and gender, she emphasizes, “have continuously been organizing principles of American citizenship” while also serving as the bases on which those historically excluded from full citizenship privileges have “contest[ed] boundaries and rights” (26). The third chapter outlines the centrality of the idea of “free labor” as the basis for claiming independence and therefore full citizenship with onset of industrial capitalism after the Civil War. Glenn underscores the role of coercive work regimes in curtailing the freedoms of white women and non-white men and women and perpetuating occupationally stratified and segregated labor markets.

Three regional case studies comprise the second half of the book. Chapter 4 focuses on blacks and whites in the Jim Crow South; Chapter 5 surveys Mexican Americans and Anglos in the Southwest; Chapter 6 examines Japanese immigrants and haoles (whites) in Hawaii; and Chapter 7 presents a discussion of the case studies in comparison. The careful attention to regional differences in racialization at the levels of representation, “micro-interaction,” and social structure is arguably the book’s most significant contribution to American studies. Glenn offers a sweeping view of the process of citizenship-making by including such sites as property, work, participation in formal politics, marriage law, education, community building, and contestation and oppositional strategies in the labor market and in public spaces. To her credit, she avoids overgeneralizations about the various racialized groups in her study, emphasizing throughout variations within each population such as class and nativity.

While Glenn’s objective to demonstrate that race and gender are “mutually constituted” and thus necessarily must be explored together is imperative to understanding American citizenship, Unequal Freedom falls somewhat short in this regard. Glenn ably illustrates that the “work” of gender is to maintain racial boundaries but could do more to show how race worked in these three regions to uphold the gender order beyond prohibitions of interracial sex between men of color and white women. Perhaps gender receives less consideration in part because of the book’s structure. In addition,
her focus on dyads in her three case studies begs the question of how her interpretation might have differed if she had included to a greater extent other racial groups in her discussion, particularly in the case of the Southwest and Hawaii. But these are minor concerns when weighed against Glenn’s laudable achievements.

Rutgers University, New Brunswick
Ellen D. Wu


Recent scholarship exists on regionalism and environmental writing, but until now there has been no thorough consideration of midwestern literature of nature, with its simultaneous reference to the literature and philosophy of the past as well as to rising ecocritical and historical perspectives. This volume’s interdisciplinary perspective fills the void with reasoned argument, providing context for and additional richness to existing and future midwestern pastoral texts.

Significant literature inevitably reflects the writer’s values, experience, and worldview. To the extent that American literary pastoralism evokes more than attractive rural settings, it embodies values, life experience, and worldview in support of its themes. The Midwestern Pastoral: Place and Landscape in Literature of the American Heartland explores the nature, characteristics, and evolution of midwestern pastoral writing with emphasis on regional and ecological perspectives. Willa Cather, Aldo Leopold, Theodore Roethke, James Wright, and Jim Harrison are analyzed as major twentieth-century exemplars. Jane Smiley, Ted Kooser, and Paul Gruchow are presented as more recent writers who reflect and advance the genre.

The volume’s preface is a value-laden first-person evocation of place in Flushing, Michigan, the site of the author’s own midwestern boyhood. The introduction follows, providing the volume’s thesis and the structuring of its argument.

Chapter one is the heart of the exposition. It describes pastoral writing from Virgil forward, identifies the components of the genre, and presents twentieth-century critical appraisals and reappraisals from literary, philosophical, religious, historical, and political perspectives. The author reviews New Critical, modernist, structuralist, postmodern, and New Historist positions, and describes the impacts of Judeo-Christian thought, the Enlightenment, Jeffersonian democratic agrarianism, utilitarianism, Romanticism, and ecological thought on interpretations of the natural world and human relation to it. The chapter also examines the tension between opposing archetypes of midwestern life. Not surprisingly, many midwestern archetypes, like the tinkerer and booster, associate with Enlightenment-based visions of human control and progress. These stand at odds with pastoral values of place and the sacredness of the natural order.

Chapter one defines midwestern pastoral and marks it as a significant, evolving literary tradition conscious of received literary and philosophical positions, yet also aware of holistic ecological science and recent historical perspectives, particularly those relating to imperialism, minorities, women, and the poor.

The next five chapters deal with pastoralism in the writings of Willa Cather, Aldo Leopold, Theodore Roethke, James Wright, and Jim Harrison. This study presents a clear progression from Cather’s somewhat uncritically optimistic Whitmanic celebration of democratic American expansion and her omission or suppression of individual and societal abuses. Leopold, who retains Cather’s faith in the beauty and sacredness of the land and opposes materialistic approaches, is more able to reconcile economics and spirit, natural order and human domestication. Roethke asserts the same connection to
place and sacredness of life, and follows Leopold in admitting American wrongs. His central image, the greenhouse, bridges science and art, sacredness and utilitarianism, nature and technological innovation. James Wright maintains received pastoral values but begins with Martins Ferry, Ohio’s degraded industrial landscapes. For him, Eden is clearly gone but not forgotten. Wright, too, acknowledges American societal abuses. Jim Harrison accepts and further advances the received tradition, in recognizing the importance of regional place and community as well as global cosmopolitanism. Chapter seven ends the volume, addressing more recent fiction, poetry, and essay writing further shaping the genre.

The author is astute in recognizing and defining the multiple perspectives often closely interwoven with the Midwestern pastoral and in acknowledging the validity of some ideological criticism regarding race, class, gender, and ecology. Barillas refuses, however, to permit reductive approaches from substituting ideology for artistic expression.

The volume makes a significant contribution to cultural studies of American and midwestern literature, encouraging awareness of holistic ethical systems and recognition of the claims of ecological science and history. Significant work has been written and will continue to be written in the tradition Barillas defines and describes. The volume is particularly strong in its balanced interdisciplinary approach. It conflates literary, historical, philosophical, and ecological perspectives in deriving the genre and tracing its evolution from the early twentieth century forward.

University of Kentucky

Philip A. Greasley


New York Sights: Visualizing Old and New New York is a must read for anyone interested in visual culture and the urban environment. Focusing on the period between 1880 and 1920 when “Old New York” was dramatically transformed into an iconic modern metropolis, Douglas Tallack surveys the full, bedazzling spectacle of Manhattan’s turn-of-the-century reinvention, offering new insight into the effects of the city’s explosive development on the visual imagination. Tallack does not aim for encyclopedic coverage in this book, but prefers instead “to examine, through close analysis of examples, the interaction between the visual arts and the phenomenon of a city on the move” (3). This he does exceptionally well. The close readings of individual images—drawn from high art to ephemera, and from painting and illustration to photography and film—frequently reveal hidden complexities, even in the case of seemingly exhausted classics like Alfred Stieglitz’s The Flatiron (1903).

Each chapter in New York Sights looks at the city from a different set of visual and thematic perspectives. A solidly theorized introduction to the city’s “varied conditions of seeing” (5) is followed by an excellent chapter on visualizing urban change, in which Tallack traces responses by artists such as Joseph Pennell, John Sloan, and Edward Steichen to the “unexpected vistas” (23) thrown up by New York’s abrupt architectural modernization. This chapter includes an unexpected section on photographing the domestic interiors of fashionable New York’s leisure class, as well as a more predictable section on artists’ obsession with building sites. The next chapter, on the topic of the elevated railway, is perhaps the most original in the book. Here, Tallack addresses “the
visual discourse of rapid transit” (73) and identifies some very interesting tensions between movement and place animating the work of Ashcan painter John Sloan. There is also an incisive reading of Charles Sheeler’s only urban transit painting, *Church Street El* (1920), that interprets the image in the broader context of Sheeler’s photography and cinematic collaboration with Paul Strand. The next two chapters focus respectively on close-up and long-distance views of the city, ranging from the congested sidewalks of George Bellows’s painting and the backstreet slums of Jacob Riis’s photography to the bird’s-eye panoramas of *Kings New York Views* (1896) and the jumbled skylines of John Marin’s modernist watercolors. Tallack closes with a thoughtful chapter on the trends of “excess and rationalization” (165) that have always dominated New York, extending the analysis into the present in order to touch on the impact of 9/11 on the city’s contemporary visual imagination.

My only point of contention with this intellectually sophisticated and staggeringly knowledgeable book is that Tallack neglects to give the concept of spatiality enough attention within his broader critical thinking about visuality. But this is a very minor quibble. Overall, *New York Sights* makes an important and thought-provoking contribution to the study of urban visuality.

Out of the era of radical urban change examined in Tallack’s book there emerged in the early 1930s an improbable achievement of creative financing and extreme engineering that quickly became (as it still remains) one of the world’s most recognizable urban landmarks: the Empire State Building. This oversized monster of the city is the subject of Mark Kingwell’s *Nearest Thing to Heaven: The Empire State Building and American Dreams*, the first sustained critical study of America’s most prominent skyscraper. Looking at—and thinking about—the building from an array of architectural, cultural, and philosophical perspectives, King illuminates the many, complicated reasons why this particular tower of steel, stone, and glass has mesmerized the popular imagination ever since its completion in 1931.

The opening chapter provides a very useful and fact-oriented history of the building’s origins and construction that lays important groundwork for the more explorative chapters that follow. These include sharply-focused chapters on the Empire State Building’s iconicity, structure, and symbolism, as well as more playful chapters on its representation in film and popular culture. Throughout, King analyzes the classic New York skyscraper in relation to other iconic buildings, including its art-deco contemporaries (such as the Chrysler Building), its high-rise antecedents (such as the Eiffel Tower), and its late capitalist successors (such as the World Trade Center Towers). This is a particular strength of the book because it enables King’s many keen observations about the Empire State Building’s place in the American mind to connect with a broader commentary about key developments in urban culture, architectural practice, and modern technology.

The many highlights of this eminently readable study include King’s uncanny ability to combine profound commentary on architecture, philosophy, and popular culture into one seamless and accessible discussion. Another highlight is his idea that “any truly monumental building,” such as the Empire State Building, “has a tendency to disappear from view, to become spectral or invisible, even if its material reality persists” (190). King’s most effective illustration of this strange phenomenon occurs in a discussion of the skyscraper’s mass-mediation and consequent subjection to a Baudrillardian hyperreality in which its image is always already reproduced. Given King’s alertness to the effects of mass media on the skyscraper’s visibility, it is a little disappointing that
his treatment of the building’s role in popular films like *King Kong* (1933) and *An Affair to Remember* (1957) lacks the same critical edge.

In *Nearest Thing to Heaven*, Mark King succeeds not only in demonstrating the importance of the Empire State Building to modern American society, but also in deepening our understanding of the murky cultural processes through which buildings become icons, and icons become dreams.

Northern Illinois University

Christoph Lindner

*CONJECTURES OF ORDER: Intellectual Life and the American South, 1810-1860.*


In his introduction to *All Clever Men Who Make Their Way*, his 1982 edition of writings by nineteenth-century Southerners, Michael O’Brien made what then seemed an extravagant claim: “we stand,” he wrote, “in our understanding of antebellum Southern thought where the study of colonial New England stood when Perry Miller came to revise the orthodoxy of Brooks Adams.” Challenging what had long passed for conventional wisdom that intellectual life in the Old South was both “inaccessible and uninteresting,” O’Brien concluded his seminal essay with a prediction: “I suspect,” he presciently wrote, that “a history of antebellum Southern intellectual life . . . when seriously undertaken . . . may possibly show a modernity more marked in the South’s intellectual elite than in even its social structure. . . . [T]here was nothing old-fashioned in the South’s movement to cultural and political nationalism. It was all too modern.”

O’Brien devoted the next twenty years to leadership by example and made his prediction come true. With the publication of his brilliant, indeed magisterial, *Conjectures of Order*, he has provided a most thorough treatment of antebellum Southern thought. These two weighty volumes summarize a life’s work while broadening and deepening the reader’s understanding of how richly and variously the life of the mind was lived in the Old South.

Readers of the Introduction will not in any way find O’Brien changed from him they knew; only more sure of all he thought was true. “I see the Old South as not premodern,” he writes, “but deeply implicated in modernity, though an idiosyncratic version mostly based on slavery” (17). The tensions created by the pace and direction of change in the nineteenth century derived from, and also shaped, a culture that was “national, postcolonial, and imperial, all at once” (3). First, national: the United States “was their world, a thing they had made or were remaking, a thing whose meaning they felt capable of defining” (3). Next, less familiarly, postcolonial: the Old South’s “intellectual traditions continued to be formed mostly by the older cultures of Europe” (4). Finally, imperial: Southerners were the “heir[s] of the conquerors,” and thus “movement was of this project’s essence, what made it work” (5).

This dynamic, derivative, mobile, and expansive culture developed through three periods, an Enlightenment phase, “inclined to be individualist”; a Romantic phase, “much more interested . . . in the pleasures of belonging”; and, finally, an early realist phase, where it began to become clear that “life compelled choices and that all choices entailed loss” (11). Between 1810 and 1860, “the South drifted away from the premise that mankind had a common nature towards the sense that society and, hence, self were segmented” (8).

Thus O’Brien’s narrative contains six “books,” through which he traces this process, both chronologically and topically. His treatment is exhaustive (1,199 pages of text, plus an 89-page bibliography). Greater and lesser political thinkers, poets, novel-
ists, critics, editors, polemicists, artists, anthropologists, philosophers, scientists, theologians, male and female, have their moment on O’Brien’s grand stage. Readers willing to experience this Nicholas Nickleby-length cast and production in full should know that the author recognizes that in the South, as everywhere else, “there were too many bad authors and too few good ones, who were appearing in too many periodicals” (548). O’Brien deftly exercises critical judgment even as he exhibits an extraordinarily comprehensive understanding of thinkers, writers, and their works.

Of the many particular observations that might be made of this publication, two seem particularly noteworthy to this reviewer. The first is O’Brien’s exemplary unwillingness to succumb to the temptation, which has affected so many students of antebellum Southern literature, to play the ultimately useless, utterly defensive parlor game of ranking. Perhaps at last, with this study, we have gotten for good past the “Simms is really better than Cooper” school of literary and intellectual history. O’Brien wisely analyzes writers and texts on their own terms, leaving to others, who, we might hope, will not take the bait, the placement of these Southerners on some table or chart of the greatest nineteenth-century American writers. Perhaps, in particular, Simms’s ghost may at last find peace.

The second observation, which extends beyond these volumes to a distinctive contribution made by O’Brien over the course of his career, is his (re-?)discovery of Southern women of mind. For a long time that comprised a very short list: Mary Boykin Chesnut. Thanks to O’Brien’s efforts, readers now know about, have access to, and thus may form critical judgments concerning, among others, Louisa Susanna Cheves McCord, Penina Moise, and Mary Elizabeth Lee. Curiously receiving less treatment, however, is the redoubtable Octavia LeVert (for whom a national prize in creative non-fiction is currently named), who presided over a notable literary salon in Mobile.

One finishes these two volumes persuaded that to talk of a single, unified “mind of the South” is no longer to be au courant. The South had, and has, many minds. The South has been, and is, American. Perhaps, as Stephen Vincent Benet once put it, the South is best thought of as “the America we have not been.” But, after reading the work of a scholar who, with Conjectures of Order establishes his position as the Perry Miller of nineteenth century Southern intellectual history, one is rather more inclined to see the vast, diverse region south of Mason and Dixon’s Line, where imperfect human beings attempted imperfectly to comprehend a rapidly changing social order in the more perfect Union they had helped to fashion, as, in fact, altogether American.

Middlebury College

John M. McCardell, Jr.


This eclectic book is the result of a collaboration by three distinguished authors who developed the idea in the course of their discussions at the Lincoln Forum, which is held every year at Gettysburg. Harold Holzer is a celebrated Civil War scholar and art historian; Edna Greene Medford is a distinguished historian with a specialty in nineteenth-century American history; and Frank J. Williams is Chief Justice of the Rhode Island Supreme Court and a widely respected Lincoln scholar.

Each of these authors contributes an essay on the subject of Lincoln’s Emancipation Proclamation. The lead essay by Medford is entitled “Imagined Promises, Bitter Realities: African Americans and the Meaning of the Emancipation Proclamation.” The
gist of this essay is a contrast: the contrast between the expectant and at times quite euphoric reception of the Proclamation by a great many black Americans during the Civil War era and the disillusionment regarding the Proclamation among many blacks in the subsequent decades. To use the old metaphor, Medford presents us with the problematical challenge of interpreting the half-full glass: half-full by the standards of the earlier age and half-empty by latter-day standards. Though the treatment of Lincoln by Medford is fairly conventional, her essay contributes to our knowledge of the African American experience, including the development of African American views, with intelligence and insight.

Williams's essay is entitled "'Doing Less' and 'Doing More': The President and the Proclamation—Legally, Militarily, and Politically." Far more than Medford, Williams emphasizes the positive about the Proclamation. "Lincoln's boldness—and considerable political risk-taking—cannot be taken for granted," he writes. "As much as abolitionists criticized Lincoln for not moving quickly enough on emancipation, others who feared its impact condemned him just as vigorously" (66).

Harold Holzer's essay is entitled "Picturing Freedom: The Emancipation Proclamation in Art, Iconography, and Memory." His thesis: "The emancipation . . . became the dominant theme of Lincoln art and iconography for the rest of the nineteenth century" (87). Presenting a broad range of imagery—in lithographs, paintings, cartoons, and sculpture—Holzer to his credit sought out all the pertinent depictions of Lincoln as the Great Emancipator, positive and negative. As to the latter, he includes some vivid white supremacist attacks upon the Proclamation, which demonstrate the obstacles that Lincoln faced right down to the end.

These essays are stimulating contributions to the literature of Lincoln, the Civil War, African American history, and the history of American race relations. The authors are to be commended, not only for their individual essays but also for developing the project that led to the joint venture.

Washington College

Richard Striner


Professor Fogelson's *Bourgeois Nightmares* provides further evidence that urban history still has rich seams to mine. In this case the author follows the streetcar into that semi-urban frontier known as suburbia. Here residents sought a new utopia which differed dramatically from other examples of nineteenth century cooperative/communal living based on shared religious values or social beliefs. This suburban transition, driven by property developers, created different needs. What emerged was a national desire for a more homogeneous suburban community, made perfect by codified rules and regulations guaranteeing a snug collective living arrangement. The glue which would bind these new communities, according to this historian, was the concept of restrictive covenants, and it is their implementation which gives this study its primary focus.

*Bourgeois Nightmares* is not then a general history of the idea of the suburb. It is though clearly indebted to the work of pioneers in this area such as Kenneth T. Jackson, Robert Fishman, and others. In addition, the book is not a comprehensive survey of suburban planning and construction between 1870 and 1930. Yet key suburbs from this period such as River Oaks in Houston, Baltimore's Roland Park, the Country Club District in Kansas City, and Los Angeles' Palos Verdes Estates, among many others, do provide abundant examples of how the covenant process worked.
As Fogelson states: “these covenants reveal more about the suburbs, where by the 1920s they were the rule, than about the cities, where they were the exception. They tell us much not only about the dreams of the suburbanites, which have been vividly described by many other historians, but also about their nightmares; not only about their hopes but about their fears” (23-24). It is the play between an optimistic suburban vision and the fear of an uncertain, unregulated future that forms the critical essence of this history.

The book’s structure is sensibly divided between: “Suburbia, 1870-1930: The Quest for Permanence” and “Bourgeois Nightmares: Fears of Almost Everyone and Everything.” Each section explores how suburban relationships were managed in order to cope with unpredictable change. Yet the use of covenants to control such change was not always an easy one for they challenged previously held legal concepts of property rights as well as base and unfettered speculative impulses. Nevertheless, by the 1890s the idea was accepted and had become a standard feature of suburban development. Famed planners such as Frederick Law Olmsted and later his sons even argued that the nation’s suburbs required ever more severe restrictions. This in time made strong covenant enforcement a property asset and not a liability.

Increasingly covenant procedures became amazingly complex, and as suburbs matured the enforcement of the restrictions passed to various ownership associations that were committed to maintaining the original planners’ objectives. With growing African-American city migration after 1890, as well as the arrival of other immigrant populations, covenants became convenient devices to ensure racial exclusion. The goal in all its many parts was suburban homogeneity.

Bourgeois Nightmares unravels an understated aspect of the suburban movement and explains in the telling how the covenant movement became a dominating feature that shaped the very nature of American suburbia. Even more importantly, this book illustrates how much Americans would tolerate, and what lengths many Americans would go, to achieve such an intrusive ideal.

Ivybridge Community College, England (Retired) Theodore W. Eversole


In Rough Justice, historian Michael J. Pfeifer contributes to the growing literature on mob violence by situating lynching within a wide-ranging cultural clash over the evolution of formal law in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Lynching certainly upheld social, and especially racial, hierarchies, he argues; yet, the narrow focus on this aspect of it has obscured its role as a critique by the rural and working classes of what they deemed the impersonal, sterile, and excessively humanitarian due-process statutes increasingly imposed by urban middle-class reformers. For these critics, “justice” demanded stern, swift retribution, administered by the offended community, and laws that failed to meet this threshold were simply unworthy of respect or adherence. Since functioning legal systems were usually established where lynching occurred, Pfeifer observes, mobs were responding not “to an absence of law but rather to a style of criminal justice” (3) that offended their cultural sensibilities.

Pfeifer argues that this clash over the style of criminal justice forged the modern American death penalty, described as a compromise between “rough justice” enthusiasts and middle-class due-process advocates concerned with dangerous public disorder. “Legislators renovated the death penalty in the early twentieth century out of direct
concern for the alternative of mob violence," he writes (8). By combining brutal, often discriminatory, retributive justice with court procedure and the application of “scientific” methods of execution carried out in the secrecy of penal institutions, Pfeifer finds, the “middle class had shaped a death penalty unlikely to arouse popular passions yet able to satisfy popular demands for retribution and racial and ethnic control” (128).

Pfeifer places lynching within a comparative framework, focusing on temporal and geographic continuities and discontinuities between and within seven states scattered throughout the Midwest, the West, the South, and the Northeast. He shows that diverse demographic, cultural, and economic forces contributed to wildly varying levels of mob violence. In Wisconsin, for example, he finds that a “political culture rooted in the Yankee heritage” and a “farm and industrial economy characterized by a vibrant capitalism meant that respect for due-process law and the promise that it might ensure social and economic order were strong counter-currents to the temptations of Judge Lynch” (27). He also shows how due-process reforms first instituted in the Northeast spread their influence west and south, transforming local understandings of criminal justice in a halting and uneven fashion.

Drawing on newspaper accounts and coroner’s inquests, Pfeifer has produced an original, persuasive, and important study that enriches considerably scholarly perspectives on lynching and its role in American history and society. He might have strengthened it further in two areas. One of these is his concept of “near lynchings,” a provocative category which he neither defines nor develops sufficiently. The second is his decision to examine geography throughout the book rather than in one centralized place, leading sometimes to redundancy and occasionally to the attribution of behaviors to one section of the country when they are clearly applicable to lynching more generally.

Emory University

Brent Campney


I gazing at the boundaries of granite and spray, the established sea-marks, felt behind me Mountain and plain, the immense breadth of the continent, before me the mass and doubled stretch of water.

Robinson Jeffers, “Continent’s End”

Artists at Continent’s End: The Monterey Peninsula Art Colony, 1875-1907, by Scott A. Shields, is an impressive study of the transformative effects of place upon art. The title marks the geographical region, Monterey, where the granite continental cliffs meet the Pacific. The title also marks time, coinciding with Frederick Jackson Turner’s closing of the American frontier. Shields describes the layered development of this coastal landscape as it moves from raw vistas to settled villages and tourist destinations, all recorded by artists frequenting the peninsula in the several decades surrounding the end of the nineteenth century. Shields describes artists like Jules Tavernier, William Keith, and George Inness who unite the “spirit, flesh, and place” (107), and he concludes that in Monterey, the landscape itself—though tempered through style and personality—serves as a catalyst for this significant body of art.

Shields cogently weaves literary and artistic references throughout his essays, providing an overview of American cultural change. For example, he describes the arts and crafts movement, art nouveau, and Gustav Stickley’s influence on interiors. He clarifies
the art world’s shifting definitions of tonalism, impressionism, naturalism and explains the Barbizon style and the Nabis. He notes, too, innovations in early photography in Monterey with Arnold Genthe’s use of the Lumière autochrome process in 1906.

*Artists at Continent’s End* is solidly interdisciplinary and exactingly researched. Drawing broadly from American icons, Shields compares the New Woman and Isadora Duncan to the robust, healthy images in *Youth, 1917* by Arthur Mathews. He references popular writers like Mary Austin, Charles Warren Stoddard, and George Sterling, to name a few, and parallels image and text. Knowingly, Shields acknowledges long-time Carmel Point resident, Robinson Jeffers (1887-1962), and connects paintings to poetic vision.

Shields is especially adept in identifying allusions. Whether it is a glimpse of Arcadia that Lucia and Arthur Mathews found on the sandy beach, the profound influence of John Muir’s environmental convictions on William Keith, the influences of Dante seen in Gottardo Piazzoni, or the terror of Bram Stoker’s *Dracula* lurking in Charles Rollo Peters’s mysterious nocturnes, the ever-changing Monterey vistas are both real and representative of a place, unique in time and geographical space.

Using primary documents, Shields develops astute character sketches. Evelyn McCormick was “tiny and birdlike . . . chic, vivacious and the belle of the ball” (119-120); Tavernier was “nervous and excitable, frequently volatile” (20); and Piazzoni was a “soft-spoken, unassuming” mystic (157, 159). Shields explores the artists’ religious convictions and literary inspirations, often mentioning Thoreau and Emerson. To painters, who transfigured transcendental thought into pigment, landscape is an embodiment of God. Others invoke the spirit of the place.

With a keen ability to recast paintings into words, Shields’s descriptions spark imaginative readings. For example, his detailing of death images, the skull, the Sphinx, the Native Americans and cloud angels in *Artist’s Reverie* (1876) is informative and accurate. However, in the text’s accompanying image, none of that is visible. In general, criticism of any art text often rests upon the reproduction of the art. *Artists at Continent’s End* is also a victim of illustrations often too small to show fine detail or color reproductions too dark to reveal subtleties of shade and line. However, if one visits the traveling exhibition for which this catalogue was created (In 2006, the exhibition, sponsored by the Crocker Art Museum in Sacramento, CA, was housed in the following California venues: Crocker Art Museum, Laguna Art Museum, Santa Barbara Museum of Art, and Monterey Museum of Art.), the dramatic beauty of the landscapes comes alive with nuances of detail, luminous flickerings of light, splendid reproductions of fauna, and seemingly limitless panoramas of sky, sea, and cypress trees.

Fortunately for readers, Shields’ competence as an art historian, his eye as a curator, and his breadth as a scholar of American culture results in a text, *Artists at Continent’s End*, that successfully conveys the formidable contributions made by the early artists of Monterey Bay.

California State University, Long Beach

Nancy Strow Sheley

BEYOND THE GIBSON GIRL: Reimagining the American New Woman, 1895-1915.

In *Beyond the Gibson Girl: Reimagining the American New Woman, 1895-1915*, Martha H. Patterson argues that when we examine literary and visual representations of the New Woman within the historical web of the turn of the century, “that figure be-
comes, in her dominant form, an anxious and paradoxical icon of modern American power and decline" (3). It is the paradox of the New Woman that engages Patterson the most. She reveals how women authors who were informed, either explicitly or indirectly, by the rhetoric of the New Woman made her into a threat, a promise, a connection to nature, a product of the machine age, a sign of evolutionary advancement and a sign of decadence and decline.

Patterson first analyzes how Charles Dana Gibson created the Gibson Girl, a figure at once straight-laced and materialistic, corseted and flirtatious. This icon, she argues, became a symbol of both feminine independence and a white, patriarchal social order. Patterson then shows how women authors of the era invoked, challenged, and appropriated this image as they created New Woman protagonists. The authors Patterson examines come from varied social, racial, and geographic positions: Margaret Murray Washington and Pauline Hopkins, who fashioned themselves as New Negro Women; Edith Wharton, who wrote from the perspective of the elite, industrial North; Sui Sin Far, an Anglo-Chinese author who sought to create a New Chinese Woman; Mary Johnson and Ellen Glasgow, white women who used the New Woman to revision the New South; and Willa Cather, who connected feminine independence to the vast Western landscape. In her analysis of narrative structures and character development, Patterson wants to "complicate . . . our understanding of 'dominant' and 'resistant' voices," by demonstrating how these authors' texts not only resisted racial and gender oppression but also upheld dominant racial, commercial, or patriarchal values (106). For instance, in The Custom of the Country, Edith Wharton uses her character Undine to question the evolutionary notion of female inferiority while validating the idea of racial inheritance. Sui Sin Far, on the other hand, challenged the belief in Chinese inferiority by promoting a performative rather than a racial model of citizenship while at the same time portraying the Chinese immigrant woman as an elemental connection to Chinese values.

A problem with Patterson's text is that she views the New Woman to be an illustration of too many turn-of-the-century debates, tensions, and controversies including the problems of industrialization, the rise of corporate culture, the establishment of Jim Crow laws, fear of the "Yellow Peril," the propagation of Darwin's theory of evolution, and the thrill and uncertainty about electric energy, not to mention the changes in the lives of American women through education, paid labor, and involvement in reform, including the suffrage movement. Keeping this many balls in the air leads to confusion and tends to dilute the analysis. Overall, though, Patterson presents a provocative re-reading of the New Woman phenomena and what it shows about the possibilities and limits for American women at the turn of the century.

Hope College

Jeanne Petit


Since its inception in the 1980s, Asian American literary studies have maintained a somewhat vexed relationship to Asian American literary texts produced before 1965: the year in which the US reopened its immigration doors to Asian immigrants from previously "barred nations." Such texts often demonstrate an ambivalent relationship to white racism and racial identity, rarely evincing an attitude of "resistance" typically associated with today's Asian American identity politics. Asian American literary critics have thus come to dismiss or ignore such texts, favoring instead the more racially
conscious, politically charged texts of the post-'65 period, such as works by Frank Chin, Maxine Hong Kingston, and Chang Rae-Lee.

This timely and useful collection of essays on early Asian American literature (defined as the period between 1880-1965) seeks to reevaluate this critical consensus by proposing new methods and readings to engage such seemingly problematic texts. By thickly contextualizing the idea of Asian American racial identity in the pre-'65 era—implicitly arguing for its historically contingent nature—the contributors strive to restore lost literary and political “authority” to early Asian American writers such as Yung Wing, Richard Kim, and Toyo Suyemoto.

The introduction lays out their specific goals and strategies: first, these essays aim to dismantle the “resistance/accommodation” binary that undergirds most Asian American literary criticism. This evaluative standard typically provides a poor fit for early Asian American texts in that such texts appear within an era in which openly “resistant” discourses were not particularly viable. Instead, these texts produce more ambiguous narratives of racial identity that tread the line between resistance and accommodation. Second, the contributors critique the “prescriptive” approach within Asian American literary criticism, whereby Asian American literary critics typically judge a literary text “good” or “bad” based on the intensity or content of a text’s political values or ideologies. Rather, this collection strives to assess these texts “on their own terms” to avoid a “presentist” bias prevalent in current Asian American scholarship. Finally, this volume aims to provide an “eccentric” rather than “concentric” account of Asian American literary production. “Eccentricity” in this case means letting their critical gaze wander to points off the conventional map of Asian American literary criticism: to engage mainstream canonical white authors such as Mark Twain; to examine non-English literary and historical sources; and to open up the geography of Asian American culture to include the Pacific Rim and East Asia.

This is a significant new manifesto for Asian American literary criticism, and in of itself, an analytical accomplishment. The essays that follow, which ostensibly serve to put these ideas into practice, cover a wide range of topics (sexuality, class, and nationalism) and authors (canonical and non-canonical), and generally favor a literary formalist approach. They range from reexaminations of long-studied figures, such as Viet Thanh Nguyen’s essay on Carlos Bulosan and John Okada, to recoveries of long-lost early Asian American authors, such as Keith Lawrence’s study of Richard Kim. However, while these essays often produce interesting and useful insights, they generally fail to fulfill the promise of this volume’s introduction, often in fact directly contradicting its various arguments and theses.

First, the essays, rather than openly laying siege on (what the introduction describes as) the “false” resistance/accommodation binary, instead either directly support it or merely rearticulate it in a slightly altered version. Authors such as H. T. Tsiang and Bulosan are constantly imagined as battling against various abstract forces of capitalism and imperialism, in which their marginal positions as workers become romanticized as contributing to a larger “revolution.” Thus, sentences such as “contemporary readers [of Toyo Suyemoto] can only wonder at the sure and steady courage of her resistance” (154), appear rather ubiquitously throughout this volume. Rather than knocking down the resistance/accommodation binary, these essays merely attempt to locate more muted examples of resistance to argue that, yes, our literary forbears too struggled against racial oppression and economic subjugation. This approach, besides only reinforcing the common assumptions of the Asian American field in general, blinds these contributors to textual moments that strain against this binary. For example, in her
reading of Tsiang, Julia Lee ignores his important relationship to mainstream white authors such as Waldo Frank and Theodore Dreiser. This relationship gestures to a more dynamic critical vocabulary than resistance or accommodation, such as racial collaboration, re-Orientalism, and cultural exchange.

Second, these essays provide an at best nominal vision of the promised-for “eccentric” view of Asian American literature. While possibilities abound for such an analysis (examined figures include bilingual, diasporic writers such as Yung Wing), the contributors deploy a monolingual, nation-based approach, rarely making use of international archives/scholarship or performing bilingual literary analyses. Thus, despite this collection’s contention that they are pursuing the literary and social transnational, one gets the feeling that these literary materials—often cross-national and bilingual in nature—exceed these essays’ analytical vocabulary. For example, the contributors cling to the reductive analytical categories of “Asian” and “Asian American” despite the editors’ own contention that the term “Asian American” simply did not exist in the pre-’65 period, and thus represents an anachronism within this kind of scholarship. A greater attention to non-English sources and international scholarship would reveal—taking the Chinese diaspora as an example—that terms such as Huagong or Huaqiao represent more accurate terms than “Asian” or “Asian American” to describe the states of subjectivity found in texts by Yung Wing and Yan Phou Lee.

Despite such criticisms, this collection represents a useful contribution to existing Asian American literary scholarship. The literary archive this collection furnishes is an important one, recovering many Asian American authors, such as Sugimoto and Richard Kim, who have become otherwise lost to scholarly view. Further, the contributors’ commitment to privileging literary formal analysis over “political” readings of literature is very welcome in a field that for too long has advanced the political over the aesthetic, often creating an activist-based scholarship rather than an intellectual-based one. Finally, the Asian American literary field would do well to pay attention to the arguments posited in this collection’s introduction if it hopes to move beyond its current cultural nationalism vs. transnationalism/Area Studies impasse, even if the collection’s essays themselves often fail to heed such advice.

Columbia University

Richard Jean So


The Corporate Eye and American Exposures analyze how community is manifested in images. Elspeth Brown traces the use of photographs as tools to manage, regulate, and discipline workers during the Progressive era’s intense industrialization and shows how advertising both fed and responded to the burgeoning consumer culture of the twentieth century’s first decades. Louis Kaplan juxtaposes vibrant communities manifested in disjunctions and failed connections to the oppressive sameness of what he calls “the fusional community.” Both books ambitiously engage large interpretive frameworks: industrial psychology, the history of technology, and instrumental use of photographs (Brown) and post-structuralist theories, represented by the philosophy of Jean-Luc Nancy (Kaplan).
Brown’s study of the corporate eye unfolds comfortably, innovatively treating familiar figures, such as Frederick Taylor and Lewis Hine, and introducing less well-known but influential educators and consultants, Frank and Lillian Gilbreth, for example. Her analysis of the advertising images of Lejaren à Hiller elevates this Wisconsin-born photographer to the same level as his more famous contemporary, Edward Steichen. Brown traces how corporations used information gleaned from photographs to hire a tractable work force from a heterogeneous labor pool and situates her study among the cultural histories of the period. The Corporate Eye guides us through a series of theoretical challenges with a deft hand, presents us with the fine-grained detail of the best historical work, and generously supplies an extended note—enticingly excerptible for student use—on reading photographs. This is first rate scholarship.

American Exposures offers a complex, sometimes intriguing look at the silences, absences, and disconnections that map the limits and essential “singularities” of community. Kaplan handles an impressive array of contemporary photographers, situated by race, ethnicity, or nationality on the margins of the so-called mainstream. How one pictures diasporic communities and represents the “slashes” and not the hyphens of hybridity are weighty subjects worthy of the attention he gives them (and more). However, the prose and the structure of American Exposures detract from this ambitious work’s effectiveness. Throughout the book, Kaplan writes himself into textual cul-de-sacs from which the often-repeated phrase “in other words” frequently offers escape to a declarative sentence that deserves underlining. Complicating matters is his reliance on the elliptical utterances of the French philosopher Nancy. Kaplan’s forays into fusional versions of community are turgid fare. Only with his exploration of Nan Goldin’s work does the author hit his stride. For those up to the task, the text rewards with astute insights into the works of photographers a la mode, most notably Goldin, Frederic Brenner, and Nikki Lee.

The authors’ invocations of the seminal theorist Roland Barthes offer a guide to the significant differences between the approaches of these two works. While acknowledging the indeterminacy of photographs, Brown begins with Barthes’ insistence that photographic signification is a historical process. Her task is to map lines of power connecting images to a particular mode of production and ultimately to the ideology of capitalism. The specific histories of institutions and the conditions of work are important to her mission. Kaplan takes from Barthes an abstract photographic vocabulary that reinforces the philosophy of Jean-Luc Nancy, as manifested in The Inoperative Community. His argument is philosophical and aesthetic, so the heft of what Barthes would have called the determining weight of history is not meticulously measured. Moments of insight and precision are accompanied by lengthy fights with other critics, frequently over photographs that are not pictured in American Exposures.

Neither book gives its photographs the full presence that elements central to the authors’ arguments—texts rather than illustrations—deserve. The occasionally postage-stamp reproductions of pictorialist images diminish the overall effect of Brown’s otherwise handsome volume. American Exposures reveals more vexing issues. After having gone through the extra expense of producing a signature of color plates, reproductions are puzzlingly poor; here Nikki Lee’s images do not carry the same impact as the color-saturated photos included in her Projects. It is more important to correct Kaplan’s version of Lee’s tourist-like photo at the base of the Statue of Liberty so that the vibrant red of her outfit (not brown) contrasts with the medium (not olive) green of the lawn behind her and the oxidized patina of the Statue overhead than to point out that this snapshot was not taken on Ellis Island, as Kaplan assumes, but on Liberty (nee
Robert Bedloes Island. More alarming is the handling of Dorothea Lange’s 1937 photograph of an Indiana woman in a California migrant labor camp. The checkerboarded image may be a mishandled scan, a suspicion reinforced by the subtle softening of the deep shadow that virtually obscures half the woman’s face in the Library of Congress print. The unacknowledged, perhaps unconscious manipulation of photographs that contribute to a discussion of manipulability may be the final irony of a book that too often doubles back on itself.

University of Wyoming


Laura Lawson’s *City Bountiful* fills an important topical gap in American urban studies. The author offers a work of scholarship and depth which makes use of an impressive assortment of historical gardening documentation drawn from a wide range of national and local sources. This material can be obscure and is sometimes quantitatively inaccurate and partial, but nevertheless it is carefully employed to tell this interesting historical story. An additional, even major, strength is Lawson’s experience and insight as a practicing community gardener. *City Bountiful* is ultimately a penetrating survey of the development of urban gardens from their late nineteenth century beginnings until the near present.

The book is logically structured into three sections each exploring particular urban gardening periods: Part I examines *Early Garden Programs*, 1890s to 1917, Part II explores the *National Urban Garden Campaigns*, 1917 to 1945, and Part III follows the growth of the *Gardening for Community movement* from 1945 to the present. Definitions are indeed important in any complex endeavour, and Laura Lawson helps this understanding when she states that the urban garden program: “encapsulates various cooperative enterprises that provide space and resources for urban dwellers to cultivate vegetables and flowers” (3). The motivations, justifications, and backdrops behind these projects can and do evolve as new issues arise. Further over the past century political, economic, and social perspectives change as do cities, and such outside and persistent pressures can affect the measurement of gardening success.

The urban gardening movement did offer several redeeming benefits to urban dwellers in each passing generation. Various social values were promoted such as self-help, independence, healthy eating as well as cooperation, education, and job training. The garden was seen by some to be as important as playgrounds and schools to the urban community. There was also the idea of the garden as an aesthetic oasis for urban communities whose landscape might correct the bleakness of urban crowding, squalor, and poverty. Vacant lots could indeed flower and communities could see the transformation. The projects often relied on volunteer labor and many depended upon donated land and the largesse of others. Such circumstances as these could and did change. These transitory aspects also made continuity and consistency in the urban gardening movement difficult. The changing ethnic make up of evolving communities created still another dynamic.

As this book attests urban gardens since the 1890s followed several developmental patterns and in: “Each phase of urban garden promotion—vacant lot cultivation associations, school gardens, civic beautification gardens, war gardens, relief gardens, victory gardens and community gardens—has been shaped by its own social, political, economic and environmental context” (287). In its more recent form, the community
The most important contribution of this multi-textured book is that it brings together the histories of U.S. foreign policy and of U.S. social reform movements during the Progressive Era in the same analytic frame. Although some U.S. diplomatic historians have recently taken a much-touted “cultural turn,” they have remained focused primarily on the cultural values of policymaking elites. Social historians, for their part, have explored the international activities and cultural internationalism of U.S. reform movements, but they have not systematically examined their role in shaping U.S. foreign policy. Dawley breaks new ground in demonstrating that elites and popular movements were engaged in a continuous “dance of democracy” with one another during the Progressive Era and moved in the “syncopated rhythm” of a Scott Joplin rag in responding to each other’s international initiatives (202, 213). In detailing the ways in which reform movements and elites interacted, Dawley illuminates both the successes and failures of Progressivism as a unifying political culture and points the way toward a more sophisticated use of cultural studies in transforming the study of international relations.

Progressives, suggests Dawley, “braided together republican, socialist, and liberal strands to create something new” (5). Although sympathetic to liberal ideas such as civil liberties and limited government, Progressives rejected the liberal emphasis on laissez-faire and advocated some state intervention on behalf of economic stability and social justice. Progressives also shared a belief in the desirability of projecting the American reform agenda onto the world stage. Yet a fundamental cleavage emerged among early Progressives about the best means to promote international reform. One group, represented by Theodore Roosevelt, sought to promote reform abroad by projecting American hegemony and by bringing “weaker peoples under its firm but benevolent rule” (26). Another, represented by Jane Addams, promoted reform through the path of multilateral cooperation.

Woodrow Wilson united these factions on some issues, but disputes soon arose. For example, some Progressives rallied around Wilson’s military interventions in Mexico in 1914 and 1916, but other groups vehemently opposed these campaigns and successfully limited their scale. Although antimilitarist Progressives failed to prevent U.S. involvement in World War I, they helped shape Wilson’s war goals by “linking ideas of a just society to a just peace” (213). Perhaps most compelling is Dawley’s discussion of the two meetings in Paris in 1919: that of the official diplomats and that of the “unofficial gathering of people’s representatives.” Although most of the people’s representatives were not invited into the officials meetings, “[e]very major decision at Versailles was made with one eye” toward damping the revolutionary fires that had been lit by transnational movements of workers, women, and anticolonial activists (252).

In an important comparative section, Dawley demonstrates that when the “dance of democracy” spun increasingly out of control in Britain in 1919, policymakers threatened state repression but successfully mediated many important class conflicts. By con-
trast, Progressive leaders in the United States proved unable or unwilling to bridge the far greater cultural divide between America’s polyglot working-class populations and its WASP elites. Reaction, Red Scare, and Progressive rebirth ensued.

Like most good books, Changing the World raises as many new questions as it answers. But it charts an important new path for scholars and activists seeking to better understand the complex linkages between culture, popular movements, and U.S. diplomacy.

University of Maine, Orono

Elizabeth McKillen


Andrew R. Heinze’s Jews and the American Soul: Human Nature in the 20th Century is a sweeping, ambitious study of Jewish contributions to Americans’ self-understanding. Heinze mines academic texts, autobiographies, novels, newspapers, television shows, music, and advice columns—in short, any cultural product that emerged from what he identifies as a shared set of “Jewish values.” Imported from Europe and then grown on American soil, those values prove central to mainstream U.S. conversations about individuals’ souls. Heinze introduces his narrative with a discussion of these complex, often unstable concepts on which his study relies: Jewish, American, and soul. The strengths and weaknesses of this book lie in how Heinze defines and identifies these concepts, alone or interfacing, across time.

Heinze reaches back to the historical crosscurrents that were foundational to the emergence of modern Jewish ideas. Beginning in the sixteenth century, individuals of all Western religions struggled to understand the workings of the human mind, and searched for guidance on their inner lives outside of theology. By the nineteenth century, the available answers remained tied based on Christianity and linked to anti-Semitism. Jews across Europe necessarily responded with their own inquiries into the nature of morality. These movements’ leaders portrayed their religious and then secular ideas as “universal” solutions to a modern society’s “moral reconstruction” (65). They slowly integrated themselves into these conversations, their thoughts legitimating their rights as intellectuals and citizens.

This context set the stage for Freud, whose ideas were then widely distributed in the United States just as Americans began seeking new ways to understand themselves, and just as Jews began to play pivotal roles in all facets of the culture. In light of the rise of corporate capitalism, massive immigration (of which these educated Jewish men were a part), and urbanization, Heinze argues that psychology was poised to overtake religion in the business of healing souls. Jewish contributors to psychology asserted the key roles of culture and history (and not “race” or genetics) to a particular group’s character. Heinze sees another interesting parallel here: psychology served Americans in their quest to know themselves; Jews used the field to protest against anti-Semitic views and “Christian domination of American culture” (130). These assertions preceded the post-Holocaust Jewish organizational work against racism and the American Liberation movements; yet they are just as crucial to the liberal portrait of the United States as a welcoming and open nation. Heinze’s look at the multiple layers of psychological discourses is in line with some of the most interesting contemporary work in Jewish studies.

Heinze employs biography to demonstrate the impact of Jewish origins on the “attitudes and values” of Jewish thinkers about the American soul (104). This is a for-
midable task, and his success is mixed as he travels across the centuries. He writes convincingly, for example, that Freud and Alfred Adler “could not avoid layering their theories with values that were either Jewish in origin or reflections of the tense Christian-Jewish dialectic within German culture” (64). But what of Western Jews in the mid- to late twentieth century, when there is no shorthand for The Jewish Experience?

Some of the individuals woven into his narrative fit neatly into his argument. Rabbi Joshua Liebman, to cite one, wrote Peace of Mind in 1964. It combined psychology with Jewish theology to reinvigorate the spirituality of Judaism and to counter claims that only Christianity could meet individual spiritual needs. Heinze rescues this book from near-obscurity, and his evidence of the text as “emphatically Jewish” is clear and compelling (239).

But the fit is less clear with others. For some, Heinze proposes, psychology was both a “vocation and a cosmology” when they lost interest in Judaism (209). The contributions of others reflect a Jewishness that is a product of persecution or more subtle feelings of outsider status. American humanists such as Bellow, Roth, and Ginsburg, he notes, expressed their Jewish values by way of “voluble introspection” and resistance to conformity (264). Heinze acknowledges that the category of Jewish is unstable, and yet his biographical portraits boil down complexity. Are they acting as Jews, as Americans, as humanists?

Including Ayn Rand, Joyce Brothers, and Betty Friedan in one (separate) chapter on Jewish women—a chapter sandwiched, oddly, between one on American Humanism and one on the Holocaust and Hasidism—highlights this problem. How might such disparate careers, politics, and worldviews testify to a shared experience? When these postwar Jewish women gain visibility as “public moralists” (as Heinze titles them), are they foregrounding their gender or their ethnic background? Other biographies he cites beg similar questions about masculinity and the meaning of Jewishness and Americanisms.

In his chronicle of Jews who have aided Americans in their search for meaning, Heinze has provided us with fascinating insights into the cultural work of many of these conversations. For American Studies and Jewish Studies scholars, the task is now to build on these insights, while being careful not to lose sight of the unstable categories of Americans’ identities.

Babson College
Marjorie N. Feld


In 1993, a group of scholars of African-American history, American-Jewish history, urban history, political science, labor studies, and sociology met at Washington University to discuss the much-storied relationship between Jews and African Americans in the United States. African Americans and Jews in the Twentieth Century emerged as a tangible product of that gathering. As a collection of revised conference papers, the volume is as rich as it is uneven. The essays range from assessments of Jewish and African-American political attitudes to surveys of urban historiography to analyses of blackface.

The authors all struggle with how to represent a relationship between two groups of people when the very terms of each group’s identity are slippery: what makes a Jew
a Jew or an African American, and how do the criteria for membership in either of those categories shift over time? In my mind, the most provocative essays were the ones that highlighted the fissures that existed within Jewish or African-American communities and, in a sense, destabilized the very question of determining a relationship between Jews and African Americans. For example, Cheryl Greenberg, a historian at Trinity College, examines Jewish responses to the civil rights movement by making the simple observation that southern and northern Jews had very different attitudes toward civil rights activism. This insight enables her to generate a nuanced discussion about why certain Jews supported the civil rights agenda while others did not and how the movement planted new seeds of tension among Jews. Her recent book *Troubling the Waters: Black-Jewish Relations in the American Century* (Princeton University Press, 2006) extends her discussion and proves that she is able to balance the necessity of talking about Jews and blacks as coherent groups with the reality of their internal diversity and tensions. Nancy Haggard-Gilson’s contribution to the volume also implicitly acknowledges the fragmentation within Jewish and black group identity. A political scientist, Haggard-Gilson draws attention to the radically different forms that Jewish and black conservatism (or neo-conservatism) took in the late twentieth century. By focusing on conservatives, she upends easy assumptions about Jewish or black politics. The relationship between Jewish and African-American conservatives is, of course, not indicative of the relationship between all Jews and all blacks, but that is not her point. Rather, like Greenberg, she highlights specific sets of relationships that indicate something of a larger relationship but also challenge single generalizations about that relationship.

The collection also draws useful attention to the role of geography and physical place in shaping the interactions between Jews and non-Jews. Historian Joe Trotter, for example, offers a fascinating historiographical essay about Jews and blacks in urban America. He chronicles the rise of scholarship that attempted to think about cities as spaces of ethnic and racial interaction (and not just inevitable assimilation). By the 1960s and 1970s, Trotter argues, many social scientists and historians were asking why Jews succeeded in cities, often leaving them for suburbs, and why blacks were unable to leave the cities. He does not offer any real conclusions, but suggests that scholars direct more attention to cultural and literary sources about shared black and Jewish urban space. A number of essays that detail Jewish and black labor activism also highlight the importance of physical proximity in creating the contours of the relationship between Jews and African Americans.

Like most collections of conference papers, the essays often feel uneven—some much longer than others and some reprints or condensations of already published material. The editors may have been able to do more to create a framework for these essays that could have, in and of itself, advanced a novel argument about Jewish-black relations. In my mind, more than proving or disproving the existence of a Jewish-black alliance, scholars should turn attention to thinking about why the relationship has been simultaneously so romanticized and so vexed. To what extent, I wonder, have historians’ political proclivities shaped the characterization of the relationship between Jews and blacks? This volume, in the end, may serve more as a primary source for that question than a secondary source about Jewish and black relationships.

Pennsylvania State University, University Park          Lila Corwin Berman

*Eugenic Nation* chronicles the development and evolution of eugenics in California across the twentieth century. It continues recent challenges to the East Coast focus of earlier scholarship as well as to the traditional chronology of eugenics, which holds that the movement began to decline in the 1930s. Studying California, Stern argues, “necessitates a re-periodization of the history of American eugenics” that recognizes the continuity of eugenic policies and practices in the decades following the Depression (114). This claim is not new, but it is well supported. Stern meticulously demonstrates the extent to which California eugenics was simultaneously distinct from eugenics in other states and also a major force in the national movement.

Stern creatively and effectively links eugenics to tropical medicine, environmentalism, Mexican immigration, and border security. Beginning her study at the Panama-Pacific International Exhibition in San Francisco where “the nucleus of California’s eugenic movement converged” in 1915, Stern shows how this specific event “fostered the cross-fertilization of tropical medicine and race betterment at a crucial moment of transition in modern medicine in American society” (55). She also demonstrates how “eugenicists naturalized notions of racial difference” through their writings about plants and vegetation, as well as through their environmental preservation efforts, which, in the example of name-placing, allowed one Sacramento eugenicist to “literally write history onto nature” (134, 143).

In perhaps the most striking chapter of *Eugenic Nation*, Stern exposes connections between eugenics and Mexican immigration that led to the creation of quarantines, fumigation stations, and delousing efforts at the Mexican-U.S. border between 1910 and 1940. She reveals how the United States Public Health Service and the Border Patrol inscribed ideas about degeneracy, imbecility, and disease onto the bodies of Mexicans crossing the border by subjecting them to routine invasive examinations. Operating together, the trends of “medicalization and militarization,” she writes, “worked to create a regime of eugenic gatekeeping on the U.S.-Mexican border that aimed to ensure the putative power of the “American” family-nation while generating lasting stereotypes of Mexicans as filthy, lousy, and prone to irresponsible breeding” (58-59). Comparing the border policies used to regulate the Mexican-U.S. border with those devised to regulate the Canadian-U.S. border, Stern makes clear the racial nature of the policies governing the former. She continues her discussion of eugenicists’ association of Mexicans and pathology in a section on IQ testing, which led to educational inequalities and segregation. California eugenicists were an ardent bunch, as other scholars have already documented. Stern’s contribution is to demonstrate the extent to which “Mexicans and Mexican Americans bore the brunt of eugenic racism” in the Golden State (113). The significance of this contribution should not be understated.

*Eugenic Nation* deepens our understanding of eugenics in California and California eugenicists’ role in shaping eugenic practices and policies across the nation. It exposes the multiple ways in which eugenicists in California used ideas about disease and pathology to relegate Mexicans and Mexican Americans to second-class status and the institutional and social legacies that their efforts left. It also illuminates connections between California eugenics, environmentalism, tropical medicine, and border security, and in doing so, broadens historians’ knowledge about the breadth and influence of California eugenics.

California State University, Sacramento
Rebecca M. Kluchin

For those unfamiliar with the history of the Provincetown Players, Brenda Murphy’s book is an excellent introduction, which builds on the best of the scholarly work that has preceded her. It places this seminal “little theatre” group within a solid historical context that is enlightening in its treatment of both the light-hearted and serious debates among the players about modernism and modernity (representation versus experimen­tation with form and language; Victorian versus modern values); it examines the social and cultural politics of the most important and influential writers and dramatists in the group and the major philosophical influences on their writing; it takes seriously the staging and design of the plays’ production in relation to the texts; and it does an admirable job of discussing both the signature, as well as some of the lesser known but culturally resonant, plays produced by this extraordinary group of men and women, between 1915 and 1922.

For those scholars who are familiar with the cultural milieu, history, and productions of the Provincetown Players, Murphy’s book offers new insights into the dynamics of the group that demythologize some of the utopian self-promotion about the “beloved community” which still clings to its story, along with fresh readings of the more experimental plays, many of which have not received their due. Of particular interest are her forays into the contestation between the (Jig) Cook- (Susan) Glaspell-(Edna) Kenton group to “consolidate power” in their own hands and keep it out of what Murphy calls “the more radical group favoring collective organization” (13), that included John Reed, Floyd Dell, Hutchins Hapgood, and Louise Bryant.

In terms of the lesser known plays and players, Ch. 3, on the “Others and the Other Players,” is the heart of what’s most original in the book. Murphy’s in-depth discussions of the design, staging, and plays of the following artists and writers, and their relation to both the broader avant-garde and the politics of their cultural moment, are fascinating: William and Marguerite Zorach, who get the attention they deserve; Alfred Kreymborg’s Lima Beans, Jack’s House: A Cubic Play, and Manikin and Minikin; Maxwell Bodenheim’s Knotholes; Edna Vincent Millay’s Two Slatterns and a King and Aria Da Capo; Mary Carolyn Davies’ The Slave with Two Faces: An Allegory; and Wallace Stevens’s Three Travelers Watch a Sunrise.

Murphy devotes Ch. 4 to the two most important dramatists produced by the Players, Susan Glaspell and Eugene O’Neill. While the plays she discusses have received substantial analysis by other scholars (whom she acknowledges), it is interesting to see the two writers given equal time, and placed in juxtaposition in terms of both the similarities and differences in their themes and staging. Murphy’s claim that their plays were influenced and enhanced by their collaboration with (and witnessing the work of) the other players, particularly those on the experimental edge, is a point all the more convincingly made, coming as it does after lengthy discussions of the productions and infrastructure of the group.

University of Massachusetts, Boston

Lois Rudnick


Following in the wake of three previous volumes edited by the authors which explore the reception of Hollywood films in the United States, Hollywood Abroad:
Audiences and Cultural Exchange is the first book to examine the reception of these movies by non-American audiences. Contributions to the volume focus on the reception of Hollywood movies from the early 20th century to the present day in a range of countries from contemporary Belgium, early 20th century France and England, Colonial India and Central Africa, mid-20th century Australia, and Japan during its period of U.S. occupation in the late 1940s.

Rather than analyzing films as texts, the contributors focus on the ways in which audiences constructed their own cultural identities through engagement with cinema and describe the “activities of local agents (in) accommodating and adapting Hollywood movies to the cultural topography of their local environment” (7). Using a variety of critical and methodological perspectives the authors analyze the place of Hollywood within national, local, and regional “cultures of exhibition, reception and consumption” while questioning the relationship between international strategies of distribution and issues of Americanization. The essays ask a series of overlapping questions about Hollywood’s relationship with foreign consumers. While some are primarily concerned with the institutional context of reception, examining the aims of those groups exercising control over the distribution and exhibition of films, others focus more directly on the local cultural interpretations of audiences themselves and the meanings of cinema-going as a social experience in local and national contexts.

As a whole these studies of the reception of Hollywood films in historically specific local and national contexts represent a strong challenge to the concept of “cultural globalization as Americanization” and the idea that foreign (and particularly “Third World”) audiences lack the sophistication to resist popular American media images or to engage with them critically. Rather, as a particularly fascinating study of the reception of heavily censored cowboy “B-movies” in Central Africa, concludes, not only are “the meanings of films and other pieces of mass media . . . elusive and contested, but that audiences continually appropriate and re-appropriate such media and subject them to various and fluid readings” (148).

This is an interesting and important book, not only for students of film but also for American studies scholars looking for practical examples of ways in which to contextualize their discipline from the perspective of the “critical internationalism” that the more forward-looking exponents of the discipline have been encouraging for more than a decade. It demonstrates that the story of the reception of American films overseas has been less one of domination than of complex adoption into various cultures. Hollywood Abroad provides sophisticated analyses of the ways in which the “Americanization of the world” has actually involved “the circulation across national boundaries of a multinational popular culture which recognises no frontiers” in which “America” is “less of a geographical territory than an imaginative one, which deliberately made itself available for assimilation in a variety of cultural contexts” (4).

Richmond, The American International University in London

Alex Seago


In 1917, when the U.S. government entered World War I, the authorities moved aggressively to stifle dissent. Anyone who failed to speak in support of the war effort against Germany risked being suspected of disloyalty, and dissidents could suffer swift punishment.
Repression during World War I has been documented in various ways, including court records. For example, a case in Minnesota reveals what happened when representatives of the Red Cross approached an elderly man in 1917 in a village. As he was sitting in front of a store, they asked him to aid U.S. troops by supporting the Red Cross. He declined, saying, "You are working for the wrong side. . . ." He was convicted under a criminal statute that forbade advocating "by oral speech that the citizens of this state should not aid or assist the United States in prosecuting or carrying on war with the public enemies of the United States" (State v. Hartung, 141 Minn. 207, 208-209 [1918]).

In "Darkest Before Dawn: Sedition and Free Speech in the American West," Clemens P. Work adds dramatically to the story of the broad, menacing sweep of repression during World War I. He takes into account violent attacks against dissidents, such as the lynching of a German baker, and harsh censorship, including an absolute ban on German-language sermons in churches of German immigrants.

At the core of Work's narrative are the Montana state legislature and its enactment of a sedition law in 1918. He shows how the law emerged amid fear and loathing of the radical labor movement led by the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW). The law criminalized speech that was "disloyal, profane, violent, scurrilous, contemptuous, slurring, or abusive" toward government (260). Congress also soon enacted a sedition law, with Montana's serving as a model.

Work suggests that sedition laws were bitter fruit of a clash between Americans' idealistic view of themselves at the turn of the century and radicalism as fostered by the IWW. Principal ingredients of American identity included individualism, respect for property ownership, and a belief in hard work as a means to gain independence. Yet, a reality was that many men were roaming the country, looking desperately for work and earning little pay when they found it. For them, the reality was severe exploitation at the hands of business and industry, including powerful mining and timber companies in the West.

The IWW, founded in 1905, aimed to organize, mobilize, and radicalize disgruntled workers. IWW leaders indicated that they planned to conduct industry-paralyzing strikes, commit sabotage if necessary, seize the industrial means of production, take the profits, and ultimately establish a worker-centric democracy.

To get its message out, the IWW took to the streets, fielding fiery, confrontational sidewalk orators to attract publicity and gain recruits. However, the IWW's tactics alienated the public, annoyed police, provoked powerful enemies in politics and industry, and drew harsh criticism from the press, which generally was aligned with big business. Thus, when the United States began waging war against Germany, the IWW widely was regarded as a threat to industries that were vital to the war effort. Meanwhile, the U.S. government engaged in a propaganda effort that fueled fury toward both the IWW and Germans as a way of motivating the public to buy war bonds.

"Darkest Before Dawn" illuminates the conditions under which repressive forces arise and flourish. It makes clear how the fate of freedom depends on the civic courage of leaders who believe in the rule of law and on vigorous, independent media that are devoted to the cause of free speech. The book helpfully traces U.S. Supreme Court decisions that moved the nation from repression to expanded First Amendment freedoms. Moreover, it provides a basis for comparing propaganda and censorship in World War I to contemporary government's efforts to influence public opinion against terror-
ism. As Work observes, looking into the “dark mirror” of the past enables us to “see ourselves as we once were, and as we might become” (5).

School of Law, University of Kansas

Mike Kautsch


Alison Isenberg’s history of downtown America holds two remarkable features. First, she masterfully employs disparate materials to narrative the production and re-production of land values in large and small downtowns. Second, her innovative story of real estate history provides new insight into a national discourse shaping downtown in the twentieth century. So, it should be no surprise that this book won the Lewis Mumford Prize for Best Book in American Planning History (2005). Downtown America eschews the declensionist narrative of urban failure: “Most models of urban transformation are driven by the theme of decline. Such theories constrain our understanding of the urban past and similarly limit current and future policy choices in ways that contribute further to disinvestment” (2). Instead, Isenberg mixes city plans, urban postcards, women’s civic groups, the early urban planning profession, consumer trade groups, and real estate investment newsletters to articulate a persistently produced and reproduced landscape shaped by gender, class, and race.

Beginning with the ways gender shaped a civic ideal of downtown, Isenberg connects the City Beautiful Movement, women’s civic organizations, and the first urban planners. Indeed cartoons of civic improvements reveal lacy bows on street lights and flowers popping out of chimneys, indicating fears of a feminized public space. Suggesting that the downtown ideal was short lived Isenberg shows how various commercial enterprises, including Sears, sought to relocate away from downtown during the 1920s. Chapter two explores how businesses and business associations purchased carefully touched up Main Street postcards that magically eradicated visual blight at a brush stroke. Carefully comparing various photographs of downtowns with their touched up counterparts reveals a powerful ideal across the nation of an idealized urban space. Chapter three uncovers commercial investors’ attitudes toward consumers. Investors idealized white middle class women, which subsequently led to the theory of the “100% district,” the most desirable geography in a downtown. Shifting to the Depression Era, chapter four explores the rise in modernization and demolition to cope with declining rents and competition with suburban shopping centers. Chapter five explores “renewal.” Seen as the saving grace of Main Street, renewal worked to “sanitize” and streamline downtowns to meet the perceived needs of the lucrative but increasingly illusive white suburban woman shopper. In chasing after that ideal shopper, developers neglected two important consumer groups, working women already located downtown, and African Americans who lived in communities close to downtown. Chapter six looks at how downtown commercial districts became a central location for the fight for desegregation and civil rights throughout urban America, which, helped propel an already familiar narrative of decline. Chapter seven explores the use of nostalgia to revitalize downtown from St. Louis’s beatnik Gaslight Square to Boston’s Faneuil Hall. Though the last section on contemporary downtowns gives short shrift to the New Urbanism, which ironically often works to recreate a mythical small downtown in suburban places, this book provides a complex and compelling history of how race, class, gender, and a cyclical economy shapes our historical and contemporary urban spaces.

In Staging Tradition, Michael Ann Williams offers a meticulously researched parallel biography of Sarah Gertrude Knott and John Lair, two important but overlooked figures in the movement to popularize American folk music. In showing how Knott and Lair, sometimes in direct collaboration, negotiated competing cultural discourses about the “folk” throughout their careers, Williams calls for a revision of prevailing notions about the relationship between “preservationists” and “commercializers,” particularly as it was understood by those involved.

John Lair was one of the key innovators of the radio barn dance formula, first on shows like the WLS National Barn Dance, and then on his own Renfro Valley Barn Dance. While he worked within an avowedly commercial context and was instrumental in developing country music’s synthetic hillbilly image, Lair strove to minimize what he considered the dilution of traditional music with Tin Pan Alley copies, positioning himself as both folklorist and radio personality. Conversely, although Knott, founder the National Folk Festival, clearly thought of herself primarily as a preservationist, she eagerly collaborated with commercial figures like Lair to locate festival talent and incorporated professional musicians without hesitation. In contrast with previous accounts, Williams argues that preservationists like Knott did not generally view commercialism or theatricality as inherent threats to the continuation of folk traditions. In part because of such inclusive definitions of the folk, Knott’s festival became the first to transcend regional, racial, and ethnic boundaries.

Williams adopts the same pragmatic view that she argues her subjects possessed regarding the relationship between commercialization and preservation. She demonstrates that both Knott’s and Lair’s greatest hurdles lay in soliciting funds to support their efforts, whether through commercial, philanthropic, or academic sponsorship. For Knott, finding resources in the days before major government funding of the arts proved the source of many more disappointments than the content of the festival itself. Paradoxically, Lair, though commercially based, seems to have had a more difficult time keeping his work afloat. Here again Williams counters prevailing interpretation, which has cast Lair as a controlling manipulator who unfairly profited from the work of his artists. In emphasizing this parallel between Knott’s and Lair’s careers, Williams underlines the similarities between the economics of preservation and those of commercial entertainment.

Williams is certainly sensitive to the complex interplay between commerce and preservation, but she ultimately suggests that these preservationists were displaced by newly commercialized versions of their own work. For years, Knott limned the border between public and academic folklore, seeking the approval of scholars while presenting a theatrical version of American folklore. As the urban folk revival emerged, bringing with it a far more popularized incarnation of the folk festival, she found herself, along with what one colleague called “collectors and preservers” within the academy, relegated to the status of a quaint antiquarian (147). Lair was similarly displaced by changes in style and structure. When the recording industry in Nashville displaced live broadcasting as the mainstay of the country music economy, bringing with it new, more pop-influenced sounds, Lair’s radio-based preservation became anachronistic.

While the implications of Williams’s work are wide-ranging, she too rarely states them explicitly. Her narrative approach allows her to develop the rich personalities and
the cultural significance of her subjects simultaneously, but it often becomes mired in
details that detract from the central thrust of her argument. Nonetheless, she calls for an
important revision of our understandings of competing definitions and enactments of
folk music during the twentieth century.

Diane Pecknold


This edited collection stemmed from a symposium and exhibit held in 1996 at the
Smithsonian National Museum of American History under the auspices of the Lemelson
Center for Invention and Innovation. The Smithsonian and Lemelson Center (whose
series this book is in) are to be congratulated for having the imagination to tackle this
topic. The exhibit they organized was a huge success. I remember the crush of people
gathered round to catch a glimpse of Prince’s gorgeous “Yellow Cloud” custom made
electric guitar. The follow-up book is a beautiful production and well worth the wait.

Writing about the electric guitar is a labor of love. Many of the scholars of the
guitar who write here, such as Andre Millard, James Kraft, John Strohm, and Susan
Schmidt Horning are musicians (the only major figure missing from the book is Steve
Waksman). Andre Millard, pictured on the cover strumming away, contributes four
essays to the volume. The book tackles a range of topics including the history and
invention of the electric guitar, its manufacture, its sound, important genres such as
“heavy metal,” its gendering, and a short history of woman guitar players. Although
there is a chapter on male guitar heroes the book came out before the take off of the
popular “Guitar Hero” video game. Interestingly the video game (at which my nine-
year-old daughter regularly beats me) has lots of options for women characters.

The big mystery of musical instrument innovation—is why it happens so infre­
quently. Before the electric guitar one has to go back to the invention of the saxophone
by Adolphe Saxe in 1846 to find an instrument of similar impact. And the saxophone
which had originally been designed as an orchestral instrument only really took off in
the jazz boom of 1930s. The key to understanding the iconic status which the electric
guitar has reached is also to look at its impact in different genres of music. It trans­
formed blues, jazz, and rock ‘n’ roll and each of these genres became synonymous with
American culture. As Charles McGovern argues in his essay, the electric guitar symbol­
ized a unique form of American individualism and freedom. The history of its invention
from the famous Rickenbacker Frying Pan guitar of 1931, through the massive contri­
butions of Leo Fender, Les Paul, and later with musicians such as Jimmy Hendrix
taking the instrument to new levels with his use of feedback, is an American story.

Susan Schmidt Horning’s chapter on the sound of the electric guitar and how dif­
ferent sorts of sounds have defined different eras is one of the most interesting. It is
crucial, as she does, to set the guitar in the context of the wider technological transfor­
mation of the recording studio and also amplification. As is well known, Eric Clapton is
not only a great guitarist but his discovery that playing the guitar through an overdriven
Marshall amplifier was what made his “sound” famous. The chapters on women guitar­
ists are useful in reminding us that there are many of them and they hate to be regarded
as female electric guitarists, rather guitarists who happen to be women.

This book with its many photographs and lucid style is perfect for the general
reader and for undergraduate teaching.

Trevor Pinch
This book analyzes the impact of New Deal public works programs, with particular emphasis on the Public Works Administration, the Works Progress Administration, and the Federal Works Agency. Unusually, but commendably, Smith takes a longer term view than most scholars and tries to show that these New Deal agencies were instrumental in laying the foundations for the vigorous post war economic expansion which lasted until 1973. There can be no doubt that this is an area that deserves searching investigation. New Dealers were united with conservatives in their fear of the supposed debilitating effects of the dole on the unemployed. As a result, during the 1930s the United States was more committed to work relief than any other industrialized nation. Moreover, the United States devoted a greater share of its GNP to social spending than any other state during the depression decade. The range of Jason Scott Smith’s research is impressive. His location and use of both primary and secondary material is admirable. His style is lucid and the material in the volume is well organized. However, the inclusion of some graphs and tables showing, for example, annual fluctuations in funding and indicating the contributions of the states to public works expenditure would have been appreciated by most readers.

Smith does not take issue with modern conservative critics who claim that New Deal expenditure was not only entirely politically motivated, it also exercised a retarding influence on economic recovery. Nor does he engage in the debate whether or not those working on relief projects should be considered employed rather than unemployed. He is harshly critical of the New Deal for failing to resolve the social distress of mass unemployment and in particular of neglecting the needs of both African Americans and women. Even with funding which was extraordinarily generous by historic standards, only forty per cent of those eligible could be employed on projects. To provide places on projects for all those eligible would have required unacceptable increases in funding; to give positions to all the unemployed, not just those in need, even more. A key problem with public works was the failure to provide systematic training to enable the jobless to acquire new skills at a time of considerable structural unemployment.

According to Smith, above all the New Dealers were builders and he is at his best analysing the role of construction in transforming the U.S. economy, its political system, and the country’s landscape. His general claim that the New Deal public works produced a revolution in state sponsored economic development is not likely to be disputed, though his assertion that it also saved capitalism would be. It is much more difficult to show just how much of the post-war economic growth, or the burgeoning military industrial complex, or the rise of the Sunbelt was dependent upon state sponsored economic development. Smith makes some interesting observations on the creation of the Federal Works Agency in 1939, on the significance of defense related public construction during the war, and the efforts made up to, and including, the Highways Act (1956). However, while the intricacies of the political relationships relating to public works are presented and analysed in an impressive manner, the post 1945 economic links to government funded construction are less convincing.

University of Leicester

Peter Fearon
Motion pictures examine the past in different ways and one of the genres which has received considerable attention in the last thirty years is the biographical film, known among the cognoscenti as the “biopic.” As early as 1977, Richard Gustafson noted a special interest in the genre in an article for *Film & History* (3.3 [1977]: 49-54). Decades later, George F. Custen's 1992 study, *Bio/pics: how Hollywood constructed public history* was a sophisticated study with emphasis on the quest for prestige by studio moguls who supported biopic projects against the advice of their marketing departments. This interest, of course, stemmed from the stubborn human interest in the “great man” approach to history. The book under review, by John Tibbetts of the University of Kansas, surveys biopics of selected composers.

Composers in this book span the decades, beginning with studio era “prestige” productions about Franz Schubert, Johann Strauss Jr., George Frederick Handel, Frederic Chopin, Niccolo Paganini, Franz Liszt, Robert Schumann, Nicholi Rimsky-Korsakov, Gilbert and Sullivan, Richard Wagner, Peter Tchaikovsky, and Ludwig van Beethoven. Independent songwriters find a chapter which includes Stephen F. Foster, George M. Cohan, Stephen Romberg, George Gershwin, Paul Dresser, Jerome Kern, Cole Porter, W. C. Handy, and John Philip Sousa. The study then turns to independent film projects by Ken Russell, director of such composer films as *Elgar, Bartok, The Debussy Film, The Song of Summer* (Delius), *The Music Lovers* (Tchaikovsky), *Mahler, Listzomania, Vaughan Williams, Anton Bruckner*—films which blend “the historical figure, the myth that that figure has created, and Russell’s own vision on the subject” (164). A chapter is devoted to a lesser-known British Director, Tony Palmer, whose *Wagner, Puccini, England, My England* (Purcell), and *Testimony* (Berlioz). On Palmer, Simon Callow is quoted approvingly to the effect that “He has to believe the composer he’s working on is the greatest composer in history. And by the time he’s through, you believe it, too” (262). The volume concludes with an affectionate study of a justifiably praised production, *Amadeus*. (Actor Simon Callow, who played Mozart in the dark biopic, supplies a Foreward to this volume.) Both the stage and cinematic versions are examined in enlightening “stage to screen” fashion, finding the Milos Forman film to be a positive “object lessen in the adaptive process” (269). Latter portions of the book examine less known experimental studies. Tibbetts has deliberately left out films about performers such as Al Jolson, Benny Goodman, Glenn Miller, referring readers to Krim Gabbard's *Jammin' at the Margins* (1996) for such creative performer/composers in the popular mainstream.

Methodology is addressed by the Introduction where Tibbetts gives some personal insight into why he is so absorbed, as a scholar, in the study of music and film. He limns out a variety of popular myths about composers—for example, that they are “possessed” by the muse (frequently Mozart) or that they were “possessors” of genius (Beethoven) whose extraordinary gifts permitted them to transgress moral patterns expected of us ordinary mortals. He discusses musical canons and the issues of “high” and “low” culture as they apply to film producers and film audiences alike. What makes this book a delight to read is the combination of enthusiasm and knowledge which this scholar of cinema and student of the arts brings to his task. Many books there will be on the issue of how motion pictures treat music and composers, but few have been—or will be—essened by someone who has credentials in the theory and practice of both art forms.
Because this study will have lasting value and continued shelf life, it is recommended for all public and university libraries. More importantly, teachers in the schools should also find it very useful in guiding the iPod generation to salient composers and works of the classical and post classical musical canon.

Oklahoma State University

Peter C. Rollins


It has taken quite a while to convince historians that sports are a worthy field of study, with those who study sports history considered separate from those who study real history. Boxing has been a particularly troublesome arena, as many have considered a personal interest in pugilism to qualify them to step into the ring. One way for sports to become better integrated into broader historical realms is for a broad range of scholars to consider how sports fit into their own field, something Lewis Erenberg has done with The Greatest Fight of our Generation: Louis vs. Schmeling.

Erenberg, who has made significant contributions to the study of American nightlife, uses the lens of the legendary Joe Louis-Max Schmeling rivalry to further our understanding of the critical interwar years. With rich historical detail regarding the fighters, their two fights, and the importance of the quest for the heavyweight championship, Erenberg sheds much light on the broader picture of the Great Depression and World War II, with astute observations regarding race, economics, and the increasingly international political stage.

For Erenberg, it is the second bout—the rematch—that is the more significant, not only because Louis prevailed, but also because of how it became a face-off between fascism and democracy, a “nationalist drama on the international stage” (2). Louis’s victory ensured him a place not as a black hero, but rather an American hero, allowing him to somewhat transcend his racial identity for a more wholly national one. While the official beginning of the Civil Rights Movement was still decades away, Louis’s triumph over Schmeling allowed many Americans—for the first time—to embrace a black man as a symbol of democracy, racializing national identity in a profoundly new and cosmopolitan way.

Yet within this sweeping portrait, it is Erenberg’s depiction of Schmeling—perhaps because Louis is simply a better known figure in American history—that is particularly effective. Schmeling became a personal favorite of Hitler, who well understood both the power of sports and the national symbolism that could be tied to the male athletic body within Nazi propaganda campaigns. But despite his profit as a symbol for Aryan superiority, Schmeling, who never publicly criticized Nazi anti-Semitism, applied his celebrity to protect Jewish friends. Of course, after his loss to Louis, “he could no longer use his influence on behalf of individual Jews,” writes Erenberg, but he still made secret efforts, such as when he hid his tailor’s two sons during Kristallnacht, when the Nazis methodically destroyed Jewish businesses (168). The loss also endangered him personally, exemplified by his almost deadly stretch serving as a paratrooper during the war, during which he refused to toe the line for propaganda campaigns against the British and the United States.

Erenberg uses the postwar fate of the two boxers to signify the appeasement between Germany and the United States. Yet the paths that each take—Schmeling became a successful executive for Coca Cola and intermittently financially aided Louis, even
helping to pay for his funeral—demonstrate how rigidly the realities of race and class remained in America, even as civil rights movements began to more visibly rage across the national landscape. Still, Erenberg makes it difficult to doubt the significance of the two men while they faced each other in the ring. While many have made observations regarding how these two fighters served as representatives of their respective nation’s political values, Erenberg gives great detail and substance to this claim, ensuring that this book about boxing is actually about the intensifying gaze of race and internationalism in the 20th century.

The College of New Rochelle


As befitting its subject, this is a lavish (and very pink!) book. Cohan approaches the musical genre (as produced by the preeminent Hollywood studio) from a queer perspective. His argument integrates cultural theory with deft close readings and judicious historical contextualization. The theoretical framework consists of a lucid synthesis of existing understandings of camp, especially in its guise as a nonconformist strategy of consumption. The textual materials consist of films and paracinematic texts (promotional commentary, video repackaging, Judy Garland fan websites). Brief historical sidelines address the fate of MGM and its assets, the evolutionary arc of the genre, career highlights of major stars, and queer collaborators behind the scenes.

In choosing his examples, Cohan juxtaposes refreshingly lesser-known numbers (from Ziegfeld Follies, Bathing Beauty, I Love Melvin, and Broadway Rhythm) with new takes on canonic films and performances. (Inveterate fans of Judy and Gene Kelly will not come away unsatisfied.) He incorporates compendious references to current research on spectatorship and gender representation. His writing is exuberant and entertaining. At the same time, he is meticulous in tracking down intertextual connections (e.g., listing all previous appearances of the recycled songs in Singin’ in the Rain) and analyzing numbers frame by frame, as to form, costume, gesture, lyric, and character. Such hyper-awareness of history and hyperattention to detail (dependent on individual-viewing technology and scholarly imperatives) creates an underlying dissonance with mainstream viewing practice at the time of release, and this dissonance could have been consciously thematized—especially given the suggestive analogue between such scholarly reading and the minority camp readings he postulates.

Overall, Cohan develops a complex alternative focus on his chosen genre, while demonstrating how camp appeal coexisted with mass appeal in the same products. As for camp, that over-theorized but still squishy concept, his main points can be enumerated as follows: Camp derives from a historical practice whereby queer people articulated their experience of incongruity in relation to dominant culture. Camp is not dependent on queer content, but can be expressed through performative attitudes of ironic engagement. Camp functioned as a strategy of passing; thus camp meanings exist as lurking potential, to which individual spectators may be sensitized or oblivious. MGM musicals expressly invited such double reception. Historically, there has been a devolution into “mass camp” spectatorship, a hip attitude toward cultural waste safely disengaged from any queer affiliation.

Cohan’s camp readings are convincing and illuminating, opening up productive avenues of interpretation while exploring and validating dialogues between central and
marginal cultural positions. But they never quite pin down the elusiveness of the strategic concept. In these readings, camp is variously located in stylistic excess, parodic performance, the dialectic between authenticity and theatricality, gender nonconformity, the erotic objectification of the male, and formal aggregation as resistant to narrative direction. Cumulatively, questions arise as to the precise delineation of incongruity as a lever of queer knowledge, but there is no doubt as to its interpretive richness.

Particularly strong and paradigmatic are his analyses of affectional triangles, the role of chorus boys, the heterosexuality of Kelly’s image over time, and the potential of the female star turn to express camp agency. Less successful for me was the final chapter on internet fan groups, which never sufficiently justified the time spent on (sometimes paltry and debased) ephemeral chat. Even without this weak ending, however, the book would still be a wonderful, 300-page performance, a model and a celebration of going over the top.

McGill University (Canada) Lloyd Whitesell


Franklin Odo’s carefully researched, textured narrative examines a select group of second generation Japanese American, or Nisei, men who volunteered to be manual laborers for the U.S. Army for approximately the first year of the war. Immediately following the Pearl Harbor attack, most of these men—who belonged to the Hawai‘i Territorial Guard (HTG)—were given weapons, without regard for their Japanese ancestry, to protect the islands from a possible Japanese invasion. No further attacks came, but as Japan’s military successes continued into the early months of 1942, racist cries about potential treachery by the local Japanese mounted. Some alarmists even called for the evacuation of all 160,000 of Hawai‘i’s Japanese, then 40% of the islands’ population, to Molokai. No mass internment occurred, but all Nisei were dismissed from the HTG in January 1942.

What followed can easily be interpreted as a heroic tale of gaman, or “perseverance,” in which the former Nisei guardsmen quickly formed the Varsity Victory Volunteers (VVV) to demonstrate their continuing patriotism and utility to their country. They labored for the 34th U.S. Army Corp of Engineers at Schofield Barracks until the opportunity to join an all-Nisei regimental combat troop was granted to them. Most then joined what became the famous 442nd/100th or the Military Intelligence Service. After the war, many attended college, and a number went on to obtain law and doctoral degrees at prestigious mainland institutions. Along with their Nisei peers, the former VVV members eventually became leaders in Hawai‘i’s government, law, education, and business professions, thereby achieving what would have been unimaginable in the racially stratified society of their youth.

Although he relies heavily on oral interviews with former VVV members, Odo’s purpose is far from hagiography. He is disturbed that the oversimplified story of Hawai‘i’s “greatest generation” maintains the myth of the “model minority” as well as the notion that those faced with injustice ought properly respond with supplication, or more fervent efforts to prove their worth. While clearly admiring of the VVV for reshaping the fate meted out to them, he emphasizes that their efforts would have failed had they lacked the crucial support of influential Euroamericans and other non-Japanese. Moreover, he thoroughly debunks the misperception that superior “Japanese” values such as
gaman, acceptance, education, etc., explain the sociopolitical and economic success of Japanese Americans in Hawai‘i. He does this by demonstrating that these presumably timeless values were, in fact, inventions of the Meiji state and were not mindlessly absorbed by Meiji subjects. Indeed, many of Odo interviewees explain that their emigrant parents de-emphasized education—a strategy that made sense given the circumscribed opportunities for educated Nisei before the war.

As for the vaunted, turn-the-other-cheek patriotism of the Nisei, Odo points out that only half of the Nisei in the HTG signed up for the VVV. He also shows that many Nisei men signed up to fight in the war not for some perceived noble cause to expand democracy, but for more prosaic personal reasons such as not wanting to be left behind by one’s buddies.

As a third generation Japanese American, or Sansei, from Hawai‘i, Odo most likely does not wonder why his parents and grandparents allowed themselves to be “herded into the camps,” as many of his mainland peers do. Rather than finding the “true” Nisei heroes in the form of draft resisters as many of them have, he eschews easy and comforting interpretations. This is why his critique of his elders is more devastating. It is voiced through one former VVV member, the late Yugo Okubo:

If we are to be credited let it be for what once was a noble cause 40 years ago. Let us be credited today for our unquestioning of the status quo, our blindness to injustice, and our ignoring of the victims of society. Let us be credited for being able to play golf and listen to EF Hutton.

. . .

(272-273)

The Nisei men who formed the VVV helped engineer the opening of the power structure in Hawai‘i; unfortunately, they did so only widely enough for their kind to enter. Franklin Odo’s excellent book helps us begin to understand why.

Brown University

Naoko Shibusawa


During World War II the United States military interned about 430,000 prisoners of war in the continental United States, including approximately 380,000 Germans, 51,000 Italians, and 5,500 Japanese servicemen captured in North African, European, and Pacific theaters. David Fiedler’s The Enemy Among Us: POWs in Missouri during World War II adds to the substantial work already done by local historians and special interest groups with military background by providing the first extensive account of four large camps and several smaller sites in Missouri that detained more than 15,000 German and Italian POWs between 1942 and 1946.

Fiedler’s book neither promises nor provides a complex thesis. Instead, it covers main camps and camp clusters individually in separate chapters that address the camps’ planning, installation, operation, conditions, as well as the relations among the POWs, American civilians, and military personnel. Fiedler adds valuable references to the U.S. military’s extensive POW labor program which was meant to alleviate manpower shortage, as well as a reorientation program that sought to democratize prisoners and make them cooperative post-war allies. He explains disobedience and violence among the
POWs with more scrutiny than other scholars have by distinguishing between National Socialist or Fascist actions and prisoners’ occasional refusal to work.

Fiedler scrupulously reconstructs this history by using military documents, newspaper articles, diaries, letters, and interviews, but takes no critical position on the history of POWs in American hands and makes no interventions in its scholarship. The book relies on a theme shared among works that already exist, namely that the mostly friendly relations between the POWs and Americans signified essentially equal social relations at a time of war. Many of the American civilians felt a sense of a shared human equality with the American soldiers and the POWs, and, as Fiedler put it, “treated those boys as their own” (v). However, such egalitarianism did not apply to African American civilians and military personnel, Japanese American citizens, or the European Jewish refugees who were denied the transportation that brought war prisoners to the United States. Anti-Semitic hostility in the American military or the German POW camps often went unpunished and is rarely mentioned in the literature on the topic. Fiedler’s theme of wartime comradeship thereby seems to disregard this undemocratic social context.

However, the book’s descriptions of different Missouri communities that negotiated the presence of American military as well as enemy prisoners demonstrate careful attention to variables in an always complex social history. Fiedler shows that while some communities desired the economic boost that accompanies the introduction of military installations, others resented the federal government’s appropriating land that citizens had owned and did not intend to sell, or accepted military sites because propaganda convinced citizens that they were, and were required to be, part of the war effort. These stories provide valuable examples of wartime negotiations between government, military, and civilians when federal interests often override rights and decisions of civilian citizens. Then again, Fiedler should have offered readers a more critical analysis of the social negotiations he describes.

University of Kansas
Andrea Weis


To proclaim that reports of the death of Yiddish are greatly exaggerated does not quite capture the point of Jeffrey Shandler’s Adventures in Yiddishland: Postvernacular Language & Culture. As Shandler (who aptly describes himself as a “native listener” [xi] of the language) understands very well, it is somehow quite plausible to analogize the careers of languages and cultures to those of persons. Thus we might say that a language is “born” in a certain place, comes to “maturation” under certain conditions (of ideology, class structure, and communications media), and becomes “moribund” or even “dies” when those conditions are no longer present. Yet, as he also makes clear, languages are not organisms, and even when (as was the case with Yiddish) a preponderance of the speakers of a language are annihilated in the span of just a few years, while the number of remaining (or new) speakers is diminished through cultural repression and assimilation, the language itself may well experience both an afterlife and a sea change into something newly strange and wonderful.

Shandler lucidly explains how the ideology of Yiddishism, and related folk ethnographies of East European Jewish life, fostered deeply ingrained notions of Yiddish vernacularity, its status as folk-shprakh (the people’s language) as at least one of the essential defining characteristics of East European Jewish life. At the turn of the twen-
tieth century, Yiddish was somewhat Eurocentrally understood, by its promoters and detractors, as the language of *di yidishe gas*, the Jewish street. It was praised as the language *vos redt zikh*, “which speaks itself,” or again as the best language because *me fershteyt yedes vort* (you can understand every word).

As Shandler acknowledges, at the turn of the millenium Yiddish remains to a large extent the language of *di yidishe gas* in highly traditionalist religious neighborhoods in New York, Israel, and elsewhere. He identifies cultural creativity in this milieu, such as the children’s board games “*handl erlikh*” (Deal Honestly), a takeoff on Monopoly that “enables players to acquire property from an international roster of sites located in a Hasidic Yiddishland, both past (Crclow, Kuźnica, Leżajsk, Lublin, Rymanów) and present (Antwerp, Boro Park, London, Monsey, Montreal)” (46). But as Shandler suggests, and as such examples attest, even this retention of Yiddish falls within the scope of his “postvernacular” rubric, inasmuch as it reflects not a naturalistic continuation of an isolated idiom, but the vigorous enforcement of a highly self-conscious traditionalism.

Shandler defines “postvernacular Yiddish” as “privileging of the secondary level of signification of Yiddish,” that is, “the symbolic value invested in the language” over its “primary level of signification,” or “its instrumental value as a vehicle for communicating information, opinions, feelings, ideas” (4). The language stops being understood primarily as a vehicle for communication, and media communications become the vehicle that point to the semi-lost language itself as a signifier—of home, of nonviolent collective identification, of authenticity, of unselfconscious laughter, of alternate gender roles, of self-reflexivity without neurotic paralysis, and of many other good things besides. Not, by any means, that the media employed are all pietistic; Shandler includes, without flinching, a discussion and illustration of the 1995 board game “Look at the Schmuck on that Camel” (171), which he aptly describes as offering “the transmission of a mock heritage” (173).

With analyses such as these, Shandler has helped provide the foundation for a contemporary Yiddish cultural studies that can now dispense with the exhausted question of whether Yiddish is more or less dead, and can balance rescue (and mourning) of the fragments of Yiddishland with celebration and contestation of the new formations that these fragments nourish.

University of Kansas

Jonathan Boyarin


Judy Morley has written a provocative analysis of the old story about how postmodern urban designers in three cities have adopted historic preservation as the essential tool for the economic revitalization of their city centers, which by the mid-20th century had become derelict or obsolete commercial and residential neighborhoods, filled with a motley selection of old businesses, empty buildings, and run-down residences catering to bums, alcoholics, or poor people. Instead of bulldozing these landscapes and starting all over again through a process called urban renewal that wiped out the people and past and ultimately failed to revitalize anything, developers, lawyers, politicians, planners, and preservationists in the 1970s through the 1990s retained whole neighborhoods for new economic and social purposes, preserved their old buildings and spatial relationships which lent an ambiance of authenticity, gave credence to a new historic identity, and provided a safe place for business people and shoppers who
wanted to forget the bums and buildings of the real past. In a neutron bomb approach in which selected buildings were kept and the unwanted rabble was banned, the preferred new historic identity with all its make-up on helped create excitement downtown in trendy stores, nifty restaurants, bars, and apartments affordable to a growing consumer class of middle and upper income people, including suburban moms and dads who wanted to take their kids on an outing to the historic market in Seattle, empty nesters who wanted loft pied-à-terre within walking distance of their downtown professional offices in Denver, and tourists who wanted a taste of the old adobe Southwest in Albuquerque, commodified and homogenized into a nicely cleansed image of a historic place that never existed before. Nine out of ten visitors to historic sites in the United States believe in their historic trustworthiness, and so not unexpectedly, these preservation initiatives have strong heritage as well as economic value.

Morley is both a realist and fatalist about these Disney lands. She confronts critics directly in her excellent intellectual introduction to the issues involving our easy replacement of history with heritage that prefers a past we can agree upon and shrouds what we select from the past with a mythic identity we can consume. “Saying that a revitalized district in 1980 was different than it had been in 1880 is a pointless observation—of course it is different. More meaningful is the existence of the district in the face of what else might have gone there” (13). Had planners not invented a new tradition and identity for these urban neighborhoods, had they decided to be perfectly honest and kept the bums with warehouses, these areas would have been unwieldy, inconsumable remnants of the unresolved past headed for extinction in the dynamics of building these post modern cities. As a part of the urban dynamics there and in many cities, preservationists fought urban renewal and its consequences for people and buildings, but in order to save anything were forced to compromise with public and private groups interested in the larger benefits of economic revitalization and heritage tourism. In “an attempt to reconcile the past with the future” (153) at the neighborhood scale preservationists compromised, accepted a facsimile of the past, and let the city’s old building fabric live on sans bums, old businesses, and poor families. In this living, they have created millions of dollars in the economies of Albuquerque, Denver, and Seattle and given them strong regional identities. This is a classic study of gentrification.

The University of Kentucky

Dennis Domer


The most respected brand-name in the publishing history of black poetry began as a small-time operation on a shoe-string budget. Founded in 1965 by Dudley Randall, Broadside Press materialized a publishing approach to the Black Power and Black Arts credos of self-determination and grassroots activism. Broadside never produced books and bestsellers on the scale of mainstream publishing conglomerates. Nonetheless, this small press generated tremendous value as an imprint based on its ability to link an assorted group of black poets to an interrelated enterprise. Indeed, if Amiri Baraka, Larry Neal, and other leading radical writers were the architects of the Black Arts Movement, then certainly Dudley Randall’s efforts with Broadside made him one of the movement’s chief builders.

Melba Joyce Boyd’s Wrestling with the Muse: Dudley Randall and the Broadside Press confirms Randall’s centrality to African American publishing history. Her study
makes Randall’s contributions to the publication of poetry quite apparent by detailing his involvement as a publisher and tireless promoter of a wide-range of literary artists. In addition to publishing volumes of poetry, Randall’s press produced and distributed audio recordings, anthologies, and poetry broadsides, which gave the press its name. Boyd explains how Randall expanded the possibilities of black poetic community by constructing a publishing network that featured established poets such as Gwendolyn Brooks, Robert Hayden, and Margaret Walker and several emergent literary artists, including Etheridge Knight, Haki Madhubuti, and Sonia Sanchez. Thanks to Randall, Boyd’s study reveals, audiences were exposed to a diversity of black writings.

In addition to charting Randall’s contributions as a publisher, Boyd creates a striking and detailed portrait of Randall as an intellectual and poet. The book exposes readers to the achievements and struggles of the man behind the press. As Randall’s protégé, Boyd offers descriptions of his life that blur the lines between conventional historical scholarship and personal reflection. Her regular use of a first-person perspective gives Wrestling with the Muse the feel of a distinctly personalized biography. That is to say, the chronicler of Randall’s life makes appearances in the text. What results is a broader recognition of the ways that the histories of younger generations of artists grow out of the narratives of their elders.

Scholars of literary history and poetry will appreciate Boyd’s charting of Randall’s life and career. The study situates Randall and his activities within larger historical and publishing developments. Wrestling with the Muse also contributes to recent scholarship on the Black Arts Movement. In particular, Boyd’s book complements such studies as James Smethurst’s The Black Arts Movement: Literary Nationalism in the 1960s and 1970s (University of North Carolina Press, 2005) and Cheryl Clarke’s “After Mecca”: Women Poets and the Black Arts Movement (Rutgers University Press, 2005). Overall, Boyd’s study reveals that some of the most significant figures in the production of African American poetry actually did more than compose their own lines of graceful verse. As an editor and publisher, Randall established links between audiences and a variety of poetic voices.

Southern Illinois University Edwardsville


Over twelve per cent of the citizens in the world’s richest country live in poverty. This is less than the twenty-one per cent reported in 1959, but still a point of national embarrassment and concern. The problem is complex, related to race, gender, and age as well as to a globalizing economy. It also has an important geographical component. Amy Glasmeier’s new atlas, underwritten by a grant from the Ford Foundation, focuses on regions that have been left behind. She discusses Appalachia, the Mississippi Delta, Indian reservations, rural America, and segregated cities, and produces multiple maps for each. Some of her graphics trace change by decade since 1960. Others portray the experience of children, the elderly, the working poor, women, and African and Hispanic Americans.

Quality marks the atlas design. Its eighty-eight pages of text and twenty of preface contain a generous 45 tables, 65 graphs, and 115 maps, an average of two per page. Its paper is glossy and thick, and an elongated format (11" × 8½") allows for three columns of text and a variety of illustration placements. As for the maps themselves, all are in full color. Most are choropleth designs with state or county divisions broken into five
or six classes. The color scheme grades from a light yellow through greens and blues to royal purple. This sounds garish but works well.

In her professional life, Amy Glasmeier straddles the border between theory and application. Her doctorate is in planning, and while maintaining a standard academic position at the Pennsylvania State University, she also has worked closely with the federal government’s Appalachian Regional Development Commission. This atlas exhibits similar hybridity. Its prose is measured and seemingly even-handed, but nevertheless makes clear that the author thinks more government investment is needed. Excellent discussions exist on the difficulties of measuring poverty (xiv-xv) and of how government policy in this area has evolved since the 1930s. Policy history actually (and inexplicably) is covered twice: pp. 31-50 and 82-88. In contrast, the analysis accompanying the maps of Appalachia and other regions of distress is much less satisfying. Regionalism is the atlas’s raison d’etre, but instead of detailed commentary, each case study receives less than a page of text. This is too short to allow much beyond platitudes.

With its emphasis on county maps, the Glasmeier atlas depicts rural areas well. Such an approach necessarily masks the important poverty within large cities, however, and readers should keep this deficiency in mind. A person can usefully spend hours with these maps. One acquires, for example, a deeper appreciation of the social security system after seeing graphic evidence how it has reduced economic hardship among the elderly. On the regional level, although poverty has lessened somewhat in Appalachia, the Delta, and rural America over the last half century, it is sobering to learn that a quarter of the nation’s counties still have average incomes twice as low as the national mean.

University of Kansas

James R. Shortridge


This book is a beautiful mess! The title promises a tough comparison between Grand Touring—that quaint trip abroad on which young Britons and Americans of a bygone era were initiated into the mysteries of High Art and low pleasure—and the Italian-themed resorts of today’s Las Vegas. It never happens. Indeed, a more systematic analysis of casino tourism in America’s self-proclaimed Sin City (“What happens in Las Vegas, stays in Las Vegas!”) and its effects on those who come to visit can be found in any episode of CSI where a colorful opening shot of the various Eiffel Towers and Doge’s Palaces of the Strip devolves quickly into views of the equally colorful innards of one of its guests.

Unanswered, alas, are the key questions. Why Italy? Why is the current off-season playground of George Clooney and bevies of divorcees seeking the consolations so attractively packaged in Under the Tuscan Sun suddenly chic again—and in the vacation homeland of the Mafia don? What, precisely, are New Yorkers or Oklahomans or Californians looking for amid the columns and frescoes and the platters of Vitello Milanese? Is this American Imperium come home to roost in the atomic desert of the west? Or an epic tale of the risk-taking of the American pioneer played out in the clutches of a one-armed bandit, under the bemused eyes of plaster Renaissance saints?

The text of the book is like a Google-driven gondola cruise through the canals of the Venetian Hotel. Or a multicourse Italian dinner in an upscale mall, with opera blar-
ing from a Three Tenors CD. A little Baudrillard. A dash of Eco. A twist of Sontag, Lyotard, Venturi, all garnished with the titles of every movie set in Las Vegas since Elvis, Liberace, and the Rat Pack blew into town. It’s got a great aroma, that feast, but the taste, surprisingly, is a little flat.

Despite gorgeous photographs of Caesar’s Palace, The Bellagio, The Venetian, and half of Italy, there is no effort to provide any real facts. Indeed, we are told that the epochal Caesar’s Palace was built in the 60s. And that’s it. The 1660s? 60 B.P.E.? What’s the scale of the copies of the genuine articles? The (re)arrangement of monuments? Why mess with success? Conspicuously absent from the theorizing and the listing is any but the most fleeting mention of the Disney simulacra, which have been thoroughly studied within the matrix of history and architectural history. Since no less a figure in Las Vegas history than Walt Disney himself came up with a bevy of ideas to improve the place—the Collins Avenue light show and monorails were both suggested years before their execution—it might have been worth looking at the Walt Disney World Piazza San Marco, for which visitor reaction was built into the designs. Similarly, the growing literature on “architourism” might have spiced up this midnight buffet of images and fragmentary quips.

Finally, why single out Italian resorts, when there are circuses, France, motel-moderne, and sleaze to be looked at right down the block, or the currently “hot” retro-retro style (used first at the latest Disney parks). Philip Johnson, in one of his final public appearances, spoke at a symposium on Disney architecture in New York, as a guest of Robert A. M. Stern. The arch-modernist who once dismissed the ugly and the ordinary of quotidian American life praised the theme parks for making buildings fun again. *Dreaming of Italy* needs a big dose of fun. A gelato, maybe. A nice glass of Chianti.

University of Minnesota

Karal Ann Marling


In the past four years the scholarship devoted to the development of Black gospel music or the lives and contributions of its major purveyors have grown significantly. This list includes, but is not limited to, Teresa Reed’s *The Holy Profane: Religion in Black Popular Music*, Robert Darden’s *People Get Ready: A New History of Black Gospel Music*, and Jerma A. Jackson’s *Singing in My Soul: Black Gospel Music in a Secular Age*. All of which, along with landmark works by scholars Horace Boyer, Anthony Heilbut, Bernice Johnson Reagon, and Kip Lornell, have sought to bring clarity and understanding about one of America’s most influential musical genres. Jerry Zolten can now be added to this list with his work *Great God A’Mighty!* Focused on one of gospel music’s seminal groups, The Dixie Hummingbirds, the book traces the group’s early years in the deep South, numerous personnel changes, experiences on the gospel circuit and meteoric rise to mainstream popularity with the recording “Loves Me Like a Rock” with Paul Simon in the early 1970s. Zolten weaves into this biographical study of the Hummingbirds an interesting discourse on the evolution of gospel music during its peak years prior to and after World War II, the rise of gospel music industry with the expanding influence of independent labels, gospel’s influence on the developing sound of secular black music, and the transition of the genre to mainstream popularity in the 1960s and 1970s.
Through discussion of recording sessions, repertoire, performance approaches and performances on the famous gospel circuit, which served as the “training ground” for many secular performers, *Great God A'Mighty!* provides the reader with clear understanding of how the performative aesthetic of black gospel music changed during the pivotal years of 1945-1965 (née the “Golden Age of Gospel”). But for all of the detail that Zolten gives to these subjects, the Hummingbirds themselves are never treated with the same zeal and passion. One is left to think that these southern-born and reared African American men faced racial tension with a nonchalant attitude; that their decision to perform politically-charged songs at Café Society was more of a career move than a conscious display of political activism; and that the setbacks they faced individually and as a group were just par for the course. The Hummingbirds are presented, outside of their music, as being one-dimensional characters whose music is their rationale for all of their life decisions. More discussion of the members’ lives and experiences outside of the recording studio and gospel circuit would have added to the book tremendously. However, despite these oversights, *Great God A'Mighty!* is a well written, thoroughly researched book that will further the knowledge of both novices and experts in gospel music. Most important it serves as a single indepth documenter of the group’s seventy-five year history.

Miami University (OH)

Tammy L. Kernodle


*Shameless,* Arlene Stein’s travelogue of lesbian life in the last part of the twentieth century, is what to assign undergraduates who don’t know what professors mean when they say “woman identified,” “sexpert,” or “The Pink Swastika.” It is an important archive of essays written largely during the 1980s and 1990s when Stein moved from San Francisco to Oregon, but offers few insights to those familiar with the battles of the past forty years.

The first part of Stein’s book analytically documents the “sex debates” between pro-sex and anti-porn feminists that emerged after the famous 1982 Barnard conference; the subsequent thrill of “lusty lesbians” like Susie Bright whose pro-porn bravado enlivened the Reagan ‘80s; and the gradual niche marketing of the women’s music subculture in the 1980s and 1990s that gave way to the mainstreaming of pop singers like k. d. lang and Melissa Etheridge. A very lesbian tour of events, Part I circles around to consider “seventies questions for nineties women.”

The second half of the book explores the political and rhetorical forces that emerged to thwart lesbian-feminism. Examining the Oregon ballot measures designed to deny civil rights to homosexuals in the 1990s, Stein provides predictable explanations of the “emotional logic” of the Christian right, relying on old theories of violent regeneration and authoritarianism. In the book’s most illuminating chapter, “Whose Memories? Whose Victimhood?,” Stein examines both how gay/lesbian groups claimed AIDS as a Holocaust and how the Christian right modeled anti-gay propaganda after Nazi anti-Semitism. She closes Part II with another predictable exploration of “anxious masculinity and emergent homophobias,” extending what she witnessed in the Pacific Northwest and published in her first book, *The Stranger Next Door,* to legislation of recent years around which the gay marriage controversy has swirled.

But *Shameless* offers few innovative scholarly arguments. Written as if Michel Foucault never called into question the “repressive hypothesis,” Stein’s book preserves
a historiography of sexual enlightenment whose progressive trajectory is disrupted by those supposed throwbacks to Victorian times. True to her sociological training, Stein also retains the ethnic model of the sexual “minority” who, like African Americans striving to rise *Up from Slavery*, must rise “up from shame.” Stein’s theorization of shame is regrettably more anecdotal than analytical, ignoring, for example, Michael Warner’s compelling distinction between shame and stigma. Without fully examining what he called “the trouble with normal” and others hailed as Queer Nation, she devotes only a couple of pages to ACT-UP, and none to Lesbian Avengers. Harvey Milk and Matthew Shepard are here, briefly, but not Brandon Teena. Indeed, the most mind-boggling omission is mentioning only once the profoundly interesting and important emergence of transgender issues from the 1990s onward. Thus, *Shameless* practically erases the most potent and provocative critiques offered by militant activism, anti-assimilationist queer theory, and subsequent transgender debates. This is a good sociology of lesbianism in the era of the Christian right, but it hardly delivers the promise of its inclusive-sounding subtitle, an examination of “sexual dissidence in American culture.”

Oklahoma State University

Carol Mason


Richard Brewer has given us a thorough review of land preservation and conservancy history in the United States. He provides a comprehensive treatment of land trusts, focused specifically on those trusts with the “intent to preserve land” as their stated mission. There are three main sections: the early chapters cover background for land preservation, the middle section serves as an excellent handbook for those involved with land trusts, and additional chapters provide case studies of major conservancies and local land trusts in this country.

Beginning with strong arguments for preserving biodiversity, Brewer provides species-specific examples, like the role of Running Buffalo Clover relative to ecological communities and ecosystem succession. He clarifies the differences between early advocacy groups and land preservation groups, explaining how that distinction has carried into the present. A key point is the growth of conservancies since 1980s, cited by Brewer as the true beginning of the land trust movement in America. He explains this well, illustrating the connections to environmental awareness, changes in the federal government’s policies, and other aspects of that era.

The middle section, chapters 3-8, is very useful for landowners, land trust staff, and board members. It addresses questions of land protection: why, who, which lands, how, and what is “land stewardship”? Brewer builds directly on the earlier material, grounded in his extensive background and experience as a biologist and land trust board member. It is here that he answers explicit questions, including how to distinguish forms of land protection. For example, there is a very good section (114ff) clarifying the actual costs of protecting land, and how to estimate them.

Brewer describes the complexities of Conservation Easements, currently very popular (as verified through statistics from the Land Trust Alliance [LTA] workshops, journal articles, etc.). He examines landowner benefits for those who protect land using Conservation Easements, while also raising the “non-economic” values that motivate landowners. He emphasizes ongoing stewardship as most vital; this is key among emerging issues of the conservancy movement today. Education of future generations of land-
owners with property protected by Conservation Easements is also raised as critical. These examples and detail, educating the public as well as current and potential land trust board members, is the gift of Brewer’s work.

More images and graphics would nicely enhance this powerful text. On p. 11 Brewer describes the powerful impact four Wisconsin maps compiled by Curtis in 1956 had on him; his own readers would similarly benefit.

Additional acknowledgement of some early key players might be appropriate. These include Ralph Borsodi (father of “trustery” and the International Independence Institute) and Robert Swann. In 1972 the latter, with others, wrote The Community Land Trust - A Guide To A New Model For Land Tenure In America. The Community Land Trust (CLT) movement is indebted to these pioneers, and Brewer explains on p. 11 that CLTs focus on low-income housing. The common roots however are significant. The California State Coastal Conservancy (CCC) also provided timely and significant assistance to California land trusts forming during the critical years Brewer describes. The Humboldt North Coast Land Trust is but one example (cited by Brewer in the chapter on TPL, [222-223]) of a coastal land trust receiving CCC assistance, including financial, political, and organizational instruction.

The Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, referenced by Kingsbury Browne on p. 35 for funding his 1977 report “Case Studies in Land Preservation,” continues to contribute to this field. Jeff Pidot’s timely paper, “Reinventing Conservation Easements: A Critical Examination and Ideas for Reform,” is from the Lincoln Institute (2005). Like the CCC, the Lincoln Institute has many programs, yet each organization has played important roles for many land trusts throughout the country.

Overall, Brewer’s history is thorough and the cases detailed and well documented. He provides a good range of different types of preservation organizations and their structures, with lessons from both success and failure through many examples. This book serves the land trust movement well in each realm—as a history, as a handbook, and for general education. He is right on target with current issues in the final chapter: stewardship, public perceptions and educations, and organizational relationships. Brewer gives us hope for the future of land preservation in the USA.
University of Kansas

Donna Luckey